

business \* \* \* at which deposits are received, or checks paid, or money lent.” The basic question is whether the sale of a bank’s money orders by an agent amounts to the receipt of deposits at a branch place of business within the meaning of this statute.

(c) Money orders are classified as deposits for certain purposes. However, they bear a strong resemblance to traveler’s checks that are issued by banks and sold off premises. In both cases, the purchaser does not intend to establish a deposit account in the bank, although a liability on the bank’s part is created. Even though they result in a deposit liability, the Board is of the opinion that the issuance of a bank’s money orders by an authorized agent does not involve the receipt of deposits at a “branch place of business” and accordingly does not require the Board’s permission to establish a branch.

**§ 208.111 Obligations concerning institutional customers.**

(a) As a result of broadened authority provided by the Government Securities Act Amendments of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3 and 78o-5), the Board is adopting sales practice rules for the government securities market, a market with a particularly broad institutional component. Accordingly, the Board believes it is appropriate to provide further guidance to banks on their suitability obligations when making recommendations to institutional customers.

(b) The Board’s Suitability Rule, § 208.37(d), is fundamental to fair dealing and is intended to promote ethical sales practices and high standards of professional conduct. Banks’ responsibilities include having a reasonable basis for recommending a particular security or strategy, as well as having reasonable grounds for believing the recommendation is suitable for the customer to whom it is made. Banks are expected to meet the same high standards of competence, professionalism, and good faith regardless of the financial circumstances of the customer.

(c) In recommending to a customer the purchase, sale, or exchange of any government security, the bank shall have reasonable grounds for believing

that the recommendation is suitable for the customer upon the basis of the facts, if any, disclosed by the customer as to the customer’s other security holdings and financial situation and needs.

(d) The interpretation in this section concerns only the manner in which a bank determines that a recommendation is suitable for a particular institutional customer. The manner in which a bank fulfills this suitability obligation will vary, depending on the nature of the customer and the specific transaction. Accordingly, the interpretation in this section deals only with guidance regarding how a bank may fulfill customer-specific suitability obligations under § 208.37(d).<sup>8</sup>

(e) While it is difficult to define in advance the scope of a bank’s suitability obligation with respect to a specific institutional customer transaction recommended by a bank, the Board has identified certain factors that may be relevant when considering compliance with § 208.37(d). These factors are not intended to be requirements or the only factors to be considered but are offered merely as guidance in determining the scope of a bank’s suitability obligations.

(f) The two most important considerations in determining the scope of a bank’s suitability obligations in making recommendations to an institutional customer are the customer’s capability to evaluate investment risk independently and the extent to which the customer is exercising independent judgement in evaluating a bank’s recommendation. A bank must determine, based on the information available to it, the customer’s capability to evaluate investment risk. In some cases, the bank may conclude that the customer is not capable of making independent investment decisions in general. In other cases, the institutional customer may have general capability, but may

<sup>8</sup>The interpretation in this section does not address the obligation related to suitability that requires that a bank have “\* \* \* a ‘reasonable basis’ to believe that the recommendation could be suitable for at least some customers.” In the Matter of the Application of F.J. Kaufman and Company of Virginia and Frederick J. Kaufman, Jr., 50 SEC 164 (1989).

not be able to understand a particular type of instrument or its risk. This is more likely to arise with relatively new types of instruments, or those with significantly different risk or volatility characteristics than other investments generally made by the institution. If a customer is either generally not capable of evaluating investment risk or lacks sufficient capability to evaluate the particular product, the scope of a bank's customer-specific obligations under § 208.37(d) would not be diminished by the fact that the bank was dealing with an institutional customer. On the other hand, the fact that a customer initially needed help understanding a potential investment need not necessarily imply that the customer did not ultimately develop an understanding and make an independent investment decision.

(g) A bank may conclude that a customer is exercising independent judgment if the customer's investment decision will be based on its own independent assessment of the opportunities and risks presented by a potential investment, market factors and other investment considerations. Where the bank has reasonable grounds for concluding that the institutional customer is making independent investment decisions and is capable of independently evaluating investment risk, then a bank's obligations under § 208.25(d) for a particular customer are fulfilled.<sup>9</sup> Where a customer has delegated decision-making authority to an agent, such as an investment advisor or a bank trust department, the interpretation in this section shall be applied to the agent.

(h) A determination of capability to evaluate investment risk independently will depend on an examination of the customer's capability to make its own investment decisions, including the resources available to the customer to make informed decisions. Relevant considerations could include:

(1) The use of one or more consultants, investment advisers, or bank trust departments;

(2) The general level of experience of the institutional customer in financial

markets and specific experience with the type of instruments under consideration;

(3) The customer's ability to understand the economic features of the security involved;

(4) The customer's ability to independently evaluate how market developments would affect the security; and

(5) The complexity of the security or securities involved.

(i) A determination that a customer is making independent investment decisions will depend on the nature of the relationship that exists between the bank and the customer. Relevant considerations could include:

(1) Any written or oral understanding that exists between the bank and the customer regarding the nature of the relationship between the bank and the customer and the services to be rendered by the bank;

(2) The presence or absence of a pattern of acceptance of the bank's recommendations;

(3) The use by the customer of ideas, suggestions, market views and information obtained from other government securities brokers or dealers or market professionals, particularly those relating to the same type of securities; and

(4) The extent to which the bank has received from the customer current comprehensive portfolio information in connection with discussing recommended transactions or has not been provided important information regarding its portfolio or investment objectives.

(j) Banks are reminded that these factors are merely guidelines that will be utilized to determine whether a bank has fulfilled its suitability obligation with respect to a specific institutional customer transaction and that the inclusion or absence of any of these factors is not dispositive of the determination of suitability. Such a determination can only be made on a case-by-case basis taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances of a particular bank/customer relationship, assessed in the context of a particular transaction.

(k) For purposes of the interpretation in this section, an institutional customer shall be any entity other than a

<sup>9</sup> See footnote 8 in paragraph (d) of this section.

natural person. In determining the applicability of the interpretation in this section to an institutional customer, the Board will consider the dollar value of the securities that the institutional customer has in its portfolio and/or under management. While the interpretation in this section is potentially applicable to any institutional customer, the guidance contained in this section is more appropriately applied to an institutional customer with at least \$10 million invested in securities in the aggregate in its portfolio and/or under management.

[Reg. H, 63 FR 37658, July 13, 1998. Redesignated at 65 FR 14814, Mar. 20, 2000. Redesignated further at 65 FR 75841, Dec. 4, 2000. Redesignated further at 75 FR 44688, July 28, 2010; 75 FR 44692, July 28, 2010]

#### APPENDIX A TO PART 208—CAPITAL ADEQUACY GUIDELINES FOR STATE MEMBER BANKS: RISK-BASED MEASURE

##### *I. Overview*

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has adopted a risk-based capital measure to assist in the assessment of the capital adequacy of state member banks.<sup>1</sup> The principal objectives of this measure are to: (i) Make regulatory capital requirements more sensitive to differences in risk profiles among banks; (ii) factor off-balance sheet exposures into the assessment of capital adequacy; (iii) minimize disincentives to holding liquid, low-risk assets; and (iv) achieve greater consistency in the evaluation of the capital adequacy of major banks throughout the world.<sup>2</sup>

The risk-based capital guidelines include both a definition of capital and a framework for calculating weighted risk assets by assigning assets and off-balance sheet items to broad risk categories. A bank's risk-based capital ratio is calculated by dividing its

qualifying capital (the numerator of the ratio) by its weighted risk assets (the denominator).<sup>3</sup> The definition of qualifying capital is outlined below in section II, and the procedures for calculating weighted risk assets are discussed in Section III. Attachment I illustrates a sample calculation of weighted risk assets and the risk-based capital ratio.

In addition, when certain banks that engage in trading activities calculate their risk-based capital ratio under this appendix A, they must also refer to appendix E of this part, which incorporates capital charges for certain market risks into the risk-based capital ratio. When calculating their risk-based capital ratio under this appendix A, such banks are required to refer to appendix E of this part for supplemental rules to determine qualifying and excess capital, calculate risk-weighted assets, calculate market risk equivalent assets, and calculate risk-based capital ratios adjusted for market risk.

The risk-based capital guidelines also establish a schedule for achieving a minimum supervisory standard for the ratio of qualifying capital to weighted risk assets and provide for transitional arrangements during a phase-in period to facilitate adoption and implementation of the measure at the end of 1992. These interim standards and transitional arrangements are set forth in section IV.

The risk-based guidelines apply to all state member banks on a consolidated basis. They are to be used in the examination and supervisory process as well as in the analysis of applications acted upon by the Federal Reserve. Thus, in considering an application filed by a state member bank, the Federal Reserve will take into account the bank's risk-based capital ratio, the reasonableness of its capital plans, and the degree of progress it has demonstrated toward meeting the interim and final risk-based capital standards.

The risk-based capital ratio focuses principally on broad categories of credit risk, although the framework for assigning assets and off-balance-sheet items to risk categories does incorporate elements of transfer risk, as well as limited instances of interest rate and market risk. The framework incorporates risks arising from traditional banking activities as well as risks arising from nontraditional activities. The risk-based

<sup>1</sup>Supervisory ratios that relate capital to total assets for state member banks are outlined in appendix B of this part and in appendix B to part 225 of the Federal Reserve's Regulation Y, 12 CFR part 225.

<sup>2</sup>The risk-based capital measure is based upon a framework developed jointly by supervisory authorities from the countries represented on the Basle Committee on Banking Regulations and Supervisory Practices (Basle Supervisors' Committee) and endorsed by the Group of Ten Central Bank Governors. The framework is described in a paper prepared by the BSC entitled "International Convergence of Capital Measurement," July 1988.

<sup>3</sup>Banks will initially be expected to utilize period-end amounts in calculating their risk-based capital ratios. When necessary and appropriate, ratios based on average balances may also be calculated on a case-by-case basis. Moreover, to the extent banks have data on average balances that can be used to calculate risk-based ratios, the Federal Reserve will take such data into account.