

THE JOURNAL OF FEDERAL AGENCY ACTION

Editor's Note: Are We All Agency Subjects Now?

Victoria Prussen Spears

Antitrust Agencies Remain Undeterred Despite Repeated Setbacks in Criminal Prosecutions of Wage-Fixing and No-Poach Agreements

Betty Graumlich, Michelle Mantine, and Danielle Stewart

Food and Drug Administration's Final Food Traceability Rule: What It Says and What It Means for the Future

Sharon Lindan Mayl, Bethany J. Hills, and Matthew Piscitelli

What Is in the Environmental Protection Agency's Billion Dollar PFAS Reporting Rule?

Victor Y. Xu and James B. Pollack

New Reimbursement Rules from Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Will Likely Impact Digital Health and Telemedicine

Jamie Ravitz, David Hoffmeister, Georgia Ravitz, Eva Yin, Paul Gadiock, Kathleen Snyder, and Jeff Weinstein

Department of Health and Human Services Offers HIPAA Guidance on Online Tracking Technologies

Paul Bond, Shannon Britton Hartsfield, Ilenna J. Stein, and Mark S. Melodia

Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council's Proposed Rule on Greenhouse Gas Emissions Would Impose Significant Compliance Obligations on Federal Contractors

Richard B. Oliver, Matt Carter, Alex D. Tomaszczuk, Michael S. McDonough, and Jeffrey A. Knight

Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs Proposes Significant Changes to Compliance Review Scheduling Letter and Itemized Listing

Christopher D. Durham and Zev L. Grumet-Morris

Treasury Department Issues Final Rule on Beneficial Ownership Reporting Requirements Under the Corporate Transparency Act

Jeff C. Dodd, Kevin E. Gaunt, Carleton Goss, Eric R. Markus, and Elizabeth P. White

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Signals Stricter Enforcement of "Unfair" Banking Fees

Clifford S. Stanford, Brendan Clegg, and Caroline K. Eisner

Robust Financial Guidelines on Tap for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Seller/Serviceers and Ginnie Mae Issuers

Amy McDaniel Williams, Edward L. Douma, Brit Mohler Dufilho, William J. Van Thunen, and Claudia H. Fendian

Securities and Exchange Commission Alleges That Investment Adviser Failed to Adequately Disclose ESG Investment Policies and Procedures

Alan R. Friedman, Andrew Otis, Steven S. Sparling, Arielle Warshall Katz, Daniel M. Ketani, and David Richards

The Journal of Federal Agency Action

Volume 1, No. 2 March–April 2023

- 77 Editor’s Note: Are We All Agency Subjects Now?**
Victoria Prussen Spears
- 83 Antitrust Agencies Remain Undeterred Despite Repeated Setbacks in Criminal Prosecutions of Wage-Fixing and No-Poach Agreements**
Betty Graumlich, Michelle Mantine, and Danielle Stewart
- 91 Food and Drug Administration’s Final Food Traceability Rule: What It Says and What It Means for the Future**
Sharon Lindan Mayl, Bethany J. Hills, and Matthew Piscitelli
- 105 What Is in the Environmental Protection Agency’s Billion Dollar PFAS Reporting Rule?**
Victor Y. Xu and James B. Pollack
- 111 New Reimbursement Rules from Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Will Likely Impact Digital Health and Telemedicine**
Jamie Ravitz, David Hoffmeister, Georgia Ravitz, Eva Yin, Paul Gadiock, Kathleen Snyder, and Jeff Weinstein
- 117 Department of Health and Human Services Offers HIPAA Guidance on Online Tracking Technologies**
Paul Bond, Shannon Britton Hartsfield, Ilenna J. Stein, and Mark S. Melodia
- 127 Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council’s Proposed Rule on Greenhouse Gas Emissions Would Impose Significant Compliance Obligations on Federal Contractors**
Richard B. Oliver, Matt Carter, Alex D. Tomaszczuk, Michael S. McDonough, and Jeffrey A. Knight
- 131 Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs Proposes Significant Changes to Compliance Review Scheduling Letter and Itemized Listing**
Christopher D. Durham and Zev L. Grumet-Morris
- 137 Treasury Department Issues Final Rule on Beneficial Ownership Reporting Requirements Under the Corporate Transparency Act**
Jeff C. Dodd, Kevin E. Gaunt, Carleton Goss, Eric R. Markus, and Elizabeth P. White

- 147 Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Signals Stricter Enforcement of “Unfair” Banking Fees**
Clifford S. Stanford, Brendan Clegg, and Caroline K. Eisner
- 153 Robust Financial Guidelines on Tap for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Seller/Serviceers and Ginnie Mae Issuers**
Amy McDaniel Williams, Edward L. Douma, Brit Mohler Dufilho, William J. Van Thunen, and Claudia H. Fendian
- 163 Securities and Exchange Commission Alleges That Investment Adviser Failed to Adequately Disclose ESG Investment Policies and Procedures**
Alan R. Friedman, Andrew Otis, Steven S. Sparling, Arielle Warshall Katz, Daniel M. Ketani, and David Richards

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Steven A. Meyerowitz

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

Victoria Prussen Spears

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Lynn E. Calkins

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

Washington, D.C.

Helaine I. Fingold

Member, Epstein Becker & Green, P.C.

Baltimore

Nancy A. Fischer

Partner, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

Washington, D.C.

Bethany J. Hills

Partner, DLA Piper

New York

Phil Lookadoo

Partner, Haynes and Boone, LLP

Washington, D.C.

Michelle A. Mantine

Partner, Reed Smith LLP

Pittsburgh

Ryan J. Strasser

Partner, Troutman Pepper Hamilton Sanders LLP

Richmond & Washington, D.C.

THE JOURNAL OF FEDERAL AGENCY ACTION (ISSN 2834-8796 (print) / ISSN 2834-8818 (online)) at \$495.00 annually is published six times per year by Full Court Press, a Fastcase, Inc., imprint. Copyright 2023 Fastcase, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner.

For customer support, please contact Fastcase, Inc., 711 D St. NW, Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20004, 202.999.4777 (phone), 202.521.3462 (fax), or email customer service at support@fastcase.com.

Publishing Staff

Publisher: Morgan Morrissette Wright

Production Editor: Sharon D. Ray

Cover Art Design: Morgan Morrissette Wright and Sharon D. Ray

This journal's cover includes a photo of Washington D.C.'s Metro Center underground station. The Metro's distinctive coffered and vaulted ceilings were designed by Harry Weese in 1969. They are one of the United States' most iconic examples of the brutalist design style often associated with federal administrative buildings. The photographer is by XH_S on Unsplash, used with permission.

Cite this publication as:

The Journal of Federal Agency Action (Fastcase)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Copyright © 2023 Full Court Press, an imprint of Fastcase, Inc.

All Rights Reserved.

A Full Court Press, Fastcase, Inc., Publication

Editorial Office

711 D St. NW, Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20004

<https://www.fastcase.com/>

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE JOURNAL OF FEDERAL AGENCY ACTION, 711 D St. NW, Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20004.

Articles and Submissions

Direct editorial inquiries and send material for publication to:

Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.,
26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@
meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541.

Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, corporate compliance officers, government agencies and their counsel, senior business executives, and anyone interested in federal agency actions.

This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact:

Morgan Morrisette Wright, Publisher, Full Court Press at mwright@fastcase.com
or at 202.999.4878

For questions or Sales and Customer Service:

Customer Service
Available 8 a.m.–8 p.m. Eastern Time
866.773.2782 (phone)
support@fastcase.com (email)

Sales
202.999.4777 (phone)
sales@fastcase.com (email)

ISSN 2834-8796 (print)
ISSN 2834-8818 (online)

Robust Financial Guidelines on Tap for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Seller/Servicers and Ginnie Mae Issuers

Amy McDaniel Williams, Edward L. Douma, Brit Mohler Dufilho, William J. Van Thunen, and Claudia H. Fendian*

In this article, the authors explain the new financial eligibility requirements for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac seller/servicers and Ginnie Mae issuers.

Regulation is like a knife: used as a scalpel, regulation can provide protections for vulnerable Americans; used as a machete, regulation can convince businesses to withdraw from sectors providing services to Americans, thus unintentionally harming people. Similar to the sharpening of a good knife, good regulation becomes scalpel-sharp by being scraped over hard questions; shedding imperfections where necessary and honing in where essential. Are recently promulgated rules governing mortgage servicers, which will not take effect until late-2023, scalpels or machetes? Agency action suggests the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) and the Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae) are committed to honing the minimum financial eligibility requirements governing mortgage servicers and creating a more secure environment for consumers and investors.

Over the past decade, regulated banks have exited the mortgage servicing business, selling their mortgage servicing rights (MSRs) to nonbank servicers, including hedge funds, who are not regulated as banks. For instance, at Ginnie Mae, nonbank servicers now handle 64% of the servicing for new loans, whereas in 2011 nonbank servicers handled only 6% of Ginnie Mae servicing. Regulators have expressed concern about the role of nonbank mortgage servicers. Will they have access to credit in times of stress? Will their drive to increase returns to investors lead them to cut corners and violate the law or consumers' rights?

With these concerns in mind, the FHFA and Ginnie Mae worked together to update financial eligibility requirements for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac seller/servicers and Ginnie Mae issuers. On August 17, 2022, they jointly announced¹ more robust minimum financial eligibility requirements for seller/servicers and issuers, which will first take effect on September 30, 2023. While these updated requirements were adopted with the goals of maintaining the safety and soundness of Ginnie Mae and the Government-Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs) and improving alignment among Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and Ginnie Mae participants, they diverge as noted in the tables below.

These heightened requirements and this divergence have already caused some seller/servicers and issuers to question their ability to continue to service Ginnie Mae MSRMs at current levels, particularly in light of the new Risk-Based Capital requirements discussed below. A product of Ginnie Mae's engagement with its issuer community, the recently released Frequently Asked Questions about Ginnie Mae's Amended Eligibility Requirement² sheds additional light on Ginnie Mae's rationale for the amended eligibility requirements and foreshadows how the requirements may impact issuer's financing of MSRMs after the effectiveness of the amended eligibility requirements.

The year leading up to the effective date for these new guidelines gives servicers time to plan and execute strategies for coming into compliance. Ginnie Mae has expressed that, while it believes that this time is sufficient time to bring affected issuers into compliance, it needs to understand issuers' strategies to ensure that compliance efforts do not cause dislocations in the MSR market. Lack of transparency in the MSR market adds to uncertainty about true value and may serve to increase price volatility.

Key Differences from Current Requirements

FHFA Requirements

The tables that follow demonstrate the changes to the definitions and various requirements with respect to the FHFA guidelines.

Definitions	Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Servicer Eligibility Guidelines 1.0	Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Servicer Eligibility Guidelines 2.0	Who the Requirement Applies to
Tangible Net Worth	Total Equity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets • Less "Affiliated Receivables" and "Pledged Assets net of associated Liabilities" 	Total Equity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets • Less "Affiliated Receivables" and "Pledged Assets net of associated Liabilities" • Less Deferred Tax Assets net of associated Deferred Tax Liabilities 	All Seller/Servicers
Eligible Liquidity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrestricted Cash and Cash Equivalents • The following unpledged, Available-for-Sale or Held-for-Trading securities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency MBS • Obligations of GSEs • U.S. Treasury Obligations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrestricted Cash and Cash Equivalents • The following unpledged, Available-for-Sale or Held-for-Trading securities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency MBS • Obligations of GSEs • U.S. Treasury Obligations • 50% of the unused portion of committed Agency servicing advance lines of credit 	All Non-Depositories

Requirements	Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Servicer Eligibility Guidelines 1.0	Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Servicer Eligibility Guidelines 2.0	Who the Requirement Applies to
Minimum Tangible Net Worth	Base: \$2.5 million Plus • 25 bps of UPB for total 1-4 unit residential mortgage loans serviced	Base: \$2.5 million Plus • Enterprise Servicing: 25 bps • Ginnie Mae Servicing: 35 bps • PLS & Other Servicing: 25 bps	All Seller/ Servicers
Capital Ratio	Tangible Net Worth/Total Assets greater than or equal to 6%	Tangible Net Worth/Total Assets greater than or equal to 6%	All Non-Depositories
Base Liquidity	3.5 bps of Agency Servicing UPB	Enterprise Servicing • Scheduled/ Scheduled: 7 bps • Scheduled/ Actual: 7 bps • Actual/Actual: 3.5 bps Ginnie Mae Servicing: 10 bps PLS & Other Servicing: 3.5 bps	All Non-Depositories
NPL* Threshold	Agency NPL greater than 6% requires an incremental NPL charge	No NPL threshold	
Incremental NPL Charge	Plus an incremental 200 bps charge on Agency NPL for the portion of Agency NPL greater than 6% of Agency servicing	No incremental NPL charge	

Requirements	Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Servicer Eligibility Guidelines 1.0	Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Servicer Eligibility Guidelines 2.0	Who the Requirement Applies to
Origination Liquidity	No origination liquidity requirement	50 bps times (Loans Held for Sale + Pipeline loans with Interest Rate Lock Commitments after Fallout Adjustments)	All Non-Depositories excluding Small Sellers
Liquidity Buffer	No liquidity buffer requirement	Enterprise Servicing: 2 bps Ginnie Mae Servicing: 5 bps	Large Non-Depositories
Capital and Liquidity Plans	No requirement to submit capital and liquidity plans	Require annual capital and liquidity plans that include MSR stress tests as part of the plan	Large Non-Depositories
Third-Party Ratings	No third-party ratings requirement	Require third-party servicer and credit ratings as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥\$50 billion in Servicing UPB must have one primary servicer or master servicer rating, as applicable • >\$100 billion in Servicing UPB must have a primary servicing rating or master servicer rating, as applicable, and one third-party long-term 	Large Non-Depositories

Requirements	Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Servicer Eligibility Guidelines 1.0	Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Servicer Eligibility Guidelines 2.0	Who the Requirement Applies to
		senior unsecured debt rating or long-term corporate family rating <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • > \$150 billion in Servicing UPB must have a primary servicer rating or master servicer rating, as applicable, and two third-party long-term senior unsecured debt ratings or long-term corporate family ratings 	

* NPL is defined as nonperforming loans.

Ginnie Mae Requirements

The table that follows demonstrates the changes to the various requirements with respect to the GNMA guidelines.

Requirements	Ginnie Mae Issuer Eligibility Guidelines 1.0	Ginnie Mae Issuer Eligibility Guidelines 2.0	Who the Requirement Applies to
Minimum Tangible Net Worth	Base: \$2.5 million Plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35 bps of UPB for outstanding Ginnie Mae obligations 	Base: \$2.5 million Plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enterprise Servicing: 25 bps • Ginnie Mae Servicing: 35 bps • PLS & Other Servicing: 25 bps 	All Issuers

Requirements	Ginnie Mae Issuer Eligibility Guidelines 1.0	Ginnie Mae Issuer Eligibility Guidelines 2.0	Who the Requirement Applies to
Base Liquidity	3.5 bps of Agency Servicing UPB	Enterprise Servicing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled/ Scheduled: 7 bps • Scheduled/ Actual: 7 bps • Actual/Actual: 3.5 bps Ginnie Mae Servicing: 10 bps PLS & Other Servicing: 3.5 bps	All Single-Family Issuer Applicants
Eligible Liquidity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least \$1 in liquid assets, including cash, cash equivalents and AAA-rated government securities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least \$1 in liquid assets, including cash, cash equivalents and AAA-rated government securities • Plus includes: Agency MBS, obligations of GSE and principal and interest advances, taxes and insurance advances, and foreclosure advances 	All Single-Family Issuer Applicants
Origination Liquidity	No origination liquidity requirement	The greater of (i) \$1 million and (ii) 50 bps times (Loans Held for Sale + Pipeline loans with Interest Rate Lock Commitments after Fallout Adjustments)	Originators of more than \$1 billion in UPB of any residential first mortgages

Requirements	Ginnie Mae Issuer Eligibility Guidelines 1.0	Ginnie Mae Issuer Eligibility Guidelines 2.0	Who the Requirement Applies to
Risk-Based Capital Requirement	No RBCR requirement	At least 6% as calculated by: (Adjusted Net Worth less Excess MSR) divided by the Risk Weighted Assets	All Single-Family Issuer Applicants

Key Differences Between FHFA and Ginnie Mae

The FHFA will be requiring liquidity buffers equal to 2 basis points for GSE unpaid principal balance (UPB) and 5 basis points for Ginnie Mae UPB. These requirements will apply to seller/servicers classified as “large” (as defined by UPB issuance). Ginnie Mae has not announced a liquidity buffer requirement.

Allowable liquid assets under Ginnie Mae and the FHFA are different as well. The FHFA allows for 50% of an unused portion of a committed agency servicing advance line of credit to count toward a seller/servicer’s liquid assets. By contrast, Ginnie Mae allows servicing advance receivables to count toward liquid assets but does not permit inclusion of a line of credit.

Lastly, the FHFA has not imposed a RBCR, while Ginnie Mae is doing so. As mentioned above, Ginnie Mae is requiring a RBCR of at least 6%, using the formula of (1) Adjusted Net Worth less Excess MSR, divided by (2) the Risk Weighted Assets. Unlike the majority of the revised guidelines, which become effective late 2023, the RBCR requirement implementation has been extended to December 31, 2024.

Key Takeaways

Some speculated at the announcement of the revised guidelines that nonbank interests in the single-family sector would cool in response. As of the end of September 2022, nonbanks serviced \$5.276 trillion on the outstanding single-family mortgage-backed securities (MBS) issued by Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and Ginnie

Mae, which was a 2.1% increase from June 2022, and raised the overall nonbank share of the Ginnie Mae MSR market to just shy of 80%, at 78.9%. So far, nonbank interest in the market remains high, particularly in the Ginnie Mae market; however, it is uncertain how the revised requirements might affect nonbank interest between now and the effective date of the changes.

While Ginnie Mae's President Alanna McCargo has said "the overwhelming majority of Ginnie Mae issuers are compliant with these requirements today," Ginnie Mae issuers and GSE seller/servicers should continue to engage with Ginnie Mae and the FHFA on these amended eligibility requirements during the implementation period. Notably, as a result of stakeholder feedback and evolving market dynamics, on October 21, 2022, Ginnie Mae extended the original compliance date for the RBC portion of the new requirements by one year, from December 31, 2023, to December 31, 2024. In particular, issuers and seller/servicers should continue to evaluate how their current and future MSR financing arrangements will impact their ability to comply with the eligibility requirements generally and Ginnie Mae's risk-based capital requirement specifically. After all, handling a scalpel with continued attention and care is the surest way to avoid unintended cuts.

Notes

* The authors, attorneys with Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP, may be contacted at awilliams@huntonak.com, edouma@huntonak.com, bdufilho@huntonak.com, wvanthunen@huntonak.com, and cfendian@huntonak.com, respectively.

1. <https://www.fhfa.gov/Media/PublicAffairs/Pages/FHFA-and-Ginnie-Mae-Announce-Updated-Min-Financial-Eligibility-Reqs-for-Enterprise-Seller-Servicers-and-Ginnie-Mae-Issuers.aspx>.

2. https://www.ginniemae.gov/newsroom/Documents/issuer_eligibility_faq_09_20_2022.pdf.