

The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt® PUBLICATION

SEPTEMBER 2017

EDITOR'S NOTE: DECISIONS, DECISIONS...

Victoria Prussen Spears

FORESEEABLE HARM IS NOT ENOUGH: SUPREME COURT REJECTS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT'S RELAXED INTERPRETATION OF PROXIMATE CAUSE FOR LENDING DISCRIMINATION CLAIMS

Tara L. Elgie, Jarrett L. Hale, Gregory G. Hesse, and Adam C. Ragan

U.S. SUPREME COURT NARROWLY HOLDS THAT FILING OF TIME-BARRED PROOF OF CLAIM DOES NOT VIOLATE FDCPA, BUT LEAVES DOOR OPEN TO APPLICATION OF THE ACT IN OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES

Justin F. Paget and Tara L. Elgie

SUPREME COURT REVERSES *JEVIC* STRUCTURED DISMISSAL THAT DEVIATED FROM BANKRUPTCY CODE'S PRIORITY SCHEME

Nicholas F. Kajon

***LYONDELL CHEMICAL COMPANY*: LITIGATION TRUST'S FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCE CLAIMS FAIL**

Stephen D. Zide and Rachael L. Ringer

CIRCUIT SPLIT DEVELOPING OVER MODIFICATION OF MORTGAGES ON MIXED-USE PROPERTIES

Jarrett L. Hale, Haley A. Hendrix, Tara L. Elgie, and Gregory G. Hesse

RIGHTS OF FOREIGN CURRENCY CREDITORS IN ENGLISH INSOLVENCY PROCEEDINGS

Jonathan Lawrence

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT REPORT ON CORE PRINCIPLES FOR REGULATING THE UNITED STATES FINANCIAL SYSTEM

Oliver I. Ireland and Anna T. Pinedo

OCC GUIDANCE SUGGESTS FLEXIBILITY FOR THIRD-PARTY RISK MANAGEMENT

Oliver I. Ireland, Barbara R. Mendelson, Nathan D. Taylor, Jeremy R. Mandell, and Calvin D. Funk

DATA COLLECTION FOR SMALL BUSINESS LENDING: HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH?

Melanie H. Brody, Jeffrey P. Taft, and Tori K. Shinohara



LexisNexis

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

VOLUME 134

NUMBER 8

September 2017

Editor's Note: Decisions, Decisions . . . Victoria Prussen Spears	419
Foreseeable Harm Is Not Enough: Supreme Court Rejects Eleventh Circuit's Relaxed Interpretation of Proximate Cause for Lending Discrimination Claims Tara L. Elgie, Jarrett L. Hale, Gregory G. Hesse, and Adam C. Ragan	422
U.S. Supreme Court Narrowly Holds that Filing of Time-Barred Proof of Claim Does Not Violate FDCPA, But Leaves Door Open to Application of the Act in Other Circumstances Justin F. Paget and Tara L. Elgie	429
Supreme Court Reverses <i>Jevic</i> Structured Dismissal That Deviated from Bankruptcy Code's Priority Scheme Nicholas F. Kajon	433
<i>Lyondell Chemical Company</i>: Litigation Trust's Fraudulent Conveyance Claims Fail Stephen D. Zide and Rachael L. Ringer	439
Circuit Split Developing over Modification of Mortgages on Mixed-Use Properties Jarrett L. Hale, Haley A. Hendrix, Tara L. Elgie, and Gregory G. Hesse	445
Rights of Foreign Currency Creditors in English Insolvency Proceedings Jonathan Lawrence	451
U.S. Treasury Department Report on Core Principles for Regulating the United States Financial System Oliver I. Ireland and Anna T. Pinedo	456
OCC Guidance Suggests Flexibility for Third-Party Risk Management Oliver I. Ireland, Barbara R. Mendelson, Nathan D. Taylor, Jeremy R. Mandell, and Calvin D. Funk	462
Data Collection for Small Business Lending: How Much Is Enough? Melanie H. Brody, Jeffrey P. Taft, and Tori K. Shinohara	466



LexisNexis®

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

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

Matthew T. Burke at (800) 252-9257

Email: matthew.t.burke@lexisnexis.com

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385

Fax Number (800) 828-8341

Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7878-2 (print)

ISBN: 978-0-7698-8020-4 (eBook)

ISSN: 0005-5506 (Print)

ISSN: 2381-3512 (Online)

Cite this publication as:

The Banking Law Journal (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

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.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Sheshunoff is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2017 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. Pratt® Publication

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Steven A. Meyerowitz

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

Victoria Prussen Spears

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

Barkley Clark
*Partner, Stinson Leonard Street
LLP*

John F. Dolan
*Professor of Law
Wayne State Univ. Law School*

David F. Freeman, Jr.
Partner, Arnold & Porter LLP

Satish M. Kini
*Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton
LLP*

Douglas Landy
*Partner, Milbank, Tweed,
Hadley & McCloy LLP*

Paul L. Lee
*Of Counsel, Debevoise &
Plimpton LLP*

Givonna St. Clair Long
*Partner, Kelley Drye & Warren
LLP*

Jonathan R. Macey
*Professor of Law
Yale Law School*

Stephen J. Newman
*Partner, Stroock & Stroock &
Lavan LLP*

Bimal Patel
Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP

David Richardson
Partner, Dorsey & Whitney

Heath P. Tarbert
Partner, Allen & Overy LLP

Stephen B. Weissman
Partner, Rivkin Radler LLP

Elizabeth C. Yen
Partner, Hudson Cook, LLP

Regional Banking Outlook
James F. Bauerle
*Keevican Weiss Bauerle & Hirsch
LLC*

Intellectual Property
Stephen T. Schreiner
Partner, Goodwin Procter LLP

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL (ISBN 978-0-76987-878-2) (USPS 003-160) is published ten times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2017 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, 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 LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquires and send any 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, 718.224.2258 (phone). Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to bankers, officers of financial institutions, and their attorneys. 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.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, A.S. Pratt & Sons, 805 Fifteenth Street, NW., Third Floor, Washington, DC 20005-2207.

OCC Guidance Suggests Flexibility for Third-Party Risk Management

*Oliver I. Ireland, Barbara R. Mendelson, Nathan D. Taylor,
Jeremy R. Mandell, and Calvin D. Funk**

This article highlights key aspects of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's FAQs that supplement the agency's 2013 guidance entitled "Third-Party Relationships: Risk Management Guidance."

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency ("OCC") issued frequently asked questions¹ ("FAQs") that supplement the OCC's 2013 guidance² entitled "Third-Party Relationships: Risk Management Guidance" ("2013 Bulletin"). The 2013 Bulletin sets forth the OCC's expectation for banks' due diligence and ongoing monitoring of third-party service providers, including enhanced diligence and monitoring for third parties that support critical activities. While the FAQs affirm this guidance, they provide substantial flexibility for banks to right-size their approach to third-party risk management, including with respect to banks' financial technology ("fintech") partnerships.³ This article highlights key aspects of the FAQs.

THE THIRD-PARTY RISK MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE IS BROAD. . .

The FAQs confirm the broad scope of the 2013 Bulletin, stating that any business arrangement between the bank and another entity—including outsourced products and services, use of outside consultants, networking arrangements, merchant payment processing services, services provided by affiliates and subsidiaries, joint ventures, and other business arrangements—are third-party relationships subject to the guidance.

* Oliver I. Ireland (oireland@mof.com) is a partner at Morrison & Foerster LLP focusing his practice on retail financial services and bank regulatory issues. Barbara R. Mendelson (bmendelson@mof.com) is a partner in the Financial Services Group advising foreign and U.S. banks in a variety of complex regulatory matters. Nathan D. Taylor (ndtaylor@mof.com) is a partner at the firm providing practical advice to help companies enhance their cybersecurity posture. Jeremy R. Mandell (jmandell@mof.com) and Calvin Funk (cfunk@mof.com) are associates in the firm's Financial Services Practice Group.

¹ <https://www.occ.treas.gov/news-issuances/bulletins/2017/bulletin-2017-21.html>.

² <https://www.occ.gov/news-issuances/bulletins/2013/bulletin-2013-29.html>.

³ The FAQs respond in part to the OCC's commitment, from its responsible innovation initiative, to provide guidance to banks on how to manage risks related to fintech partnerships, available at <https://www.occ.treas.gov/topics/responsible-innovation/comments/recommendations-decisions-for-implementing-a-responsible-innovation-framework.pdf>.

These business arrangements include banks relationships with fintech partners. Specifically, the FAQs state that “[i]f a fintech company performs services or delivers products on behalf of a bank or banks, the relationship meets the definition of a third-party relationship and the OCC would expect bank management to include the fintech company in the bank’s third-party risk management process.”

The FAQs also confirm the 2013 Bulletin definition of “critical activities” and the OCC’s expectation that banks have more comprehensive and rigorous management of third-party relationships that involve critical activities. Generally, critical activities include significant bank functions (e.g., payments, clearing, settlements, and custody); significant shared services (e.g., information technology); or other activities that could result in significant risk exposure if a third party fails to meet expectations, could have significant bank customer impact, require significant investment, or could have a major impact on bank operations if the third party fails to perform as expected.

. . . BUT FLEXIBLE

Notwithstanding the broad scope of the 2013 Bulletin, the FAQs provide flexibility for banks in managing third-party risk. The FAQs state that “[n]ot all third-party relationships present the same level of risk,” and “[b]ank management should determine the risks associated with each third-party relationship and then determine how to adjust risk management practices for each relationship” so that the “bank’s risk management practices for each relationship [are] commensurate with the level of risk and complexity of the third-party relationship.”

The FAQs further provide that “[t]he level of due diligence and ongoing monitoring . . . may differ for, and should be specific to, each third-party relationship. The level of due diligence and ongoing monitoring should be consistent with the level of risk and complexity posed by each third-party relationship.” There is, of course, an expectation that with respect to critical activities “due diligence and ongoing monitoring will be robust, comprehensive, and appropriately documented.”

The FAQs signal flexibility in other meaningful ways. For example, the FAQs

- provide for flexibility with respect to banks’ structuring of their third-party risk management process;
- indicate that a bank, while maintaining its own effective third-party risk management process tailored to its specific needs, can collaborate with other banks to address the OCC’s expectations for managing third-party relationships;

- state that banks may engage in information sharing—including through the Financial Services Information Sharing and Analysis Center (“FS-ISAC”), the U.S. Computer Emergency Readiness Team (“US-CERT”), InfraGard, and other information-sharing organizations that monitor cyber threats and vulnerabilities—to better understand cyber threats to the bank itself or to service providers; and
- state that a bank may “outsource some or all aspects of their compliance management systems to third parties, so long as banks monitor and ensure that third parties comply with current and subsequent changes to consumer laws and regulations.” (Note that this is among the strongest language we have seen from the OCC on this point and signals significant flexibility for banks’ compliance management systems.)

Notwithstanding this flexibility, the OCC repeatedly reminds banks that “the board is responsible for overseeing the development of an effective third-party risk management process commensurate with the level of risk and complexity of the third-party relationships.” Consistent with the 2013 Bulletin, an effective risk management process will include:

- policies and procedures for selecting, assessing, and overseeing third parties;
- written contracts outlining the rights and responsibilities of all parties;
- ongoing monitoring of the third party’s activities and performance;
- contingency plans for third-party relationships;
- clear roles and responsibilities for overseeing and managing third-party relationships;
- documentation and reporting that facilitates oversight, accountability, monitoring, and risk management; and
- audits of the effectiveness of the risk management process.

The FAQs also signal flexibility in performing third-party due diligence. For example, the FAQs note that when a bank does not receive all of the information it seeks about a third-party service provider that supports the bank’s critical activities, there is an expectation that the board of directors and management will

- develop appropriate alternative ways to analyze the third-party service providers;
- establish risk-mitigating controls;
- prepare to address interruptions in delivery;

- make risk-based decisions that the critical third-party service providers are the best service providers available to the bank;
- retain appropriate documentation of all efforts to obtain information and related decisions; and
- ensure that the contracts meet the bank's needs.

With respect to fintechs, the FAQs acknowledge that some third parties may be start-ups with limited financial information. The FAQs state that when assessing the financial condition of a fintech, a bank “may consider a [fintech’s] access to funds, its funding sources, earnings, net cash flow, expected growth, projected borrowing capacity, and other factors that may affect the third party’s overall financial stability.” However, the OCC emphasizes that credit underwriting is not required.

The FAQs specifically address risk management for marketplace lending and mobile payment arrangements. With respect to marketplace lending, the FAQs state that a bank’s board and management should understand the range of risks posed by marketplace lending arrangements—reputation, credit, concentrations, compliance, market, liquidity, and operational—and banks should have effective personnel, processes, and systems for monitoring and controlling such risks. As an example, the FAQs state that banks should monitor marketplace lenders to ensure that they appropriately implement applicable consumer protection laws and should not originate or support marketplace lenders that have inadequate compliance management processes. The OCC also focuses on the provision of payment cards to mobile wallets, stating that banks should “work with mobile payment providers to establish processes for authenticating enrollment of customers’ account information that the customers provide to the mobile payment providers.”

CONCLUSION

All told, the FAQs provide welcome relief to banks and bank service providers from the prevailing (and strict) reading of the 2013 Bulletin. While the guidance does not break new ground and might otherwise be lost in a crowded news cycle, the FAQs seem to signal a change in emphasis from the OCC, or, at minimum, they remind banks of their flexibility to take their own risk-based approach to managing third-party relationships.