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The FHLBank System, which is sometimes referred to as the “other housing GSE,” receives much less attention than the Enterprises. Yet, the FHLBank System deserves notice, among other reasons, because it currently has more than $600 billion in debt outstanding that is potentially taxpayer guaranteed, and in recent years, it has faced a number of challenges in terms of its safety, soundness, and housing mission achievement. Some of these challenges include:

- Several FHLBanks made investments in mortgage securities during the housing boom years – from 2005 through 2007 – that later generated billions of dollars of losses and continue to present financial challenges.

- The FHLBank System has faced plummeting member demand for advances that negatively affects the FHLBanks’ financial performance. Declining advance demand has led the FHLBanks to engage in potentially risky non-housing mission activities, such as making unsecured loans to foreign banks. Advances to insurance companies have also increased, exposing new risks, such as the fact that the FDIC does not cover the obligations of insurance companies in the event of a failure.

- The Administration has made proposals to reform the FHLBank System that may inadvertently pose challenges. These proposals include limiting FHLBank advances to small- and medium-sized members and reducing their investment portfolios. Although these proposals are intended to strengthen the FHLBank System’s safety and soundness and its focus on housing mission achievement, they involve substantial revisions to some FHLBanks’ current business models.

In light of these challenges and the potential risk that the FHLBank System represents, this report is intended to provide an overview of the FHLBank System’s structure, operations, risks, and oversight by FHFA. It also summarizes several of the key differences between the FHLBank System and the Enterprises and discusses in detail a number of the critical challenges facing the FHLBanks and FHFA.

BACKGROUND

Overview of the FHLBank System’s Structure

The FHLBank System was created in 1932 to improve the availability of funds for home ownership. It is organized under the authority of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of 1932, and its mission is to provide local lenders with readily
available, low-cost funding to finance housing, jobs, and economic growth. The 12 FHLBanks fulfill this mission by providing liquidity to their members through advances, resulting in an increased availability of credit for residential mortgages, community investments, and other housing and community development services.

The FHLBanks are cooperatives that are owned privately and wholly by their members. Each FHLBank operates as a separate entity within a defined geographic region of the country, known as its district, with its own board of directors, management, and employees. Each member of an FHLBank must purchase and maintain capital stock as a condition of its membership. FHLBank stock is held at par value and is not traded. FHLBank members may receive dividends on their investment in capital stock from the earnings of their bank.

Figure 1 (see below) provides a map of the locations of the 12 FHLBanks.

Par Value:
The face value of a security.
Currently, more than 7,700 financial institutions comprise the membership of the FHLBanks. These financial institutions include banks, thrifts, credit unions, insurance companies, and community development financial institutions. Figure 2 (see below) shows the composition of the FHLBanks by member type. Commercial banks are the largest class of members at 69%. Thrifts and credit unions each comprise 14%. Insurance companies comprise 3% and community development financial institutions 0.1%.

![Figure 2. 2011 FHLBank Composition by Member Type](image-url)

Each FHLBank has a board of directors that governs the bank. These boards range in size from 13 to 18 directors, as determined by FHFA. The directors are elected by member institutions and serve a four-year term. Each FHLBank also has a president that reports to the board of directors of the respective FHLBank. The president’s responsibilities include managing the FHLBank, administering the FHLBank’s programs, and ensuring compliance with the regulations and policies of FHFA.

The compensation of FHLBank officers and employees is subject to the approval of management and the board of directors of each individual FHLBank. FHFA has established principles and guidelines for the FHLBanks and the Office of Finance in setting executive compensation policies and practices. However, each FHLBank is responsible for creating its own compensation philosophy and objectives. Accordingly, compensation packages for the presidents and CEOs of the 12 FHLBanks ranged from approximately $1.2 million to $3.4 million for the year ended 2011.
Figure 3 (see above) provides information on the 2011 executive compensation for the Enterprises’ CEOs and the CEOs of the 12 FHLBanks.

**FHLBank System Assets, Liabilities, and Capital**

**Assets**

Advances are the FHLBanks’ largest assets and they support members’ local lending activities. In order to qualify for an advance, an FHLBank member must pledge high-quality collateral, such as government securities; mortgage loans; non-residential real estate loans; or loans for small business, agriculture, or community development. In addition, the FHLBank member must purchase additional stock in its FHLBank proportionate to the new borrowing.10

---

10 On Mar. 9, 2012, FHFA released the report, *FHFA Announces New Conservatorship Scorecard for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac; Reduces Executive Compensation* (Mar. 9, 2012) (online at www.fhfa.gov/webfiles/23438/ExecComp3912F.pdf). This report announced a new 2012 executive compensation program for the Enterprises, which eliminates bonuses, establishes a compensation target for new CEOs at $500,000 per year, and reduces compensation for top executives by roughly 75% since the advent of the conservatorships.
Figure 4 (see below) illustrates trends in FHLBank advances over the past 11 years. From 2005 to 2008, outstanding advances to members increased from approximately $600 billion to over $900 billion. However, as of December 2011, outstanding advances to members dropped by more than 50% to approximately $418 billion.11 As discussed later in this report, the substantial decline in advance demand has presented considerable financial challenges to the FHLBank System.

The FHLBanks also maintain investment portfolios for liquidity purposes and to generate income. These investments include federal funds, certificates of deposits, MBS, and private-label MBS. The FHLBanks’ investment portfolios may also include unsecured short-term loans to domestic and foreign financial institutions. Some FHLBanks may also purchase certain whole mortgages on single-family properties directly from participating member institutions.12

As shown in Figure 5 (see page 7), advances represented 55% of the FHLBank System’s total assets as of the end of 2011. Investments such as MBS and private-label MBS represented another 34% of total assets, and whole mortgages comprised 7%. Cash and miscellaneous assets equaled 4% of total assets.

**Federal Funds:**
Extensions of unsecured credit between financial institutions that are generally made on an overnight basis.

**Certificate of Deposit:**
A certificate of deposit is a relatively low-risk investment in a special deposit account with a bank or thrift institution. Investors commit a fixed sum of money for a fixed period of time – six months, one year, five years, or more. A certificate of deposit typically offers a higher rate of interest than a regular savings account. Interest is paid at regular intervals by the issuing bank, and when the deposit matures, the investor receives the original investment amount plus accrued interest. If the deposit is redeemed prior to the maturity date, there may be penalties associated with early withdrawal.
Liabilities

The FHLBanks fund their operations through the sale of consolidated obligations, which are bonds and discount notes issued to the public through the Office of Finance. The FHLBanks issue discount notes in maturities ranging from 1 day to 1 year and bonds with maturities of 6 months to 30 years. The majority of consolidated obligation maturities are between 1 and 5 years after issuance, and the sizes of these obligations can range from $10 million to several billion dollars. The Office of Finance sells the FHLBanks’ debt through a wide international network of underwriters, and the FHLBanks are jointly and severally liable for their debt. Therefore, if an individual bank is unable to pay a creditor, the other 11 banks – or any 1 or more of them – are required to step in and cover the debt.

Figure 6 (see page 8) shows the trends in consolidated obligations over the last 11 years. In 2007 and 2008, bond and discount note issuances peaked as FHLBank members’ demand for advances soared. However, the FHLBanks’ outstanding bonds and discount notes subsequently declined as demand for advances waned over the past several years.
Figure 6. FHLBank System Consolidated Obligations from 2001 to 2011 ($ billions)

As discussed in previous OIG reports, the FHLBank System generally can issue debt at favorable interest rates compared to other financial institutions due to the implicit federal guarantee on its financial obligations.\textsuperscript{16}

**Capital**

The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act of 1999 requires each of the 12 FHLBanks to maintain sufficient capital pursuant to a capital structure plan. Each FHLBank is subject to three capital requirements under its plan: (1) total regulatory capital compliance, (2) leverage capital compliance, and (3) risk-based capital compliance.\textsuperscript{17} These capital requirements serve as a cushion that protects against unanticipated losses and asset declines that could cause an FHLBank to fail, and FHFA reviews them to ensure the financial soundness and adequate capitalization of the FHLBanks.\textsuperscript{18}

Figure 7 (see below) summarizes the capital standards of the FHLBank System.

**Figure 7. FHLBank Capital Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Standard</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Compliance</strong>\textsuperscript{19}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total Regulatory Capital</td>
<td>Sum of permanent capital, <strong>Class A stock</strong> outstanding, general loss allowance, and other amounts from sources determined by FHFA as available to absorb losses</td>
<td>• 4% of assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leverage Capital</td>
<td>Sum of permanent capital weighted 1.5 times and all other capital without a weighting factor</td>
<td>• 5% of assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk-based Capital</td>
<td>Permanent capital equal to at least the sum of its credit risk, market risk, and operations risk requirements</td>
<td>• Permanent capital equal to at least the sum of: (1) credit risk measured by the weighted sum of asset classes, (2) market risk measured by a value-at-risk model and market value that falls below 85% of book value, and (3) operations risk equal to 30% of total credit and market risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Class A Stock:**
Common stock issued by the FHLBanks to member institutions at a stated par value of $100 per share. Class A stock is redeemable by members at par value with six months written notice.

**Class B Stock:**
Common stock issued by the FHLBanks to member institutions at a stated par value of $100 per share. Class B stock is redeemable by members at par value with five years written notice.
Housing Mission Related Programs and Activities

In addition to their traditional advance business, the FHLBanks support economic and community development through affordable housing and other programs, as summarized below.

Affordable Housing Program

The FHLBanks are required to contribute at least 10% of their net earnings to affordable housing efforts established through the Affordable Housing Program (AHP), which includes a competitive program that subsidizes the cost of owner-occupied housing for individuals and families with incomes at or below 80% of the area median income and rental housing in which at least 20% of the units are reserved for households with incomes at or below 50% of the area median income. Members submit applications on behalf of one or more sponsors of eligible housing projects. Projects must meet certain eligibility criteria and score successfully in order to obtain funding.

AHP funds are also awarded through a homeownership set-aside program, under which an FHLBank may set aside up to $4.5 million or 35% of its AHP funds each year to assist low- and moderate-income households to purchase homes. At least one-third of the FHLBank’s set-aside allocation must be made available to assist first-time homebuyers. Members disburse AHP home ownership set-aside funds as grants to eligible households. Set-aside funds can be used for down payment, closing costs, counseling, or rehabilitation assistance in connection with the purchase or rehabilitation of an owner-occupied unit. Each FHLBank sets its maximum grant amount, which may not exceed $15,000 per household.20

To ensure that AHP projects serve local housing needs, each FHLBank is advised by a 15-member Affordable Housing Advisory Council.21 OIG is currently conducting an evaluation of FHFA’s Oversight of AHP.

Community Investment Program

Each FHLBank also operates a Community Investment Program (CIP) that offers below market rate loans to members in need of long-term financing for housing and economic development that benefits low- and moderate-income families and neighborhoods. Members use CIP to fund owner-occupied and rental housing; construct roads, bridges, retail stores, and sewage treatment plants; and provide small business loans.22

Economic Community Development Programs

The FHLBanks also offer long-term advances at below market interest rates through Community Investment Cash Advance (CICA) programs. CICA programs provide financing for economic development projects. CICA lending is targeted to specific beneficiaries that include small businesses and certain geographic areas.
Each FHLBank has a Community Lending Plan that describes its program objectives for economic development. Additionally, several of the FHLBanks operate other voluntary programs for affordable housing, small business lending, foreclosure prevention, and financial literacy.

FHLBANK SYSTEM RISKS AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

The FHLBanks, like other financial institutions, face risks related to business operations. The following provides an overview of major risk categories and how the FHLBanks mitigate these risks. Credit risks, interest rate risks, operational risks, and housing and “image” risks are the primary risks encountered by the FHLBanks.

Credit Risks

Credit risk relates to the possibility that borrowers will fail to meet their obligations in accordance with agreed terms (e.g., that they will default on their loans). The FHLBanks face credit risks to varying degrees related to their advances, unsecured credit extensions, private-label MBS, and whole mortgages, and they have a variety of options available to mitigate the risks.

Advances

The credit risk associated with advances is that a member financial institution will fail or otherwise default on an advance from an FHLBank. The potential exists that such a failure or default could result in the FHLBank incurring a loss on the advance. FHFA has stated that the credit risks associated with advances, although generally viewed as low, have increased over the past few years due to the weakening financial condition of many FHLBank member institutions.

The FHLBanks primarily manage the credit risks associated with advances by monitoring their members’ financial health and through collateral requirements. FHLBank members are required to fully secure all advances with eligible collateral, which include: (1) residential mortgage loans (the principal form of collateral), (2) cash deposits held by the FHLBanks, (3) Treasury and agency securities, and (4) “other real estate related” collateral. Additionally, the FHLBanks apply a percentage discount to the market value of collateral used to secure an advance; this practice is known as a “haircut.” An FHLBank might apply a haircut of 25% to an advance secured by investment grade securities, which means the advance would have a value equal to only 75% of the collateral. By this procedure, the FHLBanks can ensure that the value of their collateral exceeds the value of their advances and that there will be sufficient collateral available to offset any potential losses associated with a member’s default on an advance.

The FHLBanks use a variety of other means to mitigate the credit risks associated with advances. For example, each FHLBank establishes an
overall credit limit for borrowers designed to mitigate the FHLBank's credit exposure. The FHLBanks may also require a troubled member to list or deliver collateral to a third party to ensure it is available in the event it were to fail or default on its outstanding advances.

Additionally, if an FHLBank member institution fails, the FHLBanks have a first lien on the member's assets. Therefore, the banks have priority over all other creditors, including the FDIC, to obtain the collateral necessary to protect against losses on outstanding advances. Typically in a bank failure, the FDIC pays off outstanding FHLBank advances in full then takes possession of the collateral on the institution's books to help offset its losses.

According to FHFA, no FHLBank has ever suffered a loss on an advance. However, in June 2012, OIG issued an audit assessing FHFA's oversight of the FHLBanks' advances and recommended improvements in the Agency's related oversight framework.

Unsecured Loans

Unsecured loans, such as short-term loans to domestic or foreign lenders, are generally viewed as having higher credit risks than advances because they are not backed by collateral. However, the short-term nature of unsecured lending helps to mitigate the credit risk. Further, the FHLBanks' unsecured loans are generally made only to highly rated private institutions (i.e., institutions rated at the "A" level or above). The FHLBanks also mitigate risks by periodically reviewing borrowers and adjusting limits on borrower exposure.

As discussed in Section 3 of the Federal Housing Finance Agency Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to the Congress, April 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012, OIG recently issued an evaluation report that raised questions about the FHLBanks' extensions of unsecured credit primarily to European banks in 2010 and 2011. The report recommended that FHFA take steps to strengthen its oversight process and the regulatory framework for such unsecured credit extensions.

Private-Label MBS

The credit risk associated with private-label MBS is that the underlying mortgages that support such securities will default and result in a loss. As discussed later in this report, several FHLBanks' investments in private-label MBS generated substantial losses in recent years. To mitigate such risks, FHFA regulations place limits on the FHLBanks' overall investments in MBS to 300% of its regulatory capital. However, FHFA stated it will revisit the 300% ceiling in a future rulemaking.
Whole Mortgages

As is the case with other mortgage assets, the credit risk associated with the FHLBanks’ whole mortgages is that borrowers will default on such mortgages. This risk is mitigated by insurance and other credit enhancements. For example, member institutions obtain mortgage insurance for the mortgages they sell to the FHLBanks. Further, according to FHFA, the FHLBanks’ mortgage holdings have fixed rates and are well seasoned, soundly underwritten, and supported by qualified borrowers.\(^\text{42}\)

Interest Rate Risks

Interest rate risk refers to how changes in interest rates may have an adverse effect on an institution’s financial condition.\(^\text{43}\) As stated above, FHLBank operations (e.g., advances and unsecured lending) are typically funded through debt issuances (i.e., bonds or discount notes). In other words, the FHLBanks borrow at one rate and may lend at another. Thus, depending on the terms of these transactions (i.e., maturity and yield), interest rate risk can be significant.

Prepayment offers a helpful illustration of this risk. Prepayments represent risk because they can lower the FHLBanks’ expected revenues from their various asset classes, while their costs of operation remain flat or increase.\(^\text{44}\)

Advances

Prepayments of advances can lead to lower net returns if the prepayments are reinvested in assets yielding lower returns. Further, the risk can be particularly acute if an advance was financed by a higher-cost debt.\(^\text{45}\)

Charging members a prepayment fee is one way the FHLBanks mitigate this risk. Because the FHLBanks would likely experience lower net returns due to prepayments, prepayment fees compensate for such losses, easing financial burdens. The FHLBanks also offer advances that a member may prepay without a fee. These advances are financed with instruments such as callable debt.\(^\text{46}\) Callable debt allows an FHLBank, as the issuer, to buy back the debt when interest rates decline and prepayments are likely to increase.\(^\text{47}\)

MBS and Whole Mortgage Loans

Mortgage-related investments such as MBS and mortgage loans are also affected by prepayments. Because single-family mortgages routinely include prepayment options, interest rate changes – particularly decreasing interest rates – often stimulate prepayments.\(^\text{48}\)

Mitigation of interest rate risk includes FHFA regulations governing the types of MBS the FHLBanks may own. Other mitigation methods include funding mortgage-related investments with callable debt.\(^\text{49}\)
Operational Risks

Operational risks occur due to potential losses from systems and people. According to FHFA’s Oversight of Troubled Federal Home Loan Banks, operational risks can include poor collateral risk management, flaws in the institution’s information technology systems, and weak corporate governance.50

The FHLBanks rely on business and financial models to manage financial risks and assist in making business decisions. Each FHLBank uses different models and assumptions to determine fair values of assets, liabilities, and derivatives. Models use assumptions to project future trends and performance, and any changes in the models’ underlying assumptions can cause the results to be materially different. Therefore, the reliability of an FHLBank’s models is key to making good business decisions and, thus, represents operational risk.51

The FHLBanks’ significant reliance on information systems could have severe effects on their ability to effectively conduct business if an interruption or failure occurs. In addition, failures in their financial reporting controls and procedures could adversely affect the accuracy of information reported in the FHLBanks’ financial reports.52

The FHLBanks mitigate operational risk by, among other means, internal controls and continuity plans and resources. Internal controls are a major technique used to detect and prevent operational issues. Each FHLBank has a business continuity plan and a backup location that is regularly evaluated by examiners.53

Housing and “Image” Risks

The FHLBanks’ core mission activities include advances; non-core mission activities include investing in unsecured credit, private-label MBS, and MBS.54 A significant investment in these non-core areas exposes the FHLBanks to housing mission and “image” risks55 and can impair their reputation. This risk is somewhat mitigated by a regulatory limit on investments in MBS (i.e., 300% of regulatory capital). However, no such ceiling controls unsecured lending.

FHFA’S FHLBANK SYSTEM SAFETY, SOUNDNESS, AND MISSION OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

To carry out its responsibilities with respect to the FHLBanks, FHFA may issue regulations, establish capital standards, and conduct on-site safety and soundness or mission-related examinations. FHFA may also take enforcement actions, such as issuing cease and desist orders, or may place an FHLBank into conservatorship or receivership if it becomes undercapitalized or critically undercapitalized.56

FHFA issues regulatory guidance designed to ensure sufficient liquidity and to protect against temporary disruptions in the capital markets that affect
the FHLBanks’ access to funding.57 The prompt corrective action provisions under HERA allow FHFA to determine each FHLBank’s capital classification on at least a quarterly basis. If an FHLBank is determined to be other than adequately capitalized, that FHLBank becomes subject to additional supervisory authority by FHFA.58 If FHFA determines an FHLBank is unable to satisfy its repayment obligations, FHFA has the authority to liquidate or reorganize the FHLBank. The outstanding liabilities can then be allocated among the remaining FHLBanks in proportion to their participation in all consolidated obligations outstanding.59

FHFA’s Division of FHLBank Regulation (DBR) is primarily responsible for ensuring that the FHLBanks operate in a financially safe and sound manner, remain adequately capitalized, raise funds in the capital markets, and operate in a manner consistent with their housing finance mission.60 DBR oversees and directs all FHLBank examination activities, develops examination findings, and prepares reports of examination.61

DBR receives support from other FHFA offices. FHFA’s Division of Examination Programs and Support is responsible for: (1) supporting FHFA examination activities, (2) developing and maintaining a consistent examination program, (3) developing examination policy, and (4) developing and providing FHLBank examiner training.62 Additionally, OGC advises and supports FHFA on legal matters related to the functions, activities, and operations of FHFA and the GSEs. OGC also supports supervision functions, regulation writing, and enforcement actions when warranted.63

FHLBANKS AND THE ENTERPRISES

Although the FHLBanks and the Enterprises are both classified as housing GSEs, there are substantial differences in terms of their structure and operations. For example, each FHLBank is a cooperative with its stock held by member institutions. In contrast, the Enterprises are corporations owned by investors including Treasury. The FHLBanks’ primary means of facilitating housing finance is to make advances directly to their member financial institutions. Whereas, the Enterprises facilitate liquidity in the housing finance system by purchasing mortgages directly from lenders and either holding them in their portfolios or securitizing them. Figure 8 (see page 16) illustrates these and other differences between the FHLBank System and the Enterprises.
### Figure 8. Comparison of the FHLBanks and the Enterprises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>FHLBanks</th>
<th>The Enterprises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Each FHLBank is privately owned by its members in a cooperative structure.</td>
<td>• Shareholder-owned companies that operate under congressional charter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Members of an FHLBank must purchase capital stock in their region’s FHLBank and the stock is not publicly traded.</td>
<td>• Each Enterprise was placed into conservatorship on September 6, 2008, and each organization has received capital support under the PSPAs since September 2008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FHLBank stock is purchased at the stated par value of $100 per share.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stock may be redeemed or repurchased at its stated par value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Office of Finance issues debt on behalf of the FHLBanks. The FHLBanks are jointly and severally liable for their obligations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>FHLBanks</th>
<th>The Enterprises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Each FHLBank has its own board of directors, comprised of members of that FHLBank and independent (non-member) directors.</td>
<td>• The Enterprises’ boards have a minimum of 9 and no more than 13 directors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• By statute, two-fifths of the directors must be independent and at least two of those directors must be public interest directors with at least four years of experience in representing community or consumer interests.</td>
<td>• As a result of conservatorship, FHFA immediately succeeded to all rights, titles, powers, and privileges of the Enterprises and of any officers and directors of the Enterprises.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The board of directors no longer has the power or duty to manage, direct, or oversee the business and affairs of the Enterprises without approval from FHFA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Business Operations</th>
<th>FHLBanks</th>
<th>The Enterprises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The FHLBanks provide members with short- and long-term funding through advances, which may be used for mortgage lending and other purposes.</td>
<td>• The Enterprises provide a secondary market for conventional conforming mortgage loans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Enterprises buy mortgages from lenders and either hold these mortgages in their portfolios or package them into MBS that are sold to the public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lenders use the cash raised by selling mortgages to the Enterprises to engage in further lending.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Enterprises’ purchases help ensure a continuous, stable supply of mortgage money.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Mission</th>
<th>FHLBanks</th>
<th>The Enterprises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The FHLBanks contribute 10% of their net income to affordable housing through AHP.</td>
<td>• HERA requires that FHFA establish for the Enterprises four single-family housing goals, one multifamily special affordable housing goal, and requirements relating to multifamily housing for very low-income families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The FHLBanks operate a CIP that offers below market rate loans to members in need of long-term financing for housing and economic development that benefits low- and moderate-income families and neighborhoods.</td>
<td>• Three of the single-family housing goals target purchase money mortgages for: (1) low-income families, (2) very low-income families, and (3) families that reside in low-income areas. The single-family housing goals also include one that targets refinancing mortgages for low-income families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The FHLBanks offer long-term advances at below market interest rates through CICA programs that target economic development activities.</td>
<td>• The multifamily special affordable housing goal targets multifamily rental housing affordable to low-income families. The multifamily special affordable housing subgoal targets multifamily rental housing affordable to very low-income families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Enterprises are also required to serve three underserved markets including: (1) manufactured housing, (2) affordable housing preservation, and (3) rural areas by developing loan products and flexible underwriting guidelines to facilitate a secondary market for mortgages for very low-, low-, and moderate-income families in those markets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT RISKS AND CHALLENGES FACING THE FHLBANK SYSTEM AND FHFA

The Agency, OIG, and others have identified a number of challenges facing the FHLBank System and FHFA. These include: housing boom era private-label MBS investments, declining member advances, large non-core mission asset portfolios, increasing advances to insurance companies, and significant advance concentrations. The FHLBank System is also challenged by a proposal that may involve substantial changes to the current business models of several FHLBanks. The following summarizes these challenges.

Managing Losses Associated with Housing Boom Era Private-Label MBS Investments

From 2005 through 2007, several FHLBanks made substantial investments in private-label MBS because these securities offered higher returns than other investments in their portfolios. During those years, private-label MBS were highly rated by credit rating agencies. Gains and losses on private-label MBS are dependent on the level and direction of housing prices. Accordingly, when the housing market collapsed, the FHLBanks suffered significant losses on these investments, and they continue to suffer losses in their investment portfolios. Four of the FHLBanks, with which FHFA has had supervisory concerns, collectively lost approximately $2 billion on their private-label MBS investments in 2009 and 2010, as shown in Figure 9 (see below).

Figure 9. Four FHLBanks’ Losses on Private-Label MBS Investments 2009 and 2010 ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FHLBank</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>$444</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,421</td>
<td>$512</td>
<td>$1,933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Figure 10 (see below), the FHLBanks experienced losses of $616 million on private-label MBS during the first six months of 2011. In contrast, through the first six months of 2012, the situation improved significantly as private-label MBS losses declined to $86 million. However, as of June 30, 2012, the fair value of the FHLBanks’ private-label MBS holdings hovered above $26 billion, and these investments continue to be susceptible to deterioration in the housing market. Thus, the FHLBanks are at risk of further losses on their private-label MBS investments.

## Figure 10. Losses on Private-Label MBS Investments for the Six Months Ended June 30, 2011 and 2012 ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FHLBank</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$272</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$616</td>
<td>$86</td>
<td>$702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Substantially Declining Advance Demand

As illustrated in Figure 11 (see page 19), member advances have declined by more than half since 2008. The reduced demand for advances is attributed to:

- the availability of lower-cost funding options (e.g., customer deposits);
- the deterioration of the housing market beginning in 2008;
- the increase in financial institution failures;
- voluntary or forced consolidations; and
- member withdrawals.

As a result of these and other factors, the FHLBanks are earning less interest income on member advances. Specifically, the FHLBanks reported interest income from advances of just over $3 billion in 2011 compared to over $29 billion in 2008.
Figure 11. FHLBanks’ Advances to Members 2008 Through 2011
($ billions)

Large Non-Core Mission Investment Portfolio and Advances to Insurance Companies

Non-Core Investment Portfolio

To make up for declining advance demand, some FHLBanks made investments that involve significant risks and were not clearly consistent with their housing mission. From September 2008, when advances peaked, to December 31, 2011, the proportion of advances to total assets on the FHLBanks’ balance sheets decreased from 71% to 55%. In contrast, during the same period of time, the proportion of investments to total assets on the FHLBanks’ balance sheets increased from 23% to 34%. These investments include non-core mission assets, such as unsecured credit extensions, MBS, and private-label MBS.

FHFA’s Acting Director has expressed concern about the high level of non-core mission assets of certain FHLBanks. He has stated “…the FHLBanks’ various financial problems of the past 20 years have not come from the traditional advance business. Instead, investments and mortgage purchase programs have been the source of deterioration in the financial condition of some FHLBanks …. [It] is not a sustainable operating condition for an FHLBank” to have a large investment portfolio.

Advances to Insurance Companies

Some FHLBanks have also sought to offset their declining advances to banks and other traditional members by increasing lending to insurance companies. Specifically, advances to insurance companies have increased from 3% of total advances in 2007 to 13% of total advances in 2011, as shown in Figures 12a and 12b (see page 21).

Although FHLBank advances to insurance companies are permitted, they present risks to the FHLBank System that are distinct from risks associated with other members. For example, when a failed member bank has outstanding FHLBank advances, the FDIC generally is responsible for resolving the member’s obligations. To resolve the obligations, the FDIC repays the advances in order to obtain clear title to the assets securing the advances. Conversely, the FDIC does not cover the obligations of failed insurance companies. Therefore, member advances to a failed insurance company will only be covered to the extent the assigned collateral is sufficient or state insurance guarantee funds make up the difference.

FHFA has recognized these risks and has prioritized them in the oversight process. OIG has an ongoing survey that is assessing the effectiveness of this oversight.
Advance Concentration Risk

As illustrated in Figure 13 (see page 22), several of the FHLBanks have a large percentage of their member advances confined to a relatively small percentage of members; this creates a concentration of risk. The withdrawal or failure of one or more of these members could negatively affect an FHLBank by significantly reducing its net interest income on advances. In addition, failure of one or more members could cause large losses to an FHLBank if its advances are not properly collateralized.103
Proposals by the Administration That Would Significantly Alter Some FHLBanks’ Current Business Models

On February 11, 2011, Treasury and HUD jointly issued a report to Congress on the future of housing finance, *Reforming America’s Housing Finance Market* (the Plan), which outlines the Administration’s position on reforming the U.S. housing finance market.

As with the Enterprises, the Plan proposes that the FHLBanks reduce the sizes of their investment portfolios and reorient themselves toward the core mission of providing readily available funding to FHLBank member institutions. Accordingly, the Plan advocates limiting levels of advances in order to focus FHLBank resources on small- and medium-sized financial institutions. 104

The Plan is intended to strengthen the FHLBank System, but OIG notes that it may present substantial challenges to certain FHLBanks in the short- to medium-term. As stated earlier, many FHLBanks have significant advance concentrations with large members and, therefore, they depend on them for a significant portion of their advance revenues. Further, investment portfolios may comprise 50% or more of some FHLBanks’ total assets.

Accomplishing the Plan’s objectives would likely involve substantially downsizing and reorienting certain FHLBanks’ current asset portfolios. 105
FHFA has also stated that it may be necessary to merge certain FHLBanks to strengthen the FHLBank System. FHFA and the FHLBanks would likely face substantial challenges in managing the transition to such a structure, and it is not clear how these changes would be accomplished.

OUTLOOK
The outlook for the FHLBank System is uncertain as reduced demand for member advances, investments in risky non-core mission activities, and other factors challenge the economic viability of the FHLBanks. The FHLBanks have a role in the future of the housing finance system, but they need to focus on their core business and improve their business models to operate in profitable and sustainable manners.
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