STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES Unrevised and Unedited Not for Quotation or Duplication

HEARING ON ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTING
AND MANAGEMENT FAILURES AT FANNIE MAE
Wednesday, April 6, 2005
House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance,
and Government Sponsored Enterprises
Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, D.C.

Committee Hearings

of the

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



1 FEDERAL DOCUMENT CLEARING HOUSE

- 2 HEARING ON ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTING
- 3 AND MANAGEMENT FAILURES AT FANNIE MAE
- 4 Wednesday, April 6, 2005
- 5 House of Representatives,
- 6 Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance,
- 7 and Government Sponsored Enterprises
- 8 | Committee on Financial Services,
- 9 Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:03 a.m., in Room 2128, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Richard
Baker [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Baker, Shays, Gillmor, Royce, Oxley, Kelly, Ney, Miller of California, Kennedy, Tiberi, Feeney, Hensarling, Davis of Kentucky, Kanjorski, Moore, Hinojosa, Baca, Lynch, Scott, Watt, Davis of Alabama, and

17 Wasserman Schultz.

13

14

15

16

Mr. BAKER. I would like to call this meeting in the Subcommittee on Capital Markets to order.

Today, the committee meets for the purposes of receipt of additional testimony from the Honorable Armando Falcon, director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, on his interim report relative to accounting and management failures at Fannie Mae and the enterprise's observations as to the ongoing difficulties with these disclosures and potential recommendations for our future actions.

It, indeed, is disappointing to read press reports indicating that, in some cases, signatures that were even falsified to documents were not an incidental or irregular act of a single individual but, apparently, an ongoing business practice. This is deeply troubling in light of the underlying financial uncertainties that are already facing the Congress with regard to the capital adequacy of Fannie Mae and, to a lesser extent, Freddie Mac, and so I look forward with some anticipation to the director's information concerning these matters.

Time permitting, I would also bring to the director's attention legislation which was introduced yesterday on reform of the regulatory oversight process and to seek his insights on that legislation, if he so chooses.

Perhaps more importantly today is, after reading other press stories as of yesterday, it is my understanding the

director has made clear to the White House his intention to depart his responsibility as director in the near term, and I feel I owe it to him, given our longstanding professional working relationship, to make some comment.

As he would well acknowledge, we have had our moments. However, I would say, in the last 18 months of professional conduct, he has been more than exonerated and held in high esteem by all who have studied this matter. It has been a very difficult professional responsibility to be publicly critical of either of these enterprises, and you were held up to some significant criticism even by members of this committee on occasion. I just want to say to you that I think you have done an outstanding job and a valuable public service, to you and all members of your staff.

Should legislation be adopted, there is contained in the bill, at least as I proposed, significant rules of accommodation for transition for those in OFHEO to the new regulatory body, and this is, to a great extent, in recognition of the difficult work and, I think, the good reports that the agency has developed on the activities of the enterprises, and it is work that should not be overlooked or soon forgotten.

So, for those reasons, I commend you and wish you well in whatever future endeavors may bring you.

Mr. Kanjorski?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We meet today to review the most recent developments concerning the special examination of Fannie Mae by the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight. As I have regularly noted in our past hearings on these matters, it is important and appropriate for our panel to conduct comprehensive and regular oversight over our housing government-sponsored enterprises to ensure that they fulfill their mission and operate safely and soundly.

At our first hearing this year, we heard from the chief accountant of the Securities and Exchange Commission about his decisions related to Fannie Mae's accounting practices. Today, we will follow up on that hearing by receiving testimony from a frequent witness before our panel, Armando Falcon, the director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight. As always, I appreciate learning of his insights on these issues and, again, welcome him here.

I should also note that, because he will be leaving the agency next month, this appearance will likely be the last time that Director Falcon testifies before our panel in his current capacity. During his tenure, he has steadfastly worked to increase the agency's resources and its effectiveness.

The main focus of today's hearing is the March supplemental supervisory agreement between Fannie Mae's board

and the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight. This
agreement addresses additional deficiencies identified by the
regulator during its ongoing special examination. These
failings relate to insufficient internal controls, the
improper application of accounting standards and inadequate
corporate governance.

Like many of my colleagues, I am troubled by these latest revelations. As a government-sponsored enterprise with public responsibilities and private capital, Fannie Mae has a special obligation to operate fairly, safely and soundly. These newest disclosures indicate that the company fell short in meeting these responsibilities.

Nevertheless, I am also heartened that Fannie Mae, according to its regulator, is cooperating and working to address these issues in a responsible manner. I am also pleased that, although serious, these problems do not appear to pose a systemic risk, according to those most knowledgeable of the facts in these matters.

As we proceed today, I also suspect that some of my colleagues will return to the question of how best to modify the regulation of government-sponsored enterprise, including you, Mr. Chairman. It is in the public's interest that we ensure that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac continue to operate safely and soundly. We must further ensure that these public-private entities achieve their public responsibilities

for advancing home ownership opportunities.

As I said at our very first hearing on the oversight of government-sponsored enterprises in March of 2000, we need to have strong, independent regulators that have the resources that they need to get the job done. I can assure everyone that I continue to support the strong, world-class and independent regulation of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

A strong and world-class independent regulator will protect the continued viability of our capital markets and promote confidence in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. It will also insure taxpayers against systemic risk and expand housing opportunities for all Americans.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I commend you for your continued perseverance in these matters, and I look forward to hearing from our distinguished witness.

[The statement of Mr. Kanjorski follows:]

134 ******** INSERT *******

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

140

141

142

143

By a prior agreement of the chairman and ranking member, because of an expected recess of the committee at 11 o'clock for the address on the House floor, we have agreed to limit opening statements to the chair, ranking member.

And since neither Mr. Frank or Mr. Oxley are now present, I would make all members' statements part of the official record and move at this time to recognize Mr. Falcon for whatever statement you may choose to make, sir.

Proceed as you like. Your formal statement, as is the usual practice, will be made part of the record.

Mr. FALCON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will give a summary of my written testimony.

First of all, may I say thank you for your comments about the agency and my tenure there.

You, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Kanjorski have been steadfast supporters of strong safety and soundness regulation and the agency and I appreciate that very much on behalf of the agency.

I am pleased to appear before you today to discuss OFHEO's supplemental agreement with Fannie Mae and the issues that gave rise to the agreement.

We have two objectives in our ongoing special examination of Fannie Mae. First, we must identify all the problems and fix them. As my testimony today indicates, that task is not yet complete. Second, we must institute a comprehensive reform program to prevent problems from recurring. This program will include far stronger internal controls and corporate governance measures; an adequate investment in systems, processes and personnel; and the establishment of a corporate culture fully dedicated to compliance with the law, with GAAP and all relevant rules and regulations.

170 l

With the continued cooperation of the board and management, we expect that Fannie Mae will ultimately emerge from its troubles as a healthy, well-managed enterprise properly focused on fulfilling its public mission. That is the ultimate goal of the supervisory actions we have taken. I believe it is a goal now shared by Fannie Mae's board and its interim leadership as well.

As you are aware, last September, we entered into an agreement with the board of directors that set forth a series of matters requiring immediate attention, particularly in the area of accounting. The agreement also outlined longer-term remedial steps, such as changes in the company's compensation program and corporate structure. In addition, we required that the company maintain a 30-percent minimum capital surplus in order to address safety and soundness concerns.

More recently, we entered into a supplemental agreement with Fannie's board to address problems found by OFHEO. The agreement requires additional remedial steps in accounting policy and accounting management and expands on reforms in controls and corporate governance.

Significant among the corporate governance reforms was the requirement that Fannie Mae separate the chief executive officer and chairman of the board positions. We also required that the company report weekly to OFHEO on its efforts to meet capital requirements, including any corporate

decisions on dividend payments or other matters that would affect the company's capital position.

In general, Fannie Mae has moved forward in addressing the matters set forth in our agreements. Experts have been engaged, studies undertaken, certain personnel changes have been made, and the company has formulated preliminary plans for new organizational structures and reporting lines.

OFHEO's special examination of Fannie Mae has revealed a significant number of new accounting problems at the enterprise. As with previous accounting problems, they reflect Fannie Mae's tendency towards overly aggressive interpretation of GAAP or, in certain instances, a willful disregard of accounting rules. They also reflect situations where Fannie Mae's accounting policies actually do comply with GAAP, but enterprise personnel have failed to follow those policies.

I have covered these issues in detail in my written statement, so I will not go into them further in my oral remarks.

During our special examination, we have also identified several problems involving procedures for preparing, reviewing, validating, authorizing and recording journal entries related to amortization adjustments. These issues include falsified signatures on journal entries; the failure to require that journal entry preparers determine the entries

were valid and appropriate; a failure to require that journal entries include supporting documentation; a lack of independent review of journal entries; and an absence of written policy guidance concerning journal entry procedures.

My written testimony describes the intent of our review in this area and, because it is a matter under investigation, I cannot go into further detail beyond what is contained in my written statement.

As the scope of the Fannie Mae special examination has proceeded well beyond our expectations, we will need additional funds this year. Accordingly, we have used our special assessment authority to assess Fannie Mae an additional \$5 million. However, while we have collected the funds, OMB has opined that due to a technical deficiency in the statute we may not spend the funds. While we do not agree with OMB's interpretation, we are bound by it.

I think this provides yet another example of why

Congress must enact legislation to give the regulator the

full authority it needs to do its job. Until then, I would

ask the committee's assistance in resolving this funding

matter.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to also end on a personal note, if I may. As you mentioned, my 5-year term as director of OFHEO expired last October, but I have remained in the office to guide the agency through a very challenging

period. With the most critical and pressing issues at the enterprises now addressed, I have decided to step down from my position next month.

I am proud of OFHEO's achievements during my tenure. The agency has successfully dealt with very serious problems at two of the largest financial institutions in the world, and we have done so without disrupting our financial markets, while allowing both enterprises to continue fulfilling their vital mission of making home ownership more affordable.

I am particularly proud of the efforts of OFHEO's employees and our conduct of the special examinations.

Seldom does a safety and soundness regulator identify improper actions, with potentially billions of dollars of adverse impact, before they manifest themselves in a way that does permanent harm to the company.

It has been a privilege to serve the public as the director of OFHEO, and I want to thank this committee for its support over the years.

Thank you, Mr. Baker. I would be happy to answer any questions the committee may have.

[The statement of Mr. Falcon follows:]

266 ******* INSERT *******

Mr. BAKER. Thank you very much.

268 I do not know that your position would require you to 269 make an assessment as to systemic risk potential, but, given 270 the knowledge you have now gained pursuant to these 271 inquiries, given the time it appears that the management 272 lapse allowed practices inconsistent with GAAP to be engaged in, if unchecked, would you have had some concern about some 273 potential future day when the numbers would not add up, the 274 capital would have been inadequate and a systemic risk 275 276 potential having been created?

Mr. FALCON. I would be concerned that, at some point in time, the problems we found in the company would manifest themselves some way. Fortunately, we did find them before that occurred, but the practices of the company in terms of its approach towards compliance with regulations, be they accounting or internal controls or best practices in risk management, when were not healthy.

Mr. BAKER. And had been engaged in on more than just, say, a single reporting quarter. This was year-over-year activity, not merely an aberrant activity.

Mr. FALCON. Yes.

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

Mr. BAKER. Do you have any window yet as to when Fannie would be in a position to give us certified or accurate financials?

Mr. FALCON. We cannot say with any degree of certainty

right now, but I think a useful model might be to look at the Freddie Mac situation. There, it did take a couple of years for the company to produce financial statements, and it will take a couple of years beyond that to get timely. I think that might be a useful example of what might be involved here.

Mr. BAKER. There has been no resolution or determination yet made, however, with regard to the accounting treatment of the special purpose entities.

Mr. FALCON. Right.

Mr. BAKER. And I am speaking through you to Mr. Pollard because he was at a hearing not long ago relative to the First Beneficial matter in which he indicated to me at that hearing that that examination was still continuing. We do not yet have closure on any liabilities that may accrue from the transactions with First Beneficial, for example.

Mr. FALCON. Right. That is still the subject of an examination by OFHEO.

Mr. BAKER. My point in asking these series of questions is to make clear that, with your departure from the enterprise and there having been significant gains made, significant disclosures achieved, that there are matters of some consequence still pending which will require 18 months to a couple of years to get final resolution or closure. Would that be a fair statement?

Mr. FALCON. There is still a great deal of work before the agency and Fannie Mae. That is absolutely the case.

Mr. BAKER. I do not know that you would have had time, given your preparation for your appearance here today, to be familiar at all with the provisions of the bill now introduced relative to the creation of an enhanced regulator. Do you have any comment to make about the provisions that are included in the bill generally, or is there a specific area of concern you would like to bring to the committee's attention you do not feel is addressed by the bill?

Mr. FALCON. As you said, I have not had a chance to go through much of the details of the bill, but I think the intent of the legislation to provide the regulator with authorities on par with every other safety and soundness regulator is progress. Anything which fills the gaps in the regulator's authority to do its job would be a positive step forward. Beyond that, the details of any particular revision, I have not had a chance to review them.

Mr. BAKER. There has been some discussion primarily led by Chairman Greenspan as to the advisability of limiting the growth or even further reducing the size of the existing investment portfolio, as it is his view, according to press reports, that it does not have a correlation to housing function. He had suggested even a hard-dollar limit of some \$200 billion down from the \$1.6 trillion currently engaged.

Do you have any opinion as to whether it is advisable or not 342 343 to have further restrictions on growth at the least or to 344 pursue the reductions over time, in your view? 345 Mr. FALCON. The company does need to retain a portfolio of some amount towards liquidity needs. I think that is very 346 347 evident. What that amount is I could not tell you where any 348 cap should stand. 349 Mr. BAKER. But \$1.6 trillion is more than adequate. Mr. FALCON. Yes. It is clear, I think, that the 350 351 current levels are more than adequate to provide for their 352 legitimate safety and soundness needs for their risk 353 management purposes. How much below the current levels would 354 be necessary and then how much beyond that simply for other 355 purposes would require some study. 356 Mr. BAKER. And it would be your concern, I presume, 357 that if they were precipitously lowered over too short a period of time, that could have adverse consequences for the 358 359 enterprises? Mr. FALCON. Yes 360 361 Mr. BAKER. Mr. Kanjorkski? 362 Mr. KANJORSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the insufficient internal controls and improper 363 364 application of accounting standards to meet adequate 365 corporate governance, what did your final examination show, 366 how long a period that existed -- just in the last year, the

367 last 2 years, the last 5 years, the last 10 years -- or has it 368 been endemic to the organization? 369 It varies by issue, Congressman. Mr. FALCON. 370 one lapse in their systems that dated back 21 years, other matters may have taken place in the last 1 or 2 years, but, 371 generally, I would say that they fall within the last 4 years 372 373 or so. Mr. KANJORSKI. I am concerned about, first of all, are 374 these lapses. Are they of huge significance where they could 375 put at risk the safety and soundness of the organization, or 376 377 are they not that significant? 378 Mr. FALCON. I view the weaknesses in internal controls 379 as very significant. As you know, there are many examples in history where lapses in internal controls have brought down 380 large old financial institutions almost overnight. Barings 381 382 Bank is one example of how internal controls can just bring 383 down the company, even a well-capitalized company. So lapses in internal controls, even though we often speak of them 384 385 after the accounting issues, I think, are just as, if not more, serious than the accounting problems. 386 387 Mr. KANJORSKI. Were these lack of internal controls you found really substantial, though, in this particular 388 389 instance? 390 I think they were substantial. I do think Mr. FALCON. 391 they were because there were almost no controls in some

392 instances. There was one example where one employee was 393 allowed, through the lack of internal controls, to make a 394 change in an accounting formula on the spreadsheet that resulted in an improper reporting of a billion dollars. 395 396 is that type of lack of internal controls that concern me. 397 With proper internal controls, one employee could not go and 398 make those changes without a couple of layers of verification 399 before changes like that are made. 400 Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, I guess I do not sufficiently understand the nature and focus of the regulator's 401 involvement, but what sort of bothers me here is that your 402 403 testimony says, in one instance, this problem existed over 21 404 years, and then substantial internal control failure. Why wasn't this picked up by the regulator over the last 405 406 several years or the last 10 years? That is what I do not quite understand. Is it because you did not get depthfully 407 408 involved in the books before? 409 Under prior testimony before the committee, I understood 410 that you were sort of like a meat inspector at a meat plant. You are there on a day-to-day basis and you watch the whole 411 412 process as it evolves and you sit at their internal audit exit meetings and that you are made aware of everything that 413 the corporate governance entity is made aware of. 414 415 Why didn't you pick this up? What is the why? 416 Mr. FALCON. I think you are accurate in your reasoning.

417	It is the need to do things with adequate depth. When I
418	took over the agency, we had 30 examiners, and I had our
419	examination staff do a review, a benchmarking study,
	comparing our program to other regulators and how many
421	examiners would they have on staff to supervise two companies
422	of this size.
423	This benchmarking study showed that on average another

This benchmarking study showed that on average another regulator might have 60 or so examiners per institution. We were working with 15 examiners per institution, which is why we have moved over the last 5 years to try to increase our resources. I wish I had the number of examiners that I have today back then, that maybe we would have had the ability to catch many of these problems.

Mr. KANJORSKI. But why didn't we catch some of them? I have been under the impression that over the years both Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae were fairly well-run organizations, and, every time we have had hearings over the last 5 years on this subject, that is what we were led to believe by both the regulators and by the company.

Now maybe some of the people that were testifying on behalf of the company did not even know these problems--is that your testimony--or their absence of knowledge is in itself a governance problem?

Mr. FALCON. I think many of these internal control problems revolve around accounting procedures and the

recordkeeping activities of the company, and this is an area
we have not looked at traditionally. Safety and soundness
regulators rely on the outside audit function to do its job
properly.

We have never second-guessed the external auditors to

We have never second-guessed the external auditors to make sure that the company's statements are compliant with GAAP. That is the role of the external auditor, and only after the accounting problems were uncovered did it become very apparent that controls around the accounting activities of the company and its financial systems were inadequate.

Mr. KANJORSKI. So what you are telling us now is not only the internal accounting, it is also their external auditor that participated in this misrepresentation, either by omission or commission, and I would like you to sort of specify. Do you think it was by omission, or were they participants in it?

Mr. FALCON. Well, it is clear that the external auditor—in this case, KPMG—certified financial statements as compliant with GAAP that we know, obviously, were not compliant with GAAP. We are examining the question of was that just the result of inadequate work done by the auditor or was it the result of some complicity on the part of the auditor.

Mr. KANJORSKI. You have not determined that?
Mr. FALCON. No, Congressman.

467 Mr. KANJORSKI. Under present law, does the regulator 468 have authority to not only punish the corporation or extract 469 some fine or fee from the corporation but also from the other contracted parties, like the auditor, if errors like this are 470 471 made? In other words, can you assess that auditor some 472 penalty? 473 Mr. FALCON. We do not have that explicit authority. What we could possibly do is limit the company's ability to 474 do business with certain counterparties. 475 476 Mr. KANJORSKI. What risk does the accounting firm run 477 if they do not come forth with accounting principles that are 478 according to GAAP? If they miss those either by omission or 479 commission, are they at any risk or is that part of the game, 480 do it so that you have a client and satisfy the client's 481 needs? 482 I think that spreads more to the Mr. FALCON. 483 responsibility of the PCAOB to examine whether or not the 484 auditor in this instance properly did its job, and they are that type of involved in this review 485 486 Mr. KANJORSKI. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 487 488 As much as is practicable, given our Mr. BAKER. 489 potential 11 o'clock recess, I am going to try to stick to 490 the 5-minute rule pretty strictly to give as many members as 491 possible a chance to be heard.

492 Mr. Shays?

493 Mr. SHAYS. Thank you.

Mr. Falcon, I wish you well in whatever you do in the future, and I thank you for your service to your country and in this capacity.

Having said that, I wish you were as good as you have been in the last few years earlier.

I want to understand why OFHEO became more aggressive.

I felt like--and I will just say this--you basically were almost created by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in that you were doing what they wanted rather than what Congress needed until the last year or two. What explains, though, the difference in approach that you have had?

Mr. FALCON. With the resources available to us in more recent years, it allowed us more flexibility to cover more areas and, certainly, when the problems of Freddie Mac became apparent, it did illustrate a particular area where we need to focus more of our attention, as traditionally we had not. So really, with the additional resources, it provided us with the means to become more thorough in how we went about examining the two institutions.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, I believe if you had done what you have done in the last year, we would not even be talking about a new regulator, and that is the sad part of this because we had Mr. Raines come before us, challenge your last

517

findings, almost arrogantly dismissed it, and I thought you

518 were very forceful and, frankly, somewhat courageous, and the 519 SEC backed what you all had determined. 520 So I think you are going out in a way that is important, 521 but it is sad that we never got a handle on Fannie Mae and 522 Freddie Mac sooner. That is what is sad. I would like to just ask you in regards to the illegal 523 524 entries, the forged entries, what is the significance of it? 525 I mean, I know they were illegal. Whose signatures were 526 forged? And what is the significance of that? What does it mean? I want to understand what it means. I know it was 527 528 illegal, but what does it mean in terms of its impact on the 529 accounting? Mr. FALCON. Weth, there was a breakdown in the 530 531 integrity of the process by which financial statements are 532 produced. The financial statements are produced from the 533 ledgers of the company, and the ledgers' data is entered 534 through preparers who will--Mr. SHAYS. Well, was it false information besides 535 forged signatures? 536 Mr. FALCON. Welt this was related to the amortization 537 538 entries. In our September report, we referred to some FAS 91 539 accounting. 540 Mr. SHAYS. Can you answer the question, though? 541 mean, were the amounts inaccurate?

Mr. FALCON. Yes, the amounts were improper under 542 accounting rules. These were the so-called catch-up amounts 543 544 that were adjustments. Mr. SHAYS. Do we know how high it goes up in the 545 organization? 546 547 Mr. FALCON. We do not at this time, but we are looking into that. 548 Mr. SHAYS. Yes. Is your statement as comprehensive as 549 550 your knowledge of this, or are you saying less in your 551 statement than you know? Mr. FALCON. We are doing much more work in this area 552 and, because of the sensitivity of it, we have only said what 553 we thought might be appropriate to provide the committee with 554 555 556 efforts. 557 Mr. SHAYS. So there is more to this story that you know 558 that you are not really feeling comfortable to disclose. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 559 Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman. 560 Mr. Davis? 561 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 562 Mr. Falcon, I certainly wish you well as you move into 563 564 another phase of your career. Let me bring up a subject that, frankly, we have not 565 talked about a lot this morning. As you know, there was an 566

567 inspector general's report that I think came out back in 568 December, if I am not mistaken. I think it happened while we were in recess. It may be that Congress was here for a day 569 570 on the homeland security bill, but it was basically during a 571 recess period, if I am not mistaken. I am sure the chair 572 will correct me if I am wrong. If I am not mistaken, I do 573 not think that we have had a hearing on the inspector 574 general's report. 575 Have you reviewed the other contents of the report, Mr. 576 Falcon? 577 Mr. FALCON. I have. 578 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. And respecting my 5-minute 579 timeframe, we do not have an opportunity to get into all of 580 it, but my recollection of it is that there were some fairly 581 stinging criticisms of OFHEO that were contained in that 582 report. Do you agree with that? 583 Mr. FALCON. Yes. 584 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. I recall one observation in the 585 report that OFHEO acted not as a disinterested party, but 586 that OFHEO may have acted in a fairly aggressive way toward Fannie Mae, that it may have overstepped the bounds of being 587 588 disinterested. Was that one of the observations in the 589 report, as you recall it? I am not asking if you agree with 590 Was that one of the observations? 591 Mr. FALCON. It has been a while since I have read it.

I could not tell you all the details of it. 592 593 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. So is that a pretty fair 594 characterization, that the report critiqued OFHEO for not being a disinterested regulator? 595 596 Mr. FALCON. I think it was, yes. 597 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Well, obviously, OFHEO was still 598 in existence, and so we do our task of creating a new 599 regulator, which I think there is wide consensus that we 600 will. Obviously, I presume that that report has some 601 relevance to you in the last weeks of your tenure. I am a 602 little bit concerned about the fact that you have not reviewed it in a while. 603 604 More importantly, can you tell me what steps, if any, 605 OFHEO has taken to respond to any of the criticisms 606 identified in the inspector general's report? 607 Mr. FALCON. I am not sure that any response was 608 warranted. 609 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Was there any corrective action? 610 The Justice Department of the Department of Mr. FALCON. 611 HUD determined that we had done nothing improper, and so that 612 was the end of it. 613 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Did you make your own 614 independent assessment of the report and its accuracy? 615 Mr. FALCON. I did. 616 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. And what were your conclusions?

617 Mr. FALCON. I disagreed with the criticisms. 618 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. I do not mean this pejoratively towards you, but I am having a mental picture in my mind that 619 when you all came up with your report on Fannie Mae, Mr. 620 621 Raines and Mr. Howard, I think, sat there, and they said 622 fairly forcefully that they disagreed with your conclusions. 623 What suggestion would you offer us, Mr. Falcon, as to 624 what you think this committee or this Congress should be doing to look at that report and to learn from it, because, 625 obviously, as we create a new regulator, we are going to try 626 627 to make sure they do a better job, frankly, than you all did. 628 I would think that it is relevant what is contained in that 629 report. What would you suggest Congress do, or do you think it would be appropriate, for example, if Congress had a 630 631 hearing on that report? 632 Mr. FALCON. I think you should use the report as you would like, Congressman, but, as I said, the matters were 633 634 reviewed by agencies outside my own and determined there were no rules or laws broken, and that was the end of it. 635 636 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. What about the portion of the 637 report that said that there was contact between OFHEO and 638 between some news organizations? Do you recall that part of 639 the report? 640 Mr. FALCON. Vaguely. 641 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Well, now you say you recall it

642

vaguely.

That strikes me as being a fairly serious 643 allegation, isn't it? 644 Mr. FALCON. I think agencies have contacts with the 645 press all the time. 646 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Well, contacts with the press regarding a confidential document that was only meant for the 647 648 board of directors of Fannie Mae. Presumably, that does not 649 happen all the time, does it? 650 Mr. FALCON. I am not sure what you are referring to. 651 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Well, again, speeding along, as my time is about to run out, my recollection is there was a 652 653 portion of the IG's report that said that there had been some 654 leaking or some dissemination of the confidential report in a manner that would have violated OFHEO's internal standards. 655 656 Tell me what steps you took to investigate that allegation 657 that there were improper contacts regarding confidential 658 documents. 659 Mr. FALCON. The matter was entirely investigated by the 660 inspector general's office. 661 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. What did you do as the person who runs OFHEO? Did you take any steps of your own? 662 663 Mr. FALCON. I do not know. I cannot tell you what the source of any leaks on any matter on any given day were. 664 665 Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Did you investigate them? 666 Mr. FALCON. I cannot consume my time with trying to

667 pursue it.

Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Did you investigate it?

Mr. FALCON. I do not recall what it was, specifically

670 what the document was. I do not.

Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Well, I would assume this
observation, Mr. Falcon, because my time is running out, I
hope that, as we do construct a new regulator, that, frankly,
that regulator is a little bit more attentive to the
possibility that there could be problems in its own house
because I am not sure that you have been sufficiently so in

the last few months, but I do wish you well in the private

678 sector.

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

Mr. BAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

680 Mr. Hensarling?

681 Mr. HENSARLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, Mr. Falcon, I want to congratulate you for your service to your country, and I believe you are a gentleman who was tasked with a very important mission and one for which many of us believe you had insufficient resources in which to accomplish the mission that you were given.

Let me ask a few questions about your examination in regards to Fannie Mae not applying its own policies with regard to SSAS 65 as it relates to the booking of loans for sale or investment. I think that you have indicated that the problems with accounting for these loans were recently

692 discovered, but the practice had been ongoing for over 20 693 years.

So how can Fannie be unaware that they were in breach for over 20 years and, indeed, how was it that, over a 20-year period, OFHEO did not discover this breach?

Mr. FALCON. It was just an error in their systems, which was not uncovered until the systems were upgraded in 2004. It was just such a precise error in I am not sure what part of the systems, but it was such a drill-down type issue. We was not the type of thing that we caught.

Mr. HENSARLING. It is my understanding that when OFHEO discovered accounting problems at Freddie Mac that the executives of Fannie stated that they had reviewed all of their internal accounting practices and policies and that they had found no violations. We have since, obviously, learned, according to you, according to the SEC, that there have been a number of GAAP violations. So do you believe that OFHEO and this committee was purposely misled by executives at Fannie?

Mr. FALCON. I think that is certainly something that we are reviewing in the course of our special examination.

While we do believe in certain instances there were willful violations of accounting principles, whether or not that was hidden from us, from the Congress is something we are still determining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Could it be said if de facto Fannie had the ability to designate their securities for accounting purposes as either held for investment or held for sale that that would give them an advantage over their competitors in the marketplace?

Mr. FALCON. It would certainly provide certain since accounting benefits if they were to classify certain assets as held to maturity versus available for trading. Then they would not have to recognize any loss in market value in those assets. That is certainly the case.

Mr. HENSARLING. I think also in your testimony you indicated that, although a number of Fannie's policies were not GAAP compliant, that, obviously, a number of them were, but that Fannie personnel failed to follow through on these policies. So are there particular individuals who are being investigated for knowingly violating these GAAP principles?

Mr. FALCON. We are looking at the role that various employees of the company had in both the promulgation of the accounting policies as well as the role in the implementation of the policies. So you cover both ends. One, how is the improper policy formulated and adopted? And, secondly, if it was crafted properly why wasn't it followed? That is the subject of further review by us.

Mr. HENSARLING. To speak somewhat prospectively in the limited amount time I have left, as you know, our Chairman

Baker has introduced a comprehensive piece of legislation
dealing with a new regulator for the GSEs, and I know that
you have not had an opportunity to examine the particulars of
that piece of legislation, but, conceptually, do you think
that the GSE safety and soundness regulator should also have
the authority of new programs and new activity review from
your experience? If so, why?

Mr. FALCON. I think it should. The safety and

Mr. FALCON. I think it should. The safety and soundness regulator is going to learn about these new activities anyway. We have to assign capital to them. We have to make sure that the risk of any new activities are properly managed. So we will be intimately familiar with how those activities will impact the company.

Every other safety and soundness regulator also has a responsibility, when it conducts that review, to make sure that the activity is consistent with the terms of the charter of the entity. Compliance with laws, rules and regulations does also rise to a safety and soundness issue, so it is just a natural fit that both happen at the same place.

Mr. BAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

762 Mr. Watt?

Mr. WATT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Falcon, thank you for being here.

I want to change the focus from what we have been talking about to something else. I really have no interest

in focusing on Fannie or Freddie's shortcomings in the past or your or OFHEO's shortcomings or successes in the past or on this committee's oversight shortcomings or successes in the past.

Throughout this process, my interest has been in the housing function, the housing mission of Fannie and Freddie, and on that, on page 11 of your prepared testimony, you come closest to addressing that issue.

You say during your tenure, "The agency has successfully dealt with very serious problems at two of the largest financial institutions in the world. We have done so without disrupting our financial system," which, of course, is true, but it has had some financial impact, and then you go on to say, "while allowing both enterprises to continue fulfilling their vital mission of making home ownership more affordable," which also, of course, is true because the mission is going on.

My concern is that there has, obviously, been some disruption of the ability to do the housing mission. Has your agency made any assessment of what impact this investigation and these financial disclosures have had on the ability of Fannie and Freddie to aggressively pursue the housing mission? I am not trying to assess whether that investigation went right or wrong. Obviously, it turned out to be right.

But what impact, if any, can you tell us this has had on aggressive pursuit of the housing mission and, more importantly, how can we more aggressively pursue that housing mission either through Fannie and Freddie or otherwise as we go forward in the structure of the regulatory institutions we put in place?

Give us whatever suggestions, as you have experienced this, both on the staff, in your regulatory position. What suggestions do you have for us about how we can more aggressively pursue the housing mission?

Mr. FALCON. I think the guaranteed side of their business where they purchase qualifying affordable housing goal type mortgages, that does continue, and it is proceeding at a healthy pace. Despite the problems the company has with their accounting issues and internal control problems, that side of the business remains sound.

So I can give you some comfort there, that while we are having to take some supervisory actions with the company to make sure that they continue to be as aggressive in fulfilling their mission as possible, when we get these other issues addressed properly over time, it will not deter from them continuing their guarantee side of their business.

I have always looked at our responsibility at OFHEO as part housing mission. A company that is experiencing severe financial difficulties is going to constrain the amount of

work it can do in fulfilling its mission, and so the greater 818 extent to which we can make sure that the company does not 819 get into any kind of trouble makes sure that there is no 820 interruption in their ability to continue to fulfill the 821 mission and innovate. 822 ink with a fully authorized, well-resourced there would be 823 regulator, I think that is a good safeguard to make sure that there are not unnecessary interruptions in the company's 824 825 business as a result of safety and soundness problems. 826 sooner we can get in there and identify and fix problems 827 before they manifest themselves in the form of larger problems, I think, is only a benefit to the company's 828 mission. So I think a strong safety and soundness regulator 829 830 is part of that. 831 Mr. BAKER. The gentleman's time has expired. Just by way of notice to members who have--832 833 I am sorry, Mr. Watt. 834 Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, could I have him address the 835 prospective suggestions? 836 Mr. BAKER. Sir, please. That is all right. 837 Mr. FALCON. Prospectively, I think you could look at 838 other examples of what has been done at other agencies. 839 AHP program of the federal loan bank system is one 840 possibility where you have some satisfied, dedicated amount of funds that are used towards the affordable housing and 841

842 low-income housing.

But I would like to also think about it and possibly get back to you, Congressman, if I may.

Mr. WATT. That would be great. That way, it will not disrupt the chairman's schedule. I thank you. I would welcome any suggestions you have because I think you have a picture of this that probably is unique now, given your years of service in a number of different capacities. So I would welcome those suggestions.

Thank you, Mr. Baker.

Mr. BAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

By way of prior announcement, we will likely adjourn shortly after 11 o'clock. I am told that the full committee will have a meeting commencing at 1 o'clock. They need to have access to the room by at least 12:30. The matter is on the floor. We will probably keep members beyond 12 o'clock. So, as members can expedite their comments, otherwise, we will have to take every member's comment and put it into the record for response. I will forward to the witness, if you so choose.

The next person here is Mr. Ney. You are up.

Mr. NEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On Monday, April the 4th, OFHEO--I think it was about a year in the making--added to their corporate governance rule. It takes effect in 60 days. What does that mean for Fannie?

Mr. FALCON. I think it is an important addition to our corporate governance measure that we have taken at the agency. It does include more guidance to the company in regards to the board of directors, the activity of the board, and it works to ensure that there is strong oversight exercised by the board. We think it is a good addition to a corporate governance rule that we already had out there.

Mr. NEY. Also, Fannie was given until September of this year, and that was to meet the 30 percent capital, and I think that was an extension. It was a 90 more days' extension.

Mr. FALCON. Originally, it was the end of June.

Mr. NEY. Do you believe they will be able to reach that goal?

Mr. FALCON. We monitor it very closely, and the plan that they have submitted to us does indicate that if everything happens as planned that they will meet the goal. If at any point between now and the end of September it looks like there are problems, then we will work with the company to make adjustments in the plan so that they can meet it by the end of September.

Mr. NEY. If they do not meet it, what happens?

Mr. FALCON. If they do not meet it, we will have to
determine what additional remedial steps might be necessary
in order to make sure that they can come into compliance with

892 it as soon as possible.

Mr. NEY. People have raised today the issue with
whether it was 20 years gone undetected or 5, you know, and
that has been raised several times, and Fannie had brought
this out to the attention of OFHEO actually about this
problem that had been over a 20-year period.

I guess the question I have is: How did they not know and how did OFHEO, though, not know or, you know, over a certain period of time, you know, that they were operating in a faulty and inaccurate way?:

Mr. FALCON. This was a very technical problem in their accounting systems. Assets that were being classified as either available for sale or held to maturity were properly designated by the company at the time of purchase. However, the system itself categorized everything as held to maturity, and that was just not uncovered until 21 years later.

Mr. NEY. So it was more of a technical problem than something that was conspired to do this and not be found for 20 years.

Mr. FALCON. Yes. That is what we expect by that.

Mr. NEY. Can we expect another capital assessment of Fannie by OFHEO?

Mr. FALCON. Capital assessment? χ , yes, Congressman.

Mr. NEY. Or capital adequacy to report under.

Mr. FALCON. Yes.

Mr. NEY. The GSEs, I should say, not just Fannie Mae. 917 Mr. FALCON. Yes. We typically classify the enterprises 918 at the end of every quarter for the previous quarter and, at 919 920 the end of March, we would typically classify both. We only 921 classified Freddie Mac. We are continuing to have 922 discussions with Fannie Mae about their capital 923 classification. Under the terms of our regulation governing this, they 924 925 have 30 days to comment on our proposed classification, and 926 that is where this currently stands. When they give us their 927 comments, we will take them into consideration and then determine what the proper classification will be. 928 929 Mr. NEY. Okay. Good luck with your ventures down the 930 road. I want to thank Chairman Baker for having this hearing. 931 932 Thank you. 933 Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman. 934 Mr. Baca? Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 935 Mr. BACA. 936 Mr. Falcon, thank you very much for being here today. 937 As you know, I support a strong well-funded regulator, 938 and I also support the work of Fannie Mae in providing -- I say 939 in providing -- housing to the underserved. Do you believe you 940 have the necessary expertise within your agency to regulate 941 GSE in a productive manner in an ever-growing complex market?

Mr. FALCON. I do, Congressman. I am very proud of the talented people we have at the agency.

Mr. BACA. When do you believe this process will be over because, in your report, you indicate that you have two objectives in an ongoing special examination of Fannie Mae. The first was to identify all the problems and fix it. In your testimony, you indicate that you have not completed that. There is also the second portion: Does the comprehensive reform program provide problems with recurring?

Mr. FALCON. Well, we would like to get it done as soon as possible. It is in our interest, the company's interest, and I know you would like to see it done as soon as possible.

I hesitate to give you a specific timeframe because just the new re-audit of the company by the new external auditor may possibly continue to uncover issues, even if we feel like our review is close to being brought to a conclusion. So we really need to work closely with them as they do their review accounting as well as ours.

I know that is not a good answer, but it is hard for me to pinpoint it. Our goal is to try to get it done as soon as possible.

Mr. BACA. Given the importance of the entity to home ownership, how will you know when you have fulfilled your obligation as a regulator thoroughly and fairly--and I say thoroughly and fairly--so that Fannie Mae can continue to

further its home ownership in the country in a manner that is safe and sound?

Mr. FALCON. I think when the company has addressed the issues related to proper accounting policies, adequate internal controls and any additional remedial actions that have taken place, when the company is able to submit timely financial statements to the SEC, I think when all that comes together, we will feel comfortable that the company has put itself back on a solid footing, and that is the time that we would begin to consider lifting some of these supervisory steps that we have taken, like the 30 percent capital surcharge.

Mr. BACA. Are you providing guidance or assistance or training at this point to make sure that there is adequate accounting that is done, because that is part of the process and part of your auditing report, and that was the problem, I believe, that Davis asked originally when it was leaked out to the media without allowing them to correct their own particular problems before it went out. So are you now then providing the guidance, the training to assure that the proper accounting is done, the procedures and policies are followed?

Mr. FALCON. We are, and the board is also very actively engaged in this also. The company is working to retain many qualified individuals in this accounting field so that the

company can begin to develop proper accounting policies, but we are working with them very closely.

Mr. BACA. Can you clarify the views of the amount of capital that Fannie Mae should have and how you arrive at that number? That is question number one.

And two is: Can you give a sense of under what condition you would be satisfied with remediation procedures not required to excess capital?

Mr. FALCON. Well, current capital levels are contained in the statute, 2-1/2 percent for on balance sheet assets and 45 basis points for off balance sheet. When we see safety and soundness concerns at either company, we exercise our discretion to require additional capital, but just for the time period where we see problems at each company.

Whether or not a permanent minimum capital level should be higher than 2-1/2 percent, we would have to study that issue a little more closely.

Mr. BACA. Okay. We know that Fannie Mae has taken a number of steps to address the problems that are very positive, even the change in its leadership right now because of its services. My question and final question would be:
You indicated in your statement that OFHEO became more aggressive as resources became available. Who went after the resources, and why did they go after the resources to make sure that they were more aggressive?

Mr. FALCON. We have been pursuing additional resources since I first got to the agency. As I said earlier, it became very evident to me when I assumed my position that we just did not have adequate resources to properly fulfill our mission at OFHEO and, from the very beginning, I have been seeking to increase the agency's budget, and we have had much success in that. With the committee's support, our resources have increased.

Mr. BAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BACA. Hopefully, you will apply the same standard to other entities to as well have the same standards, same policies, same procedures and same aggressiveness in holding everybody else accountable as well.

Thank you.

1031 Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

1032 Chairman Oxley?

1033 Mr. OXLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Falcon, it is good to have you back, and, based on your announcement yesterday, I want to wish you Godspeed and success in whatever you do. You have led the OFHEO folks at a very difficult time and have done remarkable work, and our sincere congratulations and best wishes to you.

Let me ask you. The last time that OFHEO discovered accounting problems at Fannie, the SEC was engaged to determine whether Fannie needed to restate earnings. Based

1042 on your testimony and the recent discovery, will that process be followed as well, or has the SEC already made a 1043 1044 determination in terms of whether Fannie Mae was GAAP 1045 compliant? 1046 The process that was followed previously, Mr. FALCON. 1047 Mr. Chairman--by the way, thank you for your comments--was an extraordinary set of circumstances. Typically, the process 1048 1049 involves the regulator working with the company and the company's external auditor on resolving any accounting issues 1050 that arise and, with the issues related to 133 and 91, 1051 1052 Fannie Mae decided to seek the input of the SEC on those 1053 accounting issues. So the SEC did provide guidance on them. 1054 In this case, that has not happened. We are working 1055 with the company. We have met with the SEC to review these additional issues with them and kept them fully apprised of 1056 1057 what we are finding and answering any questions they may 1058 have, but the SEC is working with us under the standard 1059 process for these types of matters, and they have not been 1060 asked to intervene with a formal interpretation or answer 1061 like they were previously. 1062 That could happen at some point, but it just 1063 depends on how the negotiations go with the private entity? 1064 Mr. FALCON. It could, Mr. Chairman. 1065 Mr. OXLEY. Okay. 1066 Your testimony raised some concerns about internal

controls at Fannie Mae, and that has been, obviously, an ongoing issue in corporate America for the last 3 or 4 years.

I guess my question is: What role does OFHEO play in the whole issue of internal controls vis-a-vis the SEC and perhaps the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board? How does OFHEO's role fit into the overall issue of internal controls?

Mr. FALCON. We do work closely with PCAOB on this, and we have. They participate in many of the sessions and meetings that we have had, and, obviously, we have worked very closely with the SEC.

As a safety and soundness regulator, we do examine very closely for internal control deficiencies. In addition, obviously, under Section 404 of Sarbanes-Oxley, companies are required to certify the adequacy of their internal controls. So we work very closely to make sure that certain minimum, if not best practice, standards with regards to internal controls are met by the company, and we apply these standards through our examination program.

In addition, because of Sarbanes-Oxley, there are certifications that are required on the part of management so they have their own strong incentives now to make sure that internal controls are adequate. Where we see issues related to accounting disclosure matters that require some review by the SEC, we will have discussions with the SEC. We have a

1092 very good working relationship with them.

Mr. OXLEY. Is it fair to say then that the internal controls issue as it relates not just to a financial company in a general sense, but more particularly to a GSE is treated somewhat differently than say a steel company or an oil company?

Mr. FALCON. I would say not just because they are a GSE, but because they have a safety and soundness regulator. I think that the same levels of internal control review that we apply to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac would also be applied with respect to any bank or thrift that is regulated by a safety and soundness regulator and that might very well be different from the type of internal control review that is applied with respect to a steel company.

Mr. OXLEY. Thank you.

1111|

Mr. Chairman, I just want to again compliment Mr. Falcon for his leadership and also to recognize Mr. Blumenthal. I know Mr. Falcon as an alumnus of this committee in his former iteration as the Banking Committee, and Mr. Blumenthal, who will be named as interim in your position, was a very able staffer over in the committee across the hall that I served on for a few years, and we look forward to working with him as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FALCON. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Chairman.

1117 Mr. BAKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

- I am advised that floor proceedings have now been
- 1119 initiated, and, at this time, I would ask members who have
- 1120 additional questions to please submit them for the record.
- 1121 We will get responses from Mr. Falcon.
- I wish to again extend our appreciation to you for your
- 1123 appearance here today and for your good work.
- 1124 Our meeting now stands adjourned.
- 1125 Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous
- 1126 consent --
- 1127 Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. Hinojosa.
- Mr. HINOJOSA. --that the opening statement be part of
- 1129 the record?
- 1130 Mr. BAKER. Yes, sir. All member statements have been
- 1131 made part of the record, and the record will remain open for
- 1132 5 days for any additional correspondence members may choose
- 1133 to forward.
- 1134 Mr. HINOJOSA. Thank you.
- 1135 Mr. BAKER. The meeting stands adjourned.
- [Whereupon, at 11:07 a.m., the subcommittee was
- 1137 adjourned.]

PAGE 1

1	BACA.	39	40	41	42	43		
	BAKER.	2	7	13	14	15	16	21
		24	29	32	35	36	39	43
		47						
	DAVIS OF KE	NTUCKY.	24	25	26	27	28	29
	FALCON.	8	13	14	15	16	17	18
		19	20	21	22	23	24	25
		26	27	28	29	30	31	32
		34	35	37	38	39	40	41
		42	43	44	45	46		
	HENSARLING.	29	30	31				
	HINOJOSA.	47						
	KANJORSKI.	4	16	17	18	19	20	21
	NEY.	36	37	38	39			
	OXLEY.	43	44	46				
	SHAYS.	22	23	24				
	WATT.	32	35	36				
1								

STATEMENT OF HON. ARMANDO FALCON, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

PAGE

8

HBA096.160

PAGE

3

,

3 4 t