Requests for SEFL

1. **Division:** SEFL & RMR
   Purpose: To help the Taskforce understand how the Bureau determines which of the regulatory tools it has at its discretion (rulemaking, supervision, enforcement, education, etc).
   Request: Email or point us to internal guidance, literature on the topic, or copies of unpublished papers (i.e. no briefing is being requested).
   Background: The Taskforce is seeking best practices or guiding principles that the Bureau uses to determine when to employ the regulatory tools available to it. Are there consumer protections that can be maximized, or efficiencies realized by modifying or establishing more objective guidelines on when to employ the tools? Is the guidance the same or different depending on product or circumstance?
   TF POC: Nat Weber

2. **Purpose:** To help the Taskforce understand how CFPB decides to use supervision or enforcement tools to achieve its regulatory mission and to understand the prevalence of Supervisory action. Are cost-benefit considerations part of the decision process? Is the analysis of what tool to use made upfront to confront an issue or systematically as a situation evolves? What are the marginal costs and benefits of Supervision as a tool?
   Where: Conversation via phone or audio/video chat.
   Background: The Taskforce is looking at how CFPB achieves its goal of applying the federal consumer financial laws and ensuring market participants adhere to the rules. The Taskforce is interested in effective and efficient regulatory action. Particular interest is the interplay between the tools applied by the SEFL group, supervision and enforcement, and how SEFL decides to conduct its work to achieve its goals.
   Request: We seek a conversation with experts from within the Bureau's SEFL group to help us understand the tool choice process and considerations used to make the decision. We request a brief phone call (maybe 1 hour), with the potential for some follow-up questions and feedback. Additionally, we would like the following information: How many exams are conducted annually? How many are 'repeated' exams with entities we have examined before? How many of these exams come back 'clean,' i.e. no misconduct is detected and no further action is necessary? How many exams are subsequently referred to Enforcement or require remediation within Supervision? Are there particular trends observed in entity industry, product, or exam type?
   TF POC: Alex Nongard & Jeff Magliato