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(May 22, 2020, 5:11 PM EDT) - On April 22, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission convened a meeting of its Agricultural Advisory Committee to discuss the coronavirus pandemic and its impact on agricultural commodity markets, which have experienced significant volatility in recent months.

Among other measures discussed at the meeting, CFTC Chairman Heath P. Tarbert announced that a new livestock markets task force is monitoring various markets in real time.

Beyond studying market forces, Tarbert made clear that the CFTC will be on the lookout for possible misconduct, "watching for any indication that prices are moving in an uneconomic manner relative to the underlying commodity's cash prices," and "monitoring to see if ... traders are attempting to manipulate futures prices through disruptions caused by supply and demand shocks."[1]

While the CFTC’s new measures follow calls from industry groups and political leaders since the start of the pandemic to investigate livestock and crop markets,[2] they also represent a continuation of the agency’s effort over the past year to signal a renewed focus on enforcement in the agricultural sector.

The CFTC oversees a wide range of markets, spanning energy, metals, interest rates, credit, cryptocurrencies and more, but Tarbert noted in a Jan. 22 op-ed that "making sure the agricultural sector can rely on futures prices and effectively hedge risk ... was originally — and always will be — the very cornerstone of the Commodity Exchange Act."[3]

Similarly, when the CFTC Division of Enforcement published its most recent annual report on Nov. 25, 2019, Tarbert noted that the agency would expand its focus on enforcement in agricultural markets:

America is the breadbasket of the world. Market manipulation and similar wrongdoing inflicts real pain on farmers by denying them the fair value of their hard work and crops. It also hurts American families by raising the costs of putting food on the table. Protecting our agricultural markets from manipulation and abuse is a special focus for the CFTC.[4]
This statement, which received little attention from the media and industry at the time, can now be regarded as a proactive effort to position the CFTC to address the kind of volatility that agricultural markets are currently facing.

As the CFTC focuses greater attention on enforcement in agricultural markets, a look back at the agency's past actions in this sector may shed light on where its renewed focus will lead.

The agency has brought numerous enforcement actions involving agricultural markets in the past decade. Several of these actions — including the agency's high-profile case against Kraft Foods Group Inc. and Mondelez Global LLC — have involved claims of manipulation. The agency has also pursued agricultural enforcement actions involving several other types of misconduct.

This article provides a brief survey of the CFTC's recent enforcement activity in agricultural markets, and then offers a look ahead at enforcement tools and initiatives that may inform the CFTC's approach to agricultural matters in its next phase.

**Recent CFTC Enforcement Actions in Agricultural Markets**

The CFTC's enforcement actions in agricultural markets in recent years have involved claims of manipulation, spoofing, wash trades, fraud and other types of violations.

**Manipulation**

One of the CFTC's highest-profile manipulation cases in recent years involves the wheat market. In April 2015, the CFTC initiated the Kraft action alleging manipulation and attempted manipulation of the prices of wheat futures and cash wheat, among other violations.[5]

The case became an object of unusual attention in the courts and the media in August 2019 when a settlement of the action came undone after the CFTC made public statements on the matter that allegedly violated a confidentiality provision in the settlement.[6]

Notably, the chairman's Nov. 25, 2019, statement announcing the CFTC's focus on enforcement in agricultural markets expressed sentiments similar to those in the press release that followed the now-vacated settlement in Kraft, suggesting that the agency felt it should again emphasize its ongoing commitment in this area.[7]

The CFTC's other enforcement actions in recent years targeting manipulation in agricultural markets have included a series of actions against traders for attempted manipulation of wheat futures and options, imposing penalties ranging from $125,000 to $3.4 million and other remedial measures,[8] as well as actions against attempted manipulation in milk futures and other agricultural products.[9]

**Spoofing**

In 2010, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act introduced a new provision on disruptive trading that prohibited spoofing, or entering a bid or offer with intent to cancel it before execution.[10] The CFTC Division of Enforcement has devoted significant resources in recent years to spoofing matters across a range of markets, and several of its recent cases have involved agricultural futures.[11]
In a September 2018 case, for example, a proprietary trading firm was fined $1.5 million for spoofing in various agricultural futures markets, including cattle, wheat and soybeans.[12] Indeed, the CFTC's first-ever spoofing enforcement action, brought in 2013, involved corn, soybeans and wheat, among other commodities.[13]

Wash Trades

In agricultural markets, the CFTC has also brought enforcement actions involving wash trading — noncompetitive or prearranged futures transactions that give the appearance of trading in the market without incurring market risk.[14] The CFTC has brought actions involving wash trading in wheat, cocoa, corn, soybean and cotton.[15]

Fraud

The CFTC's enforcement efforts in agriculture have also targeted fraud. In a September 2018 case, for example, an Iowa introducing broker and its principals were ordered to pay $11.9 million in restitution to farmers and a $1.25 million penalty for fraud, unauthorized trading, and false statements that had resulted in losses to farmers across five states.[16] The CFTC has also pursued fraudulent activity in other cases involving agricultural products, such as cattle, wheat and soybean futures.[17]

Disclosure, Reporting and Position Limits

The CFTC's recent enforcement actions in agricultural markets have also included an action against a provisionally registered swap dealer for providing counterparties and a swap data repository with mid-market marks that concealed the company's full markup on certain complex swaps, in violation of external business conduct rules requiring swap dealers to disclose material incentives and conflicts of interest related to their swaps.[18]

Several enforcement actions involving agricultural markets have also targeted speculative position limit violations. Position limits set maximum positions that one party can hold or control in particular commodities.

These rules aim to protect against price volatility that may arise from excessive speculation, as well as market manipulation through tactics such as corners and squeezes, in which traders accumulate such large positions that they are able to influence prices. The CFTC has brought several cases in recent years involving violations of position limits and related reporting requirements.[19]

New Areas for Potential Enforcement Activity in Agriculture

Beyond the traditional areas of enforcement summarized above, the CFTC's renewed emphasis on agricultural markets may dovetail with new Division of Enforcement initiatives on specific types of misconduct as outlined below.

Misappropriation of Confidential Information

The Division of Enforcement noted in its recent annual report that it has a task force dedicated to matters involving insider trading or other misuse of confidential information:
This type of misconduct can include misappropriating confidential information, improperly disclosing a client's trading information, front running, or using confidential information to unlawfully prearrange trades.[20]

The Division has focused on energy markets in recent cases in this area, but misappropriation of confidential information may prove to be a topic of interest in agriculture as well.

**Foreign Corruption**

In March 2019, the CFTC Division of Enforcement announced that it will work alongside the U.S. Department of Justice to investigate foreign bribery and corruption relating to commodities markets, and the division issued an enforcement advisory on self-reporting and cooperation for violations of the Commodity Exchange Act involving foreign corrupt practices.

In announcing this initiative, Enforcement Director James McDonald noted several factual scenarios that could lead to CFTC enforcement in connection with foreign corrupt practices, including bribes "to secure business in connection with regulated activities like trading, advising, or dealing in swaps or derivatives," manipulated prices that are "the product of corruption" and result in false reporting to benchmarks, and corruption that "alter[s] the prices in commodity markets that drive U.S. derivatives prices."[21]

While the division's early work on foreign corruption may focus on oil and gas or other extractive industries, the agency may see fertile ground for this initiative in agricultural markets as well.[22]

**Enforcement Tools and Initiatives That May Shape Agricultural Cases**

In recent years, the CFTC has devoted significant resources to new initiatives intended to enhance its enforcement program. The initiatives below can be expected to drive the Division of Enforcement's work in agricultural markets as they have in other areas.

**Data Analytics**

The Division of Enforcement has recently emphasized its increasing use of data analytics. In the 2019 annual report, the division noted that it has "engaged in a multi-year project to enhance [its] ability to detect misconduct through the use of data analytics," and that it has "developed an ability to identify, in the trading data, forms of misconduct that [it] might otherwise have been unable to detect."[23]

The division's efforts to pursue Tarbert's focus on potential manipulation in agricultural markets, including its new livestock markets task force, will likely draw on these resources.

**Whistleblower Program**

In 2010, the Dodd-Frank Act created a new CFTC whistleblower program that provides for payment of monetary awards to eligible individuals who voluntarily disclose original information about violations of the CEA to the CFTC, leading to a successful enforcement action.[24]

The division's annual report noted that "the whistleblower program has now awarded a total of over $100 million to deserving whistleblowers," and "Commission actions associated with those awards have resulted in judgments totaling more than $800 million."[25]
The division can be expected to draw on information provided by whistleblowers in agricultural markets as it has in other areas.[26]

**Self-Reporting and Cooperation**

In addition to the whistleblower program, the Division of Enforcement relies on a set of policies and procedures to encourage self-reporting and cooperation in its investigations. The division announced its current version of this program in September 2017.

Since then, as noted in the division's most recent annual report, several significant matters have been "developed with the assistance of cooperating witnesses or corporate cooperation," and the past year included "three cases that arose out of self-reports."[27] Registrants and other participants in agricultural markets who identify potential wrongdoing should be aware of the division's self-reporting and cooperation program as well.[28]

**Coordination With Other Agencies**

The Division of Enforcement has placed great emphasis in recent years on "increasing coordination with other regulators and criminal authorities."[29] Its annual report noted that this past year the Division "filed more actions in parallel with criminal authorities (16) than in any prior year."[30] This continues a trend that gained prominence with multi-agency enforcement actions involving LIBOR, the FX markets, and other matters over the past decade.

In recent years, the Department of Justice has devoted significant resources to matters involving spoofing and manipulation in commodities markets,[31] with several high-profile investigations of traders and financial institutions.[32]

In October 2019, noting that the Fraud Section's Securities and Financial Fraud Unit now focuses on a broader range of matters, the Department of Justice renamed the unit the Market Integrity and Major Frauds Unit and established teams dedicated to five specific areas, one of which is commodities fraud.[33] This team works closely with the CFTC.[34]

The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and other regulators, both in the U.S. and abroad, have also worked closely with the CFTC on enforcement matters in recent years. Agricultural markets may prove to be an area in which the CFTC increasingly collaborates with these other agencies as well.

In addition, the CFTC announced during the April 22 AAC meeting that it "will soon appoint a CFTC Liaison to the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the first time," a step the CFTC believes "will ensure robust dialogue and continued coordination regarding matters of mutual interest."[35] This coordination may include market research and analysis in support of enforcement investigations.

**Conclusion**

The CFTC's stated intention to focus on manipulation and other forms of misconduct in agricultural markets represents both a new focus and a return to the heartland of the agency's mission. Registered firms and market participants will benefit from understanding the Division of Enforcement's recent actions and current initiatives, which may shape this area of enforcement during the current crisis and in the years ahead.
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