

Jurisdiction:

European Commission

2016 IMN Survey of National Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations

- I. Hedge funds
- II. Securitisation
- III. Enhancing supervision
- IV. Building and implementing macroprudential frameworks and tools
- V. Improving oversight of credit rating agencies (CRAs)
- VI. Enhancing and aligning accounting standards
- VII. Enhancing risk management
- VIII. Strengthening deposit insurance
 - IX. Safeguarding the integrity and efficiency of financial markets
 - X. Enhancing financial consumer protection
 - XI. Reference to source of recommendations
- **XII.** List of Abbreviations



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
I.	Hedge funds				
1 (1)	Registration, appropriate disclosures and oversight of hedge	We also firmly recommitted to work in an internationally consistent and non- discriminatory manner to strengthen	Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the high level principles in IOSCO's <i>Report on Hedge</i>	 □ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment 	If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation:
	funds	regulation and supervision on hedge funds. (Seoul) Hedge funds or their managers will be registered and will be required to disclose appropriate information on an ongoing basis to supervisors or regulators, including on their leverage, necessary for assessment of the systemic risks they pose individually or collectively. Where appropriate registration should be subject to a minimum size. They will be subject to oversight to ensure that they have adequate risk management. (London)	 Fund Oversight (Jun 2009), in particular recommendations 1 and 2. In their response, jurisdictions should specify whether: Hedge Funds (HFs) and/or HF managers are subject to mandatory registration Registered HF managers are subject to appropriate ongoing requirements regarding:	 ☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: ☑ Implementation completed as of: ☐ Directive: 21 July 2012/Regulation: 11 April 2013 Issue is being addressed through: ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline: 1) Directive 2011/61/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2011 on Alternative Investment Fund Managers and amending Directives 	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
			those Principles.	2003/41/EC and 2009/65/EC and	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Regulations (EC) No 1060/2009 and	
				(EU) No 1095/2010 2) Commission	
				Delegated Regulation (EU) No 231/2013	
				of 19 December 2012 supplementing	
				Directive 2011/61 of the European	
				Parliament and of the Council with	
				regard to exemptions, general operating	
				conditions, depositaries, leverage,	
				transparency and supervision. The	
				AIFMD and its implementing Regulation	
				foresees rules for the registration or	
				authorisation of AIFMs, the on-going	
				operation of the AIFM's business and	
				rules on transparency and supervision.	
				Depending on the assets under	
				management they administrate or the use	
				of leverage AIFMs have to either register	
				or apply for a full authorization. The	
				Directive provides for a lighter regime	
				for AIFMs where the cumulative AIFs	
				under management fall below a threshold	
				of EUR 100 million and for AIFMs that	
				manage only unleveraged AIFs that do	
				not grant investors redemption rights	
				during a period of 5 years where the	
				cumulative AIFs under management fall	
				below a threshold of EUR 500 million.	
				While these AIFMs are not subject to the	
				full authorisation procedure but to	
				registration in their home Member States,	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				they still need to provide their competent	
				authorities with relevant information	
				regarding the main instruments in which	
				they are trading and on the principal	
				exposures and most important	
				concentrations of the AIFs they manage.	
				Registered AIFM have to comply with	
				minimum requirements regarding the	
				reporting of information to competent	
				authorities whereas authorised AIFMs	
				which are leveraged on a substantial	
				basis have to comply with a wider set of	
				reporting requirements. AIFMs have to	
				comply with organisational and	
				operational standards such as the risk and	
				liquidity management or the	
				identification, prevention, managing and	
				monitoring of conflict of interests.	
				AIFMs have to make available to	
				investors for each AIF they manage	
				and/or market in the Union information	
				such as a description of the investment	
				strategy, changes to the maximum level	
				of leverage, the risk profile of the AIF.	
				Furthermore AIFMs have to comply with	
				rules on initial capital and own funds,	
				whereby the AIFM have to provide an	
				additional amount of own funds where	
				the value of the portfolios of AIFs	
				managed by an AIFMs exceeds EUR 250	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				million. AIFMs have to appoint a	
				depositary which has to safeguard the	
				assets of the AIF either by holding them	
				in custody or by verifying the ownership	
				of the AIF and maintaining a record these	
				assets. The AIFM has to ensure that there	
				are consistent and appropriate procedures	
				in place in order to valuate assets of the	
				AIF properly and independently. The	
				AIFMD framework will be reviewed by	
				July 2017.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/inves	
				tment/alternative_investments/index_en.	
				htm	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
2	Establishment of	We ask the FSB to develop mechanisms	Jurisdictions should indicate the progress	☐ Not applicable	If this recommendation has not yet
(2)	international information sharing	for cooperation and information sharing between relevant authorities in order to	made in implementing the high level principles in IOSCO's <i>Report on Hedge</i>	☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation:
	framework	ensure effective oversight is maintained	Fund Oversight (Jun 2009) on sharing	☐ Implementation ongoing:	
		when a fund is located in a different jurisdiction from the manager. We will,	information to facilitate the oversight of globally active fund managers.	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	Planned actions (if any) and expected
		cooperating through the FSB, develop measures that implement these principles	In addition, jurisdictions should state whether they are:	☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	commencement date:
		by the end of 2009. (London)		☐ Draft published as of:	
			Signatory to the IOSCO MMoUSignatory to bilateral agreements for	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	Web-links to relevant documents:
			supervisory cooperation that cover hedge funds and are aligned to the	☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :	
			2010 IOSCO <u>Principles Regarding</u> Cross-border Supervisory	☑ Implementation completed as of: 21 July 2012/11 April 2013	
			Cooperation.	Issue is being addressed through:	
				☑ Primary / Secondary legislation	
				☑ Regulation /Guidelines	
				☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	
				Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:	
				1) Directive 2011/61/EU of the European	
				Parliament and of the Council of 8 June	
				2011 on Alternative Investment Fund	
				Managers and amending Directives	
				2003/41/EC and 2009/65/EC and	
				Regulations (EC) No 1060/2009 and	
				(EU) No 1095/2010 2) Commission	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Delegated Regulation (EU) No 231/2013	
				of 19 December 2012 supplementing	
				Directive 2011/61 of the European	
				Parliament and of the Council with	
				regard to exemptions, general operating	
				conditions, depositaries, leverage,	
				transparency and supervision. For the	
				purpose of identifying the build-up of	
				systemic risk by the use of leverage and	
				the potential systemic consequences of	
				the AIFM's activities the AIFMD and its	
				implementing Regulation foresees rules	
				on the use of information by competent	
				authorities and the exchange of	
				information between the competent	
				authorities. Subject to specific conditions	
				a disclosure of information to third	
				countries is possible.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/inves	
				tment/alternative_investments/index_en.	
				htm	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps	
3	Enhancing counterparty	Supervisors should require that	Jurisdictions should indicate specific	☐ Not applicable	Planned actions (if any) and expected	
(3)	risk management	their counterparties have effective risk		policy measures taken for enhancing counterparty risk management and	☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	commencement date:
		management, including mechanisms to	strengthening their existing guidance on	☐ Implementation ongoing:		
		monitor the funds' leverage and set limits for single counterparty exposures.	the management of exposure to leveraged counterparties.	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	Web-links to relevant documents:	
		(London)	In particular, jurisdictions should indicate whether they have implemented	☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:		
			recommendation 3 of the IOSCO <i>Report</i>	☐ Draft published as of:		
			on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009).	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:		
			In their responses, jurisdictions should not provide information on the portion of	☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :		
			this recommendation that pertains to Basel III, since it is monitored separately	☑ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2014		
			by the BCBS.	Issue is being addressed through:		
			Jurisdictions can also refer to Principle	☑ Primary / Secondary legislation		
			28 of the 2010 IOSCO <u>Objectives and</u> <u>Principles of Securities Regulation</u> , and	☐ Regulation /Guidelines		
			take into account the outcomes of any	☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:		
			recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those Principles.	Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:		
		Supervisors will strengthen their existing guidance on the management of exposures to leveraged counterparties. (Rec. II.17, FSF 2008)		EU law (Regulation (EU) No 575/2013, the Capital Requirements Regulation or CRR) already includes rules on the treatment of hedge fund exposures (capital requirements and large exposure limits).		



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				New international standards have been recently adopted (December 2013) to better capture banks' exposures to hedge funds in the banking book, including a punitive treatment of exposures to highly leveraged funds. We are considering the transposition of these standards under the	
				review of the CRR. Web-links to relevant documents:	
				CRR: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:320 13R0575&from=EN	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
I	I. Securitisation				
4 (4)	Strengthening of regulatory and capital framework for	Insurance supervisors should strengthen the regulatory and capital framework for monoline insurers in relation to structured	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for strengthening the regulatory and capital framework for	☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
	monolines	credit. (Rec II.8, FSF 2008)	monoline insurers (where these exist).	☐ Implementation ongoing:	
			See, for reference, the following principles issued by IAIS:	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	Web-links to relevant documents:
			• <u>ICP 13</u> – Reinsurance and Other	☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	
			Forms of Risk Transfer;	☐ Draft published as of:	
			• <u>ICP 15</u> – Investments; and	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	
			• <u>ICP 17</u> - Capital Adequacy. Jurisdictions may also refer to:	☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :	
			IAIS <u>Guidance paper on enterprise</u>	☑ Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2016	
			risk management for capital adequacy and solvency purposes (Oct	Issue is being addressed through:	
			<u>2008).</u>	✓ Primary / Secondary legislation	
			• Joint Forum document on <u>Mortgage</u>	☐ Regulation /Guidelines	
			insurance: market structure, underwriting cycle and policy	☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	
			implications (Aug2013).	The Solvency II regime introduces a risk-	
				based supervisory regime for all	
				(re)insurance undertakings, including	
				monoline insurers. Under this regime,	
				companies will be subject to Capital	
				Requirements calibrated as a 99.5% value	
				at risk of own funds over a 1 year time	
				horizon, calculated on each	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
II.	. Securitisation				
	. Securitisation			undertakings's true risk profile. The Capital Requirements cover life, non-life and health underwriting risk, market risks, counterparty default risk, and operational risk. For the purpose of calculating underwriting risk capital requirements, insurance obligations shall be properly segmented. Credit and suretyship insurance is one of the segments in the standard formula, for which specific risk factors are calibrated as a 99.5% value at risk of own funds over a 1 year time horizon. (Re) insurance undertakings, including monoline insurers, shall also be subject to governance requirements. In particular, undertakings "shall have in place an effective risk-management system comprising strategies, processes and reporting procedures necessary to identify, measure, monitor, manage and report, on a continuous basis the risks, at an individual and at an aggregated level, to which they are or could be exposed, and their interdependencies" (article 44 of directive 2009/138/EC). Short description of the content of the	
				legislation/regulation/guideline:	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
II	. Securitisation				
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Solvency II entered into application on 1	
				January 2016.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://ec.europa.eu/finance/insurance/solvency/solvency2/index_en.htm	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
5 (5)	Strengthening of supervisory requirements or best	Regulators of institutional investors should strengthen the requirements or best practices for firms' processes for	Jurisdictions should indicate the due diligence policies, procedures and practices applicable for investment	☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation:
	practices for investment in structured products	investment in structured products. (Rec II.18, FSF 2008)	managers when investing in structured finance instruments and other policy measures taken for strengthening best practices for investment in structured finance products.	☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of:	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
			Jurisdictions may reference IOSCO's report on Good Practices in Relation to Investment Managers' Due Diligence When Investing in Structured Finance Instruments (Jul 2009). Jurisdictions may also refer to the Joint Forum report on Credit Risk Transfer- Developments from 2005-2007 (Jul 2008).	□ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: □ Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2016 Issue is being addressed through: □ Primary / Secondary legislation □ Regulation / Guidelines □ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline: EU legislation relating to the (re)insurance sector (Solvency II)	Web-links to relevant documents:
				introduces requirements on insurers' ability to invest in securitisation, which are consistent with those being introduced in the banking sector. Insurance and	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	_			reinsurance undertakings investing in	
				securitisation will be subject to: (i)	
				Capital Requirements for all types of	
				investments calibrated as a 99.5% value	
				at risk over a one year time horizon –	
				with lower risk factors on simpler, more	
				transparent and standardised	
				securitisation products; (ii) Higher	
				market risk capital requirements for re-	
				securitization exposures; (iii) A prudent	
				person principle that limits insurance and	
				reinsurance undertakings' investments to	
				assets that they can properly identify,	
				measure, monitor, manage, control and	
				report. Insurance and reinsurance	
				undertakings are only allowed to invest in	
				securitisation after conducting	
				comprehensive due diligence; (iv)	
				insurance and reinsurance undertakings	
				should have specific governance	
				arrangements when investing in	
				securitisation (written monitoring	
				procedures, specific reporting to	
				management body); (v) In order to	
				ensure transparency, requirements to	
				publicly disclose information of any	
				investments in securitisation.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Solvency II entered into application on 1	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				January 2016. The European Commission	
				adopted on on 30 September 2015 a	
				package of two legislative proposals: 1)	
				A Securitisation Regulation that will	
				apply to all securitisations and include	
				due diligence, risk retention and	
				transparency rules together with the	
				criteria for Simple, Transparent and	
				Standardised ("STS") Securitisations.	
				STS criteria are in line with the BCBS-	
				IOSCO principles adopted in July 2015;	
				2) A proposal to amend the Capital	
				Requirements Regulation to make the	
				capital treatment of securitisations for	
				banks and investment firms more risk-	
				sensitive and able to reflect properly the	
				specific features of STS securitisations.	
				As the prudential treatment of	
				securitisations for insurers is laid down in	
				level 2 texts, future adjustments will	
				come at a later moment. The same applies	
				to banks and investment firms as regards	
				the prudential treatment for liquidity	
				purposes which is included in a	
				Delegated Act that will be amended at a	
				later stage.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://ec.europa.eu/finance/insurance/solv	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				ency/solvency2/index_en.htm	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
No 6 (6)	Description Enhanced disclosure of securitised products	G20/FSB Recommendations Securities market regulators should work with market participants to expand information on securitised products and their underlying assets. (Rec. III.10-III.13, FSF 2008)	Remarks Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures and other initiatives taken in relation to enhancing disclosure of securitised products, including working with industry and other authorities to continue to standardise disclosure templates and considering measures to improve the type of information that investors receive. See, for reference, IOSCO's Report on Principles for Ongoing Disclosure for Asset-Backed Securities (Nov 2012),	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in	Next steps If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation: Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Commission adopted in September 2015 a Proposal for a EU Regulation on securitisation which amongst others things, aims at streamlining and improving the consistency of due
			Disclosure Principles for Public Offerings and Listings of Asset-Backed Securities (Apr 2010) and report on Global Developments in Securitisation Regulations (November 2012), in particular recommendations 4 and 5.	force since: Implementation completed as of: 21 May 2013 / 2009 Issue is being addressed through: Primary / Secondary legislation Regulation /Guidelines Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The disclosure framework on securitised products has been strongly enhanced since the financial crisis. Disclosure requirements for sponsors/originators (CRR): These requirements have been in force since the implementation of the	diligence and disclosure requirements of different legislative frameworks (Prospectus, CRR/CRD IV, AIFMD, CRA3 and Solvency II) which are applicable to structured finance instruments. This legislative proposal is currently under interinstitutional negotiations (Council and European Parliament). ESMA's work on the implementation of art. 8b of the CRA III Regulation and the corresponding delegated Regulation will depend on the final version of the provisions on disclosure of the future EU Regulation on securitisation, as these provisions (aiming at insuring better consistency of different disclosure obligations) might have an



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Capital Requirements Directive II	impact on the current disclosure
				(2009/111/CE) in 2009. In practice the	provisions of art. 8b of the CRAIII
				Capital Requirements Regulation (art.	Regulation.
				409) stipulates that institutions acting as	
				an originator, a sponsor or original lender	Web-links to relevant documents:
				shall disclose to investors the level of	Web links to relevant documents.
				their commitment to maintain a net	
				economic interest in the securitisation	
				(the risk retention requirement). They	
				shall also ensure that prospective	
				investors have readily available access to	
				all materially relevant data on the credit	
				quality and performance of the individual	
				underlying exposures, cash flows and	
				collateral supporting a securitisation	
				exposure as well as such information that	
				is necessary to conduct comprehensive	
				and well informed stress tests on the cash	
				flows and collateral values supporting the	
				underlying exposures. For that purpose,	
				materially relevant data shall be	
				determined as at the date of the	
				securitisation and where appropriate due	
				to the nature of the securitisation	
				thereafter. There is also a general	
				disclosure requirement in article 8b of the	
				Regulation III on Credit Rating Agencies	
				(CRAIII Regulation)which came into	
				force June 2013. With regard to issuers of	
				ABS, Article 8b of the CRA 3 Regulation	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				requires: - The issuer, the originator and	
				the sponsor of a structured finance	
				instrument established in the Union shall,	
				on the website set up by ESMA, jointly	
				publish information on the credit quality	
				and performance of the underlying assets	
				of the structured finance instrument, the	
				structure of the securitisation transaction,	
				the cash flows and any collateral	
				supporting a securitisation exposure as	
				well as any information that is necessary	
				to conduct comprehensive and well-	
				informed stress tests on the cash flows	
				and collateral values supporting the	
				underlying exposures. Art. 8b of the	
				CRA3 Regulation was complemented by	
				a Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/3	
				adopted by the Commission on 30	
				September 2014 (http://eur-	
				lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2015_002	
				_R_0003) which specifies: (a) the	
				information that must be published in	
				order to comply with art. 8b of the CRA	
				III Regulation;(b) the frequency with	
				which the information referred to in point	
				(a) is to be updated; (c) the presentation	
				of the information referred to in point (a)	
				by means of standardised disclosure	
				templates. – According to this Delegated	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Regulation, ESMA is supposed to set up	
				a website for the publication of the	
				information on structured finance	
				instruments by 1st January 2017.	
				However ESMA's work will depend on	
				the final version of the provisions on	
				disclosure of the future EU Regulation on	
				securitisation, which might have an	
				impact on the current art. 8b of the	
				CRAIII Regulation (see next steps). In	
				addition, a Task Force established under	
				the umbrella of the Joint Committee of	
				the ESAs issued a report in 2015 which	
				identifies the main inconsistencies of the	
				existing level-1 and level-2 due diligence,	
				disclosure requirements (Prospectus,	
				CRR/CRD IV, AIFMD, CRA3 and	
				Solvency II) and reporting requirements	
				concerning SFI as well as makes	
				suggestions how to mitigate them.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				As highlighted in the reply to question 5,	
				the Commission adopted on 30	
				September 2015 a legislative proposal on	
				Securitisation Regulation that will apply	
				to all securitisations and include due	
				diligence, risk retention and transparency	
				rules for all financial sectors.	
				rules for all financial sectors.	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Web-links to relevant documents: REGULATION (EU) No 462/2013 (CRA Regulation): http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201 3R0462&from=EN Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) n°2015/3 of 30 September 2015: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-	Next steps
				content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2015_002 R_0003 Regulation (EC) No 809/2004, as amended, implementing Directive 2003/71/EC as regards information contained in prospectuses (see Annexes VII & VIII) http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?qid=1402046016254& uri=CELEX:02004R0809-20130828	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
III.	Enhancing supervision	l			
7 (7)	Consistent, consolidated supervision and	All firms whose failure could pose a risk to financial stability must be subject to consistent, consolidated supervision and	Jurisdictions should indicate: (1) whether they have identified domestic SIFIs and, if so, in which sectors; (2) whether the	☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: On banking aspects, the Commission
	supervision and regulation of SIFIs	consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation with high standards. (Pittsburgh)	if so, in which sectors; (2) whether the names of the identified SIFIs have been publicly disclosed; and (3) the types of policy measures taken for implementing consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of the identified SIFIs. In their response to (3) above, jurisdictions should note any significant changes in their approach, strategy or practices to enhance SIFI supervision. Jurisdictions should mention, but not provide details on, policy measures that pertain to higher loss absorbency requirements for G/D-SIBs, since these are monitored separately by the BCBS. See, for reference, the following documents: BCBS: • Framework for G-SIBs (Jul 2013) • Framework for D-SIBs (Oct 2012) IAIS:	at the moment ☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: ☑ Implementation completed as of: 2014 Issue is being addressed through: ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: For the banking sector: CRDIV / CRR approved by the European Parliament on 16 April 2013 and the Council on 27	On banking aspects, the Commission intends to table legislation in 2016 to implement the remaining elements of the regulatory framework pertinent to banks agreed at international level, in particular to limit bank leverage, to assure stable bank funding and to improve comparability of risk-weighted assets, and to enable implementation by 2019 of the Financial Stability Board's recommendations on Total Loss Absorbing Capacity for banks, so that adequate resources are available for failing banks without resorting to taxpayers. Web-links to relevant documents:
			Global Systemically Important Insurers: Policy Measures (Jul 2013)	March 2013 and entered into force on 1 January 2014. As regards G-SIBs and D-	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	_		and initial assessment methodology	SIBs, CRDIV / CRR as approved by the	
			• IAIS SRMP guidance - FINAL (Dec	European Parliament and the Council of	
			2013)	the EU implement in the EU the BCBS'	
				assessment methodology of global	
			Guidance on Liquidity management	systemically important banks and the	
			and planning (Oct 2014)	related additional loss absorbency	
			FSB:	requirement as well as BCBS' principles	
			- E	for dealing with domestic systemically	
			• Framework for addressing SIFIs (Nov	important banks. A Delegated Regulation	
			<u>2011)</u>	and an Implementing Regulation on the	
				methodology of G-SII (Global	
				Systemically Important Institutions)	
				identification and disclosure were	
				adopted by the Commission in 2014.	
				EBA also adopted: - Guidelines on	
				disclosure of indicators of global	
				systemic importance, and - Guidelines	
				on criteria to assess other systemically	
				important institutions (O-SIIs). For the	
				Euro Area Member States, the	
				establishment of the Banking Union, with	
				the Single Supervisory Mechanism which	
				entered into force in November 2013 and	
				the ECB which assumed its full	
				responsibilities on 4 November 2014,	
				allows for even greater consistency in the	
				supervision and regulation of SIFI	
				(banks). As regards recovery and	
				resolution, the EU-wide Bank Recovery	
				and Resolution Directive has been	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				adopted and applies since January 2015.	
				It requires Member States to equip	
				authorities with the necessary tools and	
				powers to ensure that the distress or	
				failure of all banks and large investment	
				firms can be managed in an orderly way,	
				preserving financial stability and	
				protecting taxpayers in the process. The	
				Directive relies on a series of	
				preventative steps in the shape of	
				recovery and resolution plans, cross-	
				border coordination mechanisms and	
				powers of early intervention for	
				authorities. In the event of failure,	
				authorities are accorded the tools to	
				reorganise banks and investment firms,	
				allocating losses and costs to shareholders	
				and creditors in line with the hierarchy of	
				claims in insolvency, and drawing on	
				specially set-up resolution funds built-up	
				from industry contributions for any	
				additional required funding. For the Euro	
				Area and other Member States	
				participating in the Banking Union the	
				rules of the BRRD are applied by the	
				Single Resolution Mechanism since 2016.	
				The SRM integrates key aspects of the	
				coordination and decision-making	
				structure applicable to resolution	
				planning and the resolution of banks and	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				replaces national resolution funds with a	
				Single Resolution Fund in participating	
				Member States. For the insurance	
				sector: the implementation of the IAIS	
				recommendations for G-SIIs (SRMP,	
				liquidity management) is ongoing and	
				addressed via supervisory actions and	
				monitoring. There is no EU legislation for	
				G-SIIs specifically, implementation is	
				dealt with at Member States level. The	
				framework for the identification of	
				Global Systemically Important Insurers	
				(G-SIIs), initially developed in 2013, is	
				currently under review. Following a	
				Public Consultation which ended earlier	
				in 2016, the IAIS will finalize its review	
				in May to use the updated methodology	
				already for the identification exercise of	
				2016. In the field of solvency, the IAIS is	
				developing a Common Framework	
				(ComFrame) for the supervision of	
				Internationally Active Insurance Groups	
				(IAIGs), including a global Insurance	
				Capital Standard (ICS). A first global	
				capital standard (BCR) was finalised end	
				2014 and the HLA end 2015. Both	
				requirements will be reviewed in 2017.	
				This review will take into account the	
				relevant amendments to the G-SII	
				Methodology. In addition, the latest	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	1			developments of the Insurance Capital	-
				Standards (ICS) are of considerable	
				relevance. The ICS is intended to replace	
				the BCR as the basis for HLA in the	
				future.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Since the first of January the phasing in	
				of the combined capital buffer	
				requirement has commenced, which	
				includes the buffer requirements for	
				global and other systemically important	
				institutions.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				BRRD: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/policies/ ecofin/banking-union?tab=Single- rulebook&subTab=Bank-recovery-and- resolution⟨=en SRM: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/policies/ ecofin/banking-union?tab=Supervision- and-resolution&subTab=Single- resolution-mechanism⟨=en Commission Delegated Regulation on G- SII identification methodology: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32 014R1222&from=EN Commission Implementing Regulation on disclosure of the values used to identify global systemically important institutions: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32 014R1030&from=EN EBA Guidelines G-SII disclosure:	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				http://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/101	
				80/717755/EBA-GL-2014-	
				02+%28Guidelines+on+disclosure+of+in	
				dicators+of+systemic+importance%29.pd	
				f/a017aea5-ceba-4d74-a1ee-fe513f7dbbdf	
				EBA Guidelines O-SIIs:	
				http://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/101	
				80/930752/EBA-GL-2014-	
				10+%28Guidelines+on+O-	
				SIIs+Assessment%29.pdf/964fa8c7-6f7c-	
				431a-8c34-82d42d112d91 for D-SIB	
				identification in the Union.	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
8 (8)	Establishing supervisory colleges and conducting risk assessments	To establish the remaining supervisory colleges for significant cross-border firms by June 2009. (London)	Reporting in this area should be undertaken solely by home jurisdictions of G-SIBs and G-SIIs.	☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation:
	assessments	We agreed to conduct rigorous risk assessment on these firms [G-SIFIs] through international supervisory	Please indicate the progress made in establishing and strengthening the functioning of supervisory colleges for G-SIBs and G-SIIs, including the development of any joint supervisory plans within core colleges and leveraging	☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of:	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
		colleges. (Seoul)	on supervisory activities conducted by host authorities. See, for reference, the following	 ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : 	Web-links to relevant documents:
			documents: BCBS:	☑ Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2014	
			• <u>Principles for effective supervisory</u> <u>colleges (Jun 2014)</u>	Issue is being addressed through:☑ Primary / Secondary legislation☑ Regulation /Guidelines	
			Progress report on the implementation of principles for effective supervisory colleges (Jul 2015)	☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	
			IAIS:	Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:	
			• ICPs 24 and 25, especially guidance 25.1.1 – 25.1.6, 25.6, 25.7 and 25.8	Banking aspects: The Capital Requirements Directive (2013/36/EU) provides for the mandatory establishment	
			<u>Application paper on supervisory</u> <u>colleges (Oct 2014)</u>	of colleges of supervisors for cross- border banking groups. The Regulation establishing the European Banking	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	-			Authority (Regulation 1093/2010) gives	
				EBA a central role in promoting and	
				monitoring colleges of supervisors. More	
				than 100 supervisory colleges are	
				established in the European Economic	
				Area (EEA). Most EEA cross border	
				banking groups had a college of	
				supervisors in place by the end of 2010.	
				The European Commission published in	
				January two pieces of technical rules to	
				complement the rules set out in Directive	
				2013/36/EU. These two pieces specify	
				the functioning rules of colleges of	
				supervisors. Insurance aspects: On the	
				insurance side, EIOPA is tasked to	
				promote and monitor the efficient,	
				effective and consistent functioning of the	
				colleges of supervisors by the Solvency II	
				Directive (2009/138/EC) and its	
				Founding Regulation (Article 21 of	
				1094/2010). Colleges for EEA cross-	
				border groups are in place. EIOPA	
				publishes a yearly report on the	
				functioning of colleges.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				The European Commission published in	
				January two pieces of technical rules to	
				complement the rules set out in Directive	
				2013/36/EU. These two pieces specify	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				the functioning rules of colleges of	
				supervisors.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				The RTS specifying the general	
				conditions for the functioning of colleges	
				of supervisors have been published in the	
				OJ: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2016_021	
				_R_0002, along with the ITS	
				determining the operational functioning	
				of colleges of supervisors: http://eur-	
				lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2016_021	
				_R_0003	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
9 (9)	Supervisory exchange of information and coordination	To quicken supervisory responsiveness to developments that have a common effect across a number of institutions, supervisory exchange of information and coordination in the development of best practice benchmarks should be improved at both national and international levels. (Rec V.7, FSF 2008)	Jurisdictions should include any feedback received from recent FSAPs/ROSC assessments on the <u>September 2012</u> BCP 3 (Cooperation and collaboration) and BCP 14 (Home-host relationships). Jurisdictions should also indicate any steps taken since the last assessment in this area, particularly in response to relevant FSAP/ROSC recommendations.	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
		Enhance the effectiveness of core supervisory colleges. (FSB 2012)	Jurisdictions should describe any recent or planned regulatory, supervisory or legislative changes that contribute to the sharing of supervisory information (e.g. within supervisory colleges or via bilateral or multilateral MoUs).	force since: ☐ Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2014 Issue is being addressed through: ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation / Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline: The EU has put in place a comprehensive set of rules concerning the exchange of information and coordination among competent authorities. Banking aspects: Directive 2013/36/EU specifies rules governing the exchange of information,	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				planning and coordination of supervisory	
				activities between the various national	
				authorities involved in the supervision of	
				banking groups carrying out activities	
				within the EU. This Directive also	
				provides provisions for information	
				exchanges between EU banking	
				supervisors and other authorities, persons	
				or bodies within and outside the EU	
				Directive 2013/36/EU provides for	
				exchange of information obligations	
				among authorities involved in the	
				supervision of institutions operating in	
				more than one Member State (art. 50 and	
				53-62) and authorities concerned by the	
				establishment of a branch of a credit	
				institution (art. 35-38). These provisions	
				are further specified by secondary	
				legislation. Two pieces of legislation	
				were issued on the information to be	
				notified when exercising the right of	
				establishment and the freedom to provide	
				services (Regulation (EU) No 1151/2014	
				and No 926/2014). Two regulations,	
				clarifying the information to be	
				exchanged by competent authorities	
				supervising institutions operating in more	
				than one Member State, have also been	
				adopted (Reg. (EU) No 524/2014 and No	
				620/2014). Furthermore, the ESAs	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				continue developing the single rulebook	
				applicable to all 28 Member States so as	
				to ensure that supervisory practices are	
				consistent across the whole Union. In	
				particular EBA develops and maintains a	
				single supervisory handbook (a	
				non-binding collection of supervisory	
				best practices). Finally, the creation of a	
				Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM),	
				which is fully in place since 4 November	
				2014 and which is responsible for	
				supervising all banks in the euro area and	
				in Member States outside the euro area	
				which would decide to participate in the	
				SSM, supplements the monetary union by	
				further strengthening supervisory	
				consistency across the euro area. The pre-	
				SSM home/host supervisor information	
				exchange and coordination procedures	
				and colleges of supervisors continue to	
				exist, as far as coordination with	
				supervisors in non-euro area Member	
				States as well as with third country	
				supervisory authorities is concerned.	
				However, the ECB has taken over	
				supervisory tasks within the euro area.	
				The ECB carries out the functions of	
				home supervisor for credit institutions	
				which are established in the euro-area and	
				fulfil the criteria to be considered	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	-			'significant' within the meaning of	
				Article 6(4) of the SSM Regulation	
				Therefore, for credit institutions which	
				are established in the euro area only, no	
				colleges of supervisors exist anymore.	
				The EBA is allowed to participate in	
				supervisory college meetings as a	
				member and provides regular assessments	
				of the functioning of supervisory	
				colleges. The SSM information sharing is	
				further developed through cooperation	
				agreements: • Art. 3(1) of the SSM	
				Regulation states that the ECB shall	
				enter, where necessary, into MoUs with	
				market authorities of Member States. •	
				Based on Art. 3(6) of the SSM	
				Regulation, the ECB shall conclude an	
				MoU with non participating Member	
				States. • Based on Art. 8 SSM the ECB	
				may enter into administrative	
				arrangements with supervisory	
				authorities, international organisations	
				and the administrations of third countries.	
				Insurance aspects: See replies provided to	
				questions 7 and 8.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				No major developments since last year.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				Directive 2013/36/EU (CRD IV):	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32013L00 36 On the information to be exchanged in relation to the exercise of the freedom of establishment/to provide services: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L201 4.309.01.0001.01.ENG http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L201 4.254.01.0002.01.ENG On the exchanges of information for supervisory purposes: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2014_148 _R_0003 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2014_172 _R_0001 On the SSM: SSM Regulation: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:287:0063:0089:EN:PDF SSM Framework regulation https://www.ecb.europa.eu/ecb/legal/pdf/celex_32014r0468_en_txt.pdf	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
10 (10)	Strengthening resources and effective supervision	We agreed that supervisors should have strong and unambiguous mandates, sufficient independence to act, appropriate resources, and a full suite of tools and powers to proactively identify and address risks, including regular stress testing and early intervention. (Seoul) Supervisors should see that they have the requisite resources and expertise to oversee the risks associated with financial innovation and to ensure that firms they supervise have the capacity to understand and manage the risks. (FSF 2008) Supervisory authorities should continually re-assess their resource needs; for example, interacting with and assessing Boards require particular skills, experience and adequate level of seniority. (Rec. 3, FSB 2012)	Remarks Jurisdictions should indicate any steps taken on recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 (i.e. supervisory strategy, engagement with banks, improvements in banks' IT and MIS, data requests, and talent management strategy respectively) in the FSB thematic peer review report on supervisory frameworks and approaches to SIBs (May 2015).	Not applicable Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable " or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: Draft in preparation, expected publication by: Draft published as of: Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2014 Issue is being addressed through: Primary / Secondary legislation Regulation /Guidelines Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The EU has put in place a comprehensive set of rules concerning effective supervision.	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				supervisors shall have (art. 102-104), the power to impose penalties (art. 18 and 64) and the procedure to follow to carry out banks' supervision (art. 97-98). Among the powers entrusted to supervisors, there is the obligation to carry out stress testing at least annually (Art. 100). Legislation has been complemented principally by the EBA guidelines on supervisory review and evaluation process, applicable since January 2016. (cont.) Highlight main developments since last year's survey: In SSM participating Member States, in 2015 the SREP was for the first time carried out according to a common methodology for the 120 largest banks and banking groups. Previous national processes were rather diverse. Capital and liquidity levels of banks directly supervised by the ECB have been set according to their risk profiles. Additional supervisory measures have been applied where deemed necessary. Web-links to relevant documents: EBA guidelines on supervisory review and evaluation process https://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/10 180/935249/EBA-GL-2014-13+(Guidelines+on+SREP+methodologie s+and+processes).pdf SSM SREP methodology booklet: https://www.bankingsupervision.europa.e u/ecb/pub/pdf/ssm_srep_methodology_bo oklet.en.pdf	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
IV.	Building and implemen	nting macroprudential frameworks and	d tools		
11 (11)	Establishing regulatory framework for macroprudential oversight	Amend our regulatory systems to ensure authorities are able to identify and take account of macro-prudential risks across	Please describe major changes in the institutional arrangements for macroprudential policy (structures,	 □ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment 	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
		the financial system including in the case of regulated banks, shadow banks ¹ and private pools of capital to limit the build up of systemic risk. (London)	mandates, powers, reporting etc.) that have taken place since the global financial crisis, particularly over the past year.	 ☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: 	Web-links to relevant documents:
		Ensure that national regulators possess the powers for gathering relevant information on all material financial institutions, markets and instruments in order to assess the potential for failure or severe stress to contribute to systemic	Please indicate whether an assessment has been conducted with respect to the adequacy of powers to collect and share relevant information among different authorities on financial institutions, markets and instruments to assess the	 □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: ☑ Implementation completed as of: 2014 	
		risk. This will be done in close coordination at international level in order to achieve as much consistency as possible across jurisdictions. (London)	potential for systemic risk. If so, please describe identified gaps in the powers to collect information, and whether any follow-up actions have been taken.	Issue is being addressed through: ☑ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The EU macro-prudential framework has	

¹ The recommendation as applicable to shadow banks will be retained until the monitoring framework for shadow banking, which is one of the designated priority areas under the CFIM, is established.



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				been established gradually, via the	
				adoption of successive important	
				legislations: the ESRB founding	
				Regulations –in force since December	
				2010- (Regulation (EU) No 1092/2010 of	
				the European Parliament and of the	
				Council of 24 November 2010), the CRD	
				IV/CRR macro-prudential rules and tools	
				-in force since January 2014- and the	
				SSM Regulation (Council Regulation	
				(EU) No 1024/2013 of 15 October 2013	
				conferring specific tasks on the European	
				Central Bank concerning policies relating	
				to the prudential supervision of credit	
				institutions) which entrusts specific	
				macro-prudential competences to the	
				ECB/SSM. The last piece of legislation is	
				in force since November 2014. Following	
				the ESRB Regulation, the responsibility	
				of macro-prudential oversight has been	
				entrusted to the European Systemic Risk	
				Board (ESRB). In pursuing its macro-	
				prudential mandate, the ESRB performs a	
				number of key activities, namely risk	
				monitoring, risk assessment and,	
				ultimately, if deemed appropriate, it	
				adopts warnings and recommendations.	
				Going forward, with the establishment of	
				the Banking Union as of 1 November	
				2014 the ECB as single supervisor also	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				has some macro-prudential competences	
				within the Single Supervisory Mechanism	
				(SSM). The SSM Regulation provides	
				that the ECB has been entrusted with	
				specific macro-prudential competences to	
				be applied within the Banking Union	
				using the macro-prudential instruments	
				enshrined in EU law (i.e. CRD IV/CRR	
				macro-prudential tools). The ECB	
				Framework Regulation further clarifies	
				how these powers are to be implemented.	
				The ESRB Recommendation	
				((ESRB/2011/3), OJ 2012/C 41/01) on	
				the macro-prudential mandate of national	
				authorities initiated the setting-up of	
				national macro-prudential authorities.	
				Almost all Member States have already	
				established their competent national	
				authorities and in the months to come it is	
				expected that all 28 Member States will	
				have completed their macro-prudential	
				institutional set-up. In addition the new	
				regulations on capital requirements	
				(CRDIV/CRR) that entered into force on	
				31 December 2013 further require the	
				Member States to designate the national	
				macro-prudential authorities.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Ongoing implementation of macro-	
				prudential framework following the SSM	
				Regulation; establishment of national	
				macro-prudential authorities in Member	
				States, increased macroprudential activity	
				by Member States (more than 200	
				measures notified up to the end of 2015),	
				the ESRB is currently conducting a	
				review of macroprudential policy in the	
				EU in 2015.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	



monitoring and the use of macro-prudential instruments molicators and/or constraints on leverage and margins as macro-prudential tools for supervisory purposes. Authorities should use quantitative indicators of leverage as guides for policy, both at the institution-specific and at the macro-prudential (system-wide) level(Rec. 3.1, FSF 2009) We are developing macro-prudential policy frameworks and tools to limit the build-up of risks in the financial sector, building on the ongoing work of the FSB-BIS-IMF on this subject. (Cannes) Authorities should monitor substantial changes in asset prices and their Specific and at the user of macroprudential tools in the past year, including the objective for their use and the process used to select, calibrate, and apply them. See, for reference, the following documents:	No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
the financial system. (Washington) • IMF staff papers on <u>Macroprudential policy, an organizing framework</u> (<u>Mar 2011), Key Aspects of Macroprudential policy (Jun 2013)</u> , and <u>Staff Guidance on Macroprudential Policy (Dec 2014)</u> **Macroprudential Policy (Dec 2014) **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The adopted ESRB Recommendation ((ESRB/2013/1), OJ 2013/C 170/01) on intermediate objectives and instruments of macro-prudential policies proposes a	12	Enhancing system-wide monitoring and the use of macro-prudential	Authorities should use quantitative indicators and/or constraints on leverage and margins as macro-prudential tools for supervisory purposes. Authorities should use quantitative indicators of leverage as guides for policy, both at the institution-specific and at the macro-prudential (system-wide) level(Rec. 3.1, FSF 2009) We are developing macro-prudential policy frameworks and tools to limit the build-up of risks in the financial sector, building on the ongoing work of the FSB-BIS-IMF on this subject. (Cannes)	Please describe at a high level (including by making reference to financial stability or other reports, where available) the types of methodologies, indicators and tools used to assess systemic risks. Please indicate the use of macroprudential tools in the past year, including the objective for their use and the process used to select, calibrate, and apply them. See, for reference, the following documents: • CGFS report on Operationalising the selection and application of macroprudential instruments (Dec 2012) • FSB-IMF-BIS progress report to the G20 on Macroprudential policy tools and frameworks (Oct 2011) • IMF staff papers on Macroprudential policy, an organizing framework (Mar 2011), Key Aspects of Macroprudential policy (Jun 2013), and Staff Guidance on	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: ☑ Implementation completed as of: January 2014 (CRD IV/CRR) Issue is being addressed through: □ Primary / Secondary legislation □ Regulation /Guidelines □ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline: The adopted ESRB Recommendation ((ESRB/2013/1), OJ 2013/C 170/01) on intermediate objectives and instruments	Planned actions (if any) and expected



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				intermediate objectives. The	
				Recommendation gives an indicative list	
				of instruments that national macro-	
				prudential authorities can use to fulfil	
				their mandate. Also with the EU	
				prudential rules for banks (CRDIV/CRR)	
				that entered into force on 1 January 2014	
				the macro-prudential authorities in the	
				EU can apply a new set of policy	
				instruments to address financial stability	
				risks more effectively. Member States are	
				increasingly choosing to apply macro-	
				prudential instruments in their	
				jursidictions, with many of these	
				instruments being reciprocated by	
				neighboring jurisdictions to ensure they	
				can take full effect. To assist the use of	
				macro-prudential instruments the ESRB	
				has prepared the following set of	
				documents: the ESRB Flagship Report	
				that provides a first overview of the new	
				macro-prudential policy framework in the	
				EU; the ESRB Handbook which provides	
				more detailed assistance to macro-	
				prudential authorities on how to use the	
				new instruments; Decision sets out the	
				process and coordination framework for	
				preparing ESRB opinions or issuing	
				recommendations on macro-prudential	
				measures, notified to the ESRB by	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				relevant authorities, in line with the	
				CRD/CRR; the ESRB Recommendation	
				on guidance for setting countercyclical	
				buffer rates based on the analysis	
				summarized in the ESRB Occasional	
				Paper on indicators, thresholds and	
				calibration of the buffer; the ESRB	
				Recommendation on recognising and	
				setting countercyclical buffer rates for	
				exposures to third countries.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				The review of the macroprudential tools	
				of CRDIV/CRR, that should have been	
				completed by December 2014 according	
				to the regulation, has been postponed to	
				take due account of an evolving	
				institutional landscape with the	
				implementation of the Banking Union. A	
				comprehensive review of the	
				macroprudential regulatory framework	
				covering both the toolset (ie crd IV/CRR	
				macroprudential rules and tools) but also	
				governance and institutional aspects (ie	
				ESRB Regulations and SSM	
				macroprudential tools and tasks), which	
				is a more ambitious undertaking, should	
				be launched in due course.	
				oc faunthed in due course.	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32013R05	
				75 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32013L00	
				36	
				https://www.esrb.europa.eu/pub/html/ind	
				ex.en.html?skey=Flagship	
				https://www.esrb.europa.eu/pub/html/ind	
				ex.en.html?skey=03/03/2014%20Handbo	
				ok	
				https://www.esrb.europa.eu/pub/html/ind	
				ex.en.html?skey=28/01/2014%20framew	
				ork	
				https://www.esrb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/reco	
				mmendations/2014/140630_ESRB_Reco	
				mmendation.en.pdf	
				https://www.esrb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/occa	
				sional/20140630_occasional_paper_5.pdf	
				https://www.esrb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/reco	
				mmendations/2016/Recommendation_ES	
				RB_2015_1.pdf	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
V.	Improving oversight	of credit rating agencies (CRAs)			
	<u> </u>	All CRAs whose ratings are used for regulatory purposes should be subject to a regulatory oversight regime that includes registration. The regulatory oversight regime should be established by end 2009 and should be consistent with the IOSCO Code of Conduct Fundamentals. (London) National authorities will enforce compliance and require changes to a rating agency's practices and procedures for managing conflicts of interest and assuring the transparency and quality of the rating process.	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures undertaken for enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs including registration, oversight and sharing of information between national authorities. They should also indicate their consistency with the following IOSCO document: • Code of Conduct Fundamentals for Credit Rating Agencies (Mar 2015) (including governance, training and risk management) Jurisdictions may also refer to the following IOSCO documents:	Progress to date □ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : □ Implementation completed as of: 7 October 2009	If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation: Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Implementation by ESMA of the regulatory technical standards (RTS) adopted by Commission on 30 September 2014. Commission's Report on the state of the credit rating market, which will include an analysis of provisions which aim at promoting diversity in the rating industry, to be published by Julyt-2016.
		CRAs should differentiate ratings for structured products and provide full disclosure of their ratings track record and the information and assumptions that underpin the ratings process. The oversight framework should be consistent across jurisdictions with appropriate sharing of information between national authorities, including through IOSCO. (London) Regulators should work together towards appropriate, globally compatible solutions (to conflicting compliance	 Principle 22 of <u>Principles and Objectives of Securities Regulation</u> (<u>Jun 2010</u>) which calls for registration and oversight programs for CRAs <u>Statement of Principles Regarding the Activities of Credit Rating Agencies</u> (<u>Sep 2003</u>) <u>Final Report on Supervisory Colleges for Credit Rating Agencies (Jul 2013</u>) Jurisdictions should take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those principles. 	Issue is being addressed through: ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation / Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 introduces a regulatory regime for credit rating agencies which have to comply with stringent rules on transparency, accuracy and conflicts of interests, subject to authorisation and on-going	Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
		obligations for CRAs) as early as possible		supervision. In addition, the Regulation	
		in 2010. (FSB 2009)		was amended: - in 2011 in order to	
		We encourage further steps to enhance		attribute the authorisation and supervision	
		transparency and competition among		of rating agencies to a single authority,	
		credit rating agencies. (St Petersburg)		the European Securities and Markets	
		credit rating ageneres. (Stretersourg)		Authority (ESMA), which has been	
				effective since the 1st of July 2011; - on	
				21 of June 2013, in order to introduce	
				rules to reduce reliance on CRA ratings,	
				enhance transparency on sovereign debt	
				ratings, introduce a civil liability regime,	
				further address conflicts of interests and	
				enhance competition in the rating	
				industry. As a follow-up to the	
				Regulation, a report on the feasibility of a	
				network of SME CRAs was adopted in	
				May 2014. Also, a regulatory dialogue	
				with relevant stakeholders took place on	
				26 June 2015. In order to encourage	
				competition in the rating industry, the	
				latest amendment of the CRA regulation	
				provides for 1) disclosure of information	
				on structured finance instruments, which	
				could facilitate unsolicited credit ratings;	
				2) the creation European Rating Platform	
				which publish all available credit ratings	
				on a central platform operated by the	
				European Securities and Markets	
				Authority and 3) the disclosure of fees	
				charged by CRAS. To this end, the	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	-			Commission adopted three regulatory	
				technical standards on 30 September	
				2014: • Commission Delegated	
				Regulation (EU) 2015/3 on disclosure	
				requirements for issuers, originators and	
				sponsors on structured finance	
				instruments; • Commission Delegated	
				Regulation (EU) 2015/1 on reporting	
				requirements for credit rating agencies	
				(CRAs) on fees charged by CRAs to their	
				clients; • Commission Delegated	
				Regulation (EU) 2015/2 on reporting	
				requirements to CRAs for the European	
				Rating Platform.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				The Commission is currently working on	
				the preparation of a Report which will	
				assess the state of the ratings market and	
				the impact of measures on competition	
				introduced in the Regulation as well as	
				analysing potentially feasible alternatives	
				to ratings.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/rating -agencies/index_en.htm The latest amendment of the CRA regulation: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32013R04 62 Report on the SME network: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52014DC 0248 Delegated Regulations adopted by	
				the Commission on 30 September 2014:	
				- http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2015_002 _R_0003; - http://eur-	
				lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL 2015 002	
				R_0001; - http://eur-	
				lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2015_002 _R_0002	



14 Reducing the reli (14) on ratings		Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	We also endorsed the FSB's principles on reducing reliance on external credit ratings. Standard setters, market participants, supervisors and central banks should not rely mechanistically on external credit ratings. (Seoul) Authorities should check that the roles that they have assigned to ratings in regulations and supervisory rules are consistent with the objectives of having investors make independent judgment of risks and perform their own due diligence, and that they do not induce uncritical reliance on credit ratings as a substitute for that independent evaluation. (Rec IV. 8, FSF 2008) We reaffirm our commitment to reduce authorities' and financial institutions' reliance on external credit ratings, and call on standard setters, market participants, supervisors and central banks to implement the agreed FSB principles and end practices that rely mechanistically on these ratings. (Cannes) We call for accelerated progress by national authorities and standard setting	Jurisdictions should indicate the steps they are taking to address the recommendations of the May 2014 FSB thematic peer review report on the implementation of the FSB Principles for Reducing Reliance on Credit Ratings, including by implementing their agreed action plans. Any revised action plans should be sent to the FSB Secretariat so that it can be posted on the FSB website. Jurisdictions may refer to the following documents: • FSB Principles for Reducing Reliance on CRA Ratings (Oct 2010)	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ Implementation completed as of: 21 May 2013 Issue is being addressed through : □ Primary / Secondary legislation □ Regulation /Guidelines □ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The progress made by EU in reducing reliance on ratings in accordance with the 2012 FSB Roadmap is summarised in the EU Action Plan to reduce reliance on ratings which was published on 12 May 2014 (see weblink below). The overall	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: In accordance with the requirements of Article 39b of the CRA3 Regulation, the European Commission is currently working on the preparation of a report to the European Parliament and to the Council on: (a) the steps taken as regards the deletion of references to credit ratings which trigger or have the potential to trigger sole or mechanistic reliance thereon; (b) alternative tools to enable investors to make their own credit risk assessment of issuers and of financial instruments. If Report will be based on Technical advice issued by ESMA and will also take into account insights from an external study commissioned by the Commission. If appropriate and if alternatives to external credit ratings can be identified and can be implemented by market participants, the Commission will consider removing remaining references in EU financial services legislation by 2020. Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
		bodies in ending the mechanistic reliance	Use of External Credit Ratings (Dec	framework in the EU to reduce reliance	
		on credit ratings and encourage steps that	2015).	on CRA has a multilayer approach,	
		would enhance transparency of and		covering EU regulation on credit rating	
		competition among credit rating agencies.		agencies, sectoral legislation in financial	
		(Los Cabos)		services, actions by European	
				Supervisory Authorities, including the	
		We call on national authorities and		European Securities and Markets	
		standard setting bodies to accelerate		Authority (ESMA), the European	
		progress in reducing reliance on credit		Banking Authority (EBA) and the	
		rating agencies, in accordance with the		European Insurance and Occupational	
		FSB roadmap. (St Petersburg)		Pensions Authority (EIOPA) and by	
				national competent sectoral authorities.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				see next steps	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				EU Action Plan: http://ec.europa.eu/finance/rating- agencies/docs/140512-fsb-eu- response en.pdf	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VI.	Enhancing and aligning	g accounting standards			
15	Consistent application	Regulators, supervisors, and accounting	Jurisdictions should indicate the	☐ Not applicable	Planned actions (if any) and expected
(15)	of high-quality accounting standards	standard setters, as appropriate, should work with each other and the private	accounting standards that they follow and whether (and on what basis) they are of a	☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	commencement date:
		sector on an ongoing basis to ensure	high and internationally acceptable	☐ Implementation ongoing:	
		consistent application and enforcement of high-quality accounting standards.	quality (eg equivalent to IFRSs as published by the IASB), and provide	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	Web-links to relevant documents:
		(Washington)	accurate and relevant information on financial performance. They should also	☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	
			explain the system they have for	☐ Draft published as of:	
			enforcement of consistent application of those standards.	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	
			Jurisdictions may want to refer to their	☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :	
			jurisdictional profile prepared by the IFRS Foundation, which can be accessed	☑ Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2005	
			at: http://www.ifrs.org/Use-around-the-world/Pages/Analysis-of-the-G20-IFRS-	Issue is being addressed through:	
			profiles.aspx.	☐ Primary / Secondary legislation	
			As part of their response on this	☑ Regulation /Guidelines	
			recommendation, jurisdictions should	☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	
			indicate the policy measures taken for appropriate application of fair value accounting.	Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:	
				The EU adopted in 2002 a regulation to	
			In addition, jurisdictions should set out	adopt IFRS (i.e. the IAS Regulation).	
			any steps they intend to take (if appropriate) to foster transparent and	Since January 2005, the IFRS are	
			consistent implementation of the new	mandatory for the consolidated accounts of listed companies. Enforcement of	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
			accounting requirements for expected	IFRS is done by National Market	
			loan loss provisioning for impaired loans	Authority and coordinated by the	
			that are being introduced by the IASB	European Securities and Markets	
			and are scheduled to be introduced by the	Authority (ESMA). In that context in	
			FASB.	March 2016 ESMA published a Report	
			See, for reference, the following BCBS	on Enforcement and Regulatory activities	
			document:	of Accounting Enforcers in 2015. Over	
				10 years after the adoption of the IAS	
			Supervisory guidance for assessing	Regulation, the European Commission	
			banks' financial instrument fair value	has assessed the effects of the use of	
			practices (Apr 2009)	IFRS in the EU against its original aims.	
				Its report on the evaluation to the	
				European Parliament was published on 18	
				June 2015. The EU endorsed the new	
				standard on Fair Value Measurement	
				(IFRS 13) in 2012. This standard has	
				been in force in Europe since the 1st	
				January 2013.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				The EU is in the process of endorsing	
				IFRS 9 for implementation in the EU in	
				2018. The EBA has begun transforming	
				the Basel Guidance on credit risk and	
				accounting for expected losses into EBA	
				Guidelines which will have a "comply or	
				explain" status.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://ec.europa.eu/finance/accounting/leg al framework/regulations adopting ias/i	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				ndex_en.htm http://ec.europa.eu/finance/accounting/ias -evaluation/index_en.htm https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/ files/library/2016- 410_esma_report_on_enforcement_and_r egulatory_activities_of_accounting_enfor cers_in_2015.pdf	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VII.	Enhancing risk manag	ement			-
	Enhancing risk manag Enhancing guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, including on liquidity and foreign currency funding risks	Regulators should develop enhanced guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, in line with international best practices, and should encourage financial firms to re-examine their internal controls and implement strengthened policies for sound risk management. (Washington) National supervisors should closely check banks' implementation of the updated guidance on the management and supervision of liquidity as part of their regular supervision. If banks' implementation of the guidance is inadequate, supervisors will take more prescriptive action to improve practices. (Rec. II.10, FSF 2008)	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken to enhance guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices. Jurisdictions may also refer to the following documents: • FSB's thematic peer review report on risk governance (Feb 2013); • Joint Forum's Developments in credit risk management across sectors: current practices and recommendations (June 2015); and • BCBS Peer review of supervisory authorities' implementation of stress testing principles (Apr 2012) and Principles for sound stress testing	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : □ Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2014 Issue is being addressed through : □ Primary / Secondary legislation	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
		Regulators and supervisors in emerging markets ¹ will enhance their supervision of banks' operation in foreign currency	practices and supervision (May 2009).	☑ Regulation /Guidelines☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	
		funding markets. (FSB 2009) We commit to conduct robust, transparent stress tests as needed. (Pittsburgh)		Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The Basel III agreement on an international framework for the Liquidity	

¹ Only the emerging market jurisdictions that are members of the FSB may respond to this recommendation.



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Coverage Ratio and liquidity risk	
				monitoring tools adopted in its final	
				version in January 2013 and the	
				Principles for Sound Liquidity Risk	
				Management and Supervision of	
				September 2008 are implemented into EU	
				law by the CRD IV Package which is	
				made up of a Directive (Directive	
				2013/36/EU of the European Parliament	
				and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on the	
				access to the activity of credit institutions	
				and the prudential supervision of credit	
				institutions and investment firms) and a	
				Regulation (Regulation (EU) No	
				575/2013 of the European Parliament and	
				of the Council of 26 June 2013 on	
				prudential requirements for credit	
				institutions and investment firms). These	
				prudential rules introduced in the two	
				legislative texts have been applied since 1	
				January 2014. In particular, both texts	
				contain provisions strengthening the	
				requirements regarding risk management	
				practices, including the management of	
				liquidity risks, of credit institutions and	
				investment firms. Pursuant to Directive	
				2013/36/EU supervisory authorities are	
				required to review the arrangements,	
				strategies, processes and mechanisms	
				implemented by institutions and ensure	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				that their risk management frameworks	
				provide for sound management and	
				coverage of their risks under the Pillar 2	
				approach. If not, supervisory authorities	
				are allowed to apply supervisory	
				measures to non-compliant institutions	
				and take actions to address any situations	
				of non-compliance. Other Regulations	
				complementing the CRDIV package have	
				been adopted, amongst which a	
				Commission Implementing Regulation on	
				additional liquidity monitoring metrics	
				that entered into force in March 2016. In	
				December 2013, EBA adopted guidelines	
				on Pillar 2 capital measures for lending in	
				foreign currencies. These guidelines	
				address the recommendation made by the	
				ESRB (European Systemic Risk Board),	
				following its 2011 Report on lending in	
				foreign currencies. These guidelines	
				specify the method to be used by	
				supervisory authorities where FX lending	
				risk is deemed to be material and where	
				capital measures are deemed to be an	
				appropriate method of treating this risk.	
				On 29 April 2014 EBA published the	
				stress test methodology including	
				scenarios and templates. The results of	
				the stress tests, which also reflect asset	
				quality reviews, were published in	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	_			October 2014. New stress tests are	
				currently on-going. In December 2014,	
				EBA published Guidelines on common	
				procedures and methodologies for the	
				supervisory review and evaluation	
				process (SREP) (EBA/GL/2014/13).	
				These Guidelines aim to provide	
				supervisory authorities with a common	
				European framework for SREP and risk	
				assessment under Pillar 2. These	
				guidelines explain how to assess the	
				various risks to which banks are exposed,	
				including FX lending and liquidity risks,	
				as well the governance and internal	
				control framework of banks for	
				identifying, managing, monitoring risks.	
				These guidelines entered into force in	
				January 2016.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				The provisions of the Regulation on	
				liquidity coming from the Regulation	
				(EU) No 575/2013 of the European	
				Parliament and of the Council of 26 June	
				2013 on prudential requirements for	
				credit institutions and investment firms	
				have been complemented by the adoption	
				of the Commission Delegated Regulation	
				(EU) No 2015/61 of 10 October 2014 to	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	-			supplement Regulation (EU) 575/2013	
				with regard to liquidity coverage	
				requirement for credit institutions that	
				specifies the method of calculation of the	
				LCR and that entered into force in	
				October 2015 and by the adoption of the	
				Commission Implementing Regulation	
				(EU) 2016/313 of 1 March 2016	
				amending Implementing Regulation (EU)	
				No 680/2014 with regard to additional	
				monitoring metrics for liquidity reporting	
				that entered into force in March 2016.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32013L00 36 Regulation (EU) No 575/2013 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32013R05 75 Commission Delegated Regulation on the LCR: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1458140192307&uri=CELEX:32015R0061 Commission Implementing Regulation on Additional Liquidity Monitoring Metrics: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A3201	
				6R0313 EBA guidelines on capital measures for foreign currency lending:http://www.eba.europa.eu/regulat ion-and-policy/supervisory-review-and-evaluation-srep-and-pillar-2/guidelines-on-capital-measures-for-foreign-currency-lending A common stress test methodology and scenario for 2014 EU-	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	banks stress test: https://www.eba.europa.eu/-/eba- publishes-common-methodology-and- scenario-for-2014-eu-banks-stress-test EBA recommendations on asset quality reviews: http://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/101 80/449802/EBA-Rec-2013- 04+Recommendations+on+asset+quality +reviews.pdf/1eb0b843-0c2c-4b05-995e- f2887edb2981 ECB manual for asset quality review: http://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/pr/date/2 014/html/pr140311.en.html EBA stress test https://www.eba.europa.eu/-/eba- publishes-2014-eu-wide-stress-test- results. EBA Guidelines on SREP	Next steps
				http://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/101 80/935249/EBA-GL-2014-	
				13+%28Guidelines+on+SREP+methodol ogies+and+processes%29.pdf	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps	
17	Enhanced risk	Financial institutions should provide	Jurisdictions should indicate the status of	☐ Not applicable	Planned actions (if any) and expected	
(18)	disclosures by financial	enhanced risk disclosures in their	implementation of the disclosures	☐ Applicable but no action envisaged	commencement date:	
	institutions	reporting and disclose all losses on an	requirements of IFRSs (in particular IFRS	at the moment		
		ongoing basis, consistent with	7 and 13) or equivalent. Jurisdictions may	☐ Implementation ongoing:		
		international best practice, as appropriate. (Washington)	also use as reference the recommendations of the October 2012	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	Web-links to relevant documents:	
			report by the Enhanced Disclosure Task	☐ Draft in preparation, expected		
			Force on Enhancing the Risk Disclosures	publication by:		
			of Banks and Implementation Progress	☐ Draft published as of:		
			Report by the EDTF (Dec 2015), and set out any steps they have taken to foster	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:		
		We encourage further efforts by the	adoption of the EDTF Principles and Recommendations.	☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :		
		public and private sector to enhance financial institutions' disclosures of the	financial institutions' disclosures of the		☑ Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2013	
		risks they face, including the ongoing work of the Enhanced Disclosure Task		Issue is being addressed through:		
		Force. (St. Petersburg)		☐ Primary / Secondary legislation		
				☑ Regulation /Guidelines		
				☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:		
				Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:		
				EU endorsed IFRS 13 and the IFRS 7		
				amendments.		
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:		
				n/a		
				Web-links to relevant documents:		



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:360:0078:0144:EN:PDFThe extent to which Member States seek to enforce the EDTF Guidelines depends on national supervisors.	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VIII.	Strengthening deposit	insurance			
			Jurisdictions should describe any revisions made to national deposit insurance system, including steps taken to address the following recommendations of the FSB's February 2012 thematic peer review report on deposit insurance systems: • Adoption of an explicit deposit insurance system (for those jurisdictions that do not have one) • Addressing the weaknesses and gaps to full implementation of the Core Principles for Effective Deposit	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: 03. July 2015 □ Implementation completed as of: 3	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
			Insurance Systems issued by IADI in November 2014.	July 2015 Issue is being addressed through: ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The Directive on Deposit Guarantee Schemes (DGSD) maintains the harmonised level of coverage (€ 100 000) and harmonises the scope of coverage (i.e. specify depositors and products	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				being eligible or ineligible for DGS	
				protection); gradually reduces the pay-out	
				deadline from 20 to 7 working days (by	
				2024); strengthens the financing of DGS	
				by introducing a principle of ex-ante	
				financing with a specified target fund	
				level (0.8% of covered deposits to be	
				reached within 10 years); allows for the	
				partial use of DGS funds for early	
				intervention, failure prevention, and bank	
				resolution, as well as the transfer of	
				deposits in liquidation; introduces an	
				obligation to apply risk-based	
				contributions in Member States; improves	
				depositor information: enhances cross	
				border cooperation between EU schemes.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				All EU Member States have fully	
				implemented the DGSD except Belgium,	
				Sweden, Poland and Slovenia which are	
				expected to implement in the near future.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				DGS Directive published in the OJ on 12/6/2014 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201 4L0049&from=EN	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
IX.	Safeguarding the integ	rity and efficiency of financial markets			
19 (20)	Enhancing market integrity and efficiency	We must ensure that markets serve efficient allocation of investments and savings in our economies and do not pose risks to financial stability. To this end, we commit to implement initial recommendations by IOSCO on market integrity and efficiency, including measures to address the risks posed by high frequency trading and dark liquidity, and call for further work by mid-2012. (Cannes)	Jurisdictions should indicate whether high frequency trading and dark pools exist in their national markets. Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the recommendations: • in relation to dark liquidity, as set out in the IOSCO Report on Principles for Dark Liquidity (May 2011). • on the impact of technological change in the IOSCO Report on Regulatory Issues Raised by the Impact of Technological Changes on Market Integrity and Efficiency (Oct 2011). • on market structure made in the IOSCO Report on Regulatory issues raised by changes in market structure (Dec 2013).	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: 3 July 2016 (MAD) □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : □ Implementation completed as of: Issue is being addressed through: □ Primary / Secondary legislation □ Regulation / Guidelines □ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: Highlight main developments since last year's survey: The Market Abuse Regulation (MAR)	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Work on the secondary legislation necessary for the implementation of Market Abuse Regulation (MAR) and MIFID2 is well underway; endorsement of technical advice received in December 2014 from the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) and draft technical standards delivered in by ESMA in September 2015. Following endorsement by the EC and scrutiny of the rules by co-legislators, the EU market abuse regime will be finalised by July 2016. Market Abuse Regulation and Criminal Sanctions for Market Abuse Directive will enter into application on 3 July 2016. Web-links to relevant documents:
				will increase the transparency and	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				integrity of the derivatives and the	
				commodity derivatives markets including	
				OTC transactions.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				Market Abuse Regulation: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R05 96 Criminal Sanctions for Market Abuse Directive http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014L00 57	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
20 (21)	Regulation and supervision of commodity markets	We need to ensure enhanced market transparency, both on cash and financial commodity markets, including OTC, and achieve appropriate regulation and supervision of participants in these markets. Market regulators and authorities should be granted effective intervention powers to address disorderly markets and prevent market abuses. In particular, market regulators should have, and use formal position management powers, including the power to set exante position limits, particularly in the delivery month where appropriate, among other powers of intervention. We call on IOSCO to report on the implementation of its recommendations by the end of 2012. (Cannes) We also call on Finance ministers to monitor on a regular basis the proper implementation of IOSCO's principles for the regulation and supervision on commodity derivatives markets and encourage broader publishing and unrestricted access to aggregated open interest data. (St. Petersburg)	Jurisdictions should indicate whether commodity markets of any type exist in their national markets. Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken to implement the principles found in IOSCO's report on Principles for the Regulation and Supervision of Commodity Derivatives Markets (Sep 2011). Jurisdictions, in responding to this recommendation, may also make use of the responses contained in the update to the survey published by IOSCO in September 2014 on the principles for the regulation and supervision of commodity derivatives markets.	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: : 3 January 2018 (MIFID II) 3 July 2016 (MAR) □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : □ Implementation completed as of: Issue is being addressed through: □ Primary / Secondary legislation □ Regulation /Guidelines □ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The new MiFID introduces specific requirements for commodity derivatives markets, including registration of market participants and transparency requirements. It also addresses IOSCO's recommendation on position management	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Work on the secondary legislation necessary for the implementation of MAR and MIFID is well underway- with technical advice from ESMA received in December 2014; and draft regulatory technical standards delivered by ESMA in September 2015. Following scrutiny of the rules by co-legislators, they should be finalised by mid- 2016. Expected commencement date: 2nd January 2017 or 3 January 2018. Web-links to relevant documents: http://www.esma.europa.eu/content/Technical-Advice-Commission-MiFID-II-and-MiFIR https://www.esma.europa.eu/policy-rules/mifid-ii-and-mifir#title-paragrah-2

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				through position limits and position management. Together with the new MAR, it will increase the transparency and the integrity of the derivatives and the commodity derivatives markets including OTC transactions.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				This legislation entered into force on 12 June 2014 and will enter into application on 3 January 2017 (MIFID 2). A legislative proposal has been made to extend the date of application to 3 January 2018. Currently implementation rules regarding position limits, the scope of authorisations for commodity firms and the delineation between financial and physical instruments are being finalised, and should be approved by mid-2016. The Market Abuse Regulation (MAR) entered into force on 12 June 2014 and will enter into application on 3 July 2016.	
				Web-links to relevant documents: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014L00	
				65 MIFIR http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R06 00 Market Abuse http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R05 96	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
21	Reform of financial	We support the establishment of the	Collection of information on this		
(22)	benchmarks	FSB's Official Sector Steering Group to	recommendation will continue to be		
(22)		coordinate work on the necessary reforms	deferred given the forthcoming FSB		
		of financial benchmarks. We endorse	progress report on implementation of		
		IOSCO's Principles for Financial	FSB recommendations in this area, and		
		Benchmarks and look forward to reform	ongoing IOSCO work to review the		
		as necessary of the benchmarks used	implementation of the IOSCO Principles		
		internationally in the banking industry	for Financial Benchmarks.		
		and financial markets, consistent with the			
		IOSCO Principles. (St. Petersburg)			



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
X.	Enhancing financial c	onsumer protection			
22 (23)	Enhancing financial consumer protection	We agree that integration of financial consumer protection policies into regulatory and supervisory frameworks contributes to strengthening financial stability, endorse the FSB report on consumer finance protection and the high level principles on financial consumer protection prepared by the OECD together with the FSB. We will pursue the full application of these principles in our jurisdictions. (Cannes)	Jurisdictions should describe progress toward implementation of the OECD's G-20 high-level principles on financial consumer protection (Oct 2011). Jurisdictions may also refer to OECD's September 2013 and September 2014 reports on effective approaches to support the implementation of the High-level Principles. The effective approaches are of interest across all financial services sectors – banking and credit; securities; insurance and pensions – and consideration should be given to their cross-sectoral character when considering implementation. Jurisdictions should, where necessary, indicate any changes or additions that have been introduced as a way to support the implementation of the High-level Principles, to address particular national terminology, situations or determinations.	 □ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment ☑ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: ☑ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: 21 March 2016 (MCD)/18 September 2016 (PAD) / IDD has entered into force and has to be transposed into national legislation by 23 February 2018. ☑ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: PSD2 has entered into force and shall be transposed into national legislation by 13 January 2018. □ Implementation completed as of: Issue is being addressed through: □ Primary / Secondary legislation □ Regulation /Guidelines □ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline: 	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: IDD: Technical Advice by EIOPA – 1 February 2017 Draft Implementing Technical Standards – February 2017 Transposition into national law: 23 February 2018. MCD: Adopted in 2014. Deadline for transposition by Member States is 21 March 2016, the Commission will closely follow. MIFID Work on the secondary legislation necessary for the implementation of MIFID is well underway- with advice from regulatory bodies received in December 2014; and draft regulatory technical standards delivered in September 2015. Following scrutiny of the rules by co-legislators, they should be finalised by mid 2016. Expected commencement date: 2nd January 2017 or 3 January 2018 PAD: PAD adopted in 2014. Deadline for transposition by Member States is 18 September 2016, the Commission will closely follow. PRIIPS: PRIIPs adopted in 2014. It shall apply from 31 December 2016. Implementing measures, i.e. the draft regulatory technical standards were submitted jointly by ESAs in early April



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	-			The Insurance Distribution Directive	2016 and should be adopted by the EC by
				covers inter alia direct sales by insurers	mid-2016. PSD2: The deadline for
				and aims at enhancing the internal market	transposition into national law is January
				in insurance distribution and providing	13, 2018. The European Commission will
				for a more effective protection of	closely follow the transposition measures
				consumers when purchasing insurance	adopted by Member States.
				products. The Mortgage Credit Directive	
				improves the information given to the	Web-links to relevant documents:
				consumer at pre-contractual stage by the	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
				means of a standardised sheet with user-	
				friendly, detailed information on the	
				characteristics of the loan on offer,	
				including specific warnings in the case of	
				variable rate loans and foreign currency	
				loans; it also provides for a list of	
				standard information at the advertising	
				stage. The MCD obliges creditors to	
				conduct a thorough, documented	
				creditworthiness. The Directive also sets	
				important principles to guarantee that	
				creditors and credit intermediaries act in	
				the consumer's interests, imposes high-	
				level standards regarding their	
				remuneration structure and requires	
				specific disclosures to the consumer as	
				regards the nature of the links between	
				creditors and credit intermediaries. The	
				Directive requires Member States to	
				designate the national competent	
				authorities and grant them investigating	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				and enforcement powers and adequate	
				resources. MiFID II introduces better	
				organisational and business conduct	
				requirements for investment firms, such	
				as client asset protection, stricter conflict	
				of interest rules, remuneration policy and	
				product governance requirements. It also	
				sets additional requirements with regard	
				to information to clients about costs and	
				financial instruments. Furthermore,	
				limitations are imposed on the receipt of	
				inducements with more stringent rules for	
				independent advisors and portfolio	
				managers. Payment Accounts Directive	
				(PAD) Directive 2014/92/EU of 23 July	
				2014 will be transposed into national law	
				by 18 September 2016. The Directive	
				concerns three areas: • Comparability of	
				payment account fees: the aim is to make	
				it easier for consumers to compare the	
				fees charged by banks and other payment	
				service providers in the EU on payment	
				accounts; • Switching between payment	
				accounts: the aim is to establish a simple	
				and quick procedure for changing from	
				one payment account to another, with a	
				different bank or financial institution at	
				national level and to help consumers who	
				close their bank account in one Member	
				State and open another account in a	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				different country. • Access to payment	
				accounts: the aim is to allow all EU	
				consumers, irrespective of their country	
				of residence in the EU, to open a basic	
				payment account that allows them to	
				perform essential operations (like	
				receiving their salary or pension,	
				transferring funds to another account,	
				withdrawing cash or using debit cards)	
				unless he/she already holds an account in	
				this Member State. The Directive	
				requires Member States to designate the	
				national competent authorities and grant	
				them investigating and enforcement	
				powers and adequate resources. PAD also	
				introduces an obligation for competent	
				authorities of different Member States to	
				cooperate with each other. Packaged	
				Retail and Insurance-based Investment	
				Products (PRIIPS): PRIIPs Regulation	
				aims to improve investor protection by	
				introducing the obligation for PRIIPs	
				manufacturers to provide a clear, short	
				and standardised key information	
				document (KID), and to publish it on its	
				website. The KID is to offer a	
				standardised presentation that clearly	
				spells out main features, risks and	
				expected returns as well as costs	
				associated with a broad range of	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				investment products available to retail	
				investors, such as insurance-based	
				investment products, structured	
				investment products and collective	
				investment schemes.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				The ESAs (through the Joint Committee)	
				drafted RTS on the content and	
				presentation of the KID and procedural	
				aspects on its provision and revision that	
				include: • a common, mandatory template	
				for the KID, covering the texts and	
				layouts to be used for each section • a	
				summary risk indicator of seven classes	
				for the risk and reward section of the KID	
				that reflects the aggregation of the market	
				and credit risk • quantitative	
				methodologies to assign each PRIIP to	
				one of the seven classes contained in the	
				summary risk indicator, The summary	
				risk indicator is complemented by	
				warnings and narrative explanations for	
				certain PRIIPs • a methodology for the	
				calculation and presentation of	
				performance scenarios at different time	
				periods and at least three scenarios • costs	
				presentation and calculation	
				methodology, including the category of	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				costs that must be taken into account and	
				the format to be used to show their	
				impact on potential returns i.e. in both	
				monetary and percentage terms • specific	
				contents for the KID for products offering	
				multiple options that cannot effectively	
				be covered in three pages • rules on	
				revision and republication of the KID, to	
				be done at least each year • rules on	
				providing the KID sufficiently early for a	
				retail investor to be able to take its	
				contents into account when making an	
				investment decision. The draft technical	
				standards have been submitted to the	
				European Commission for endorsement	
				on 6 April 2016. The whole package will	
				enter into application on 31 December	
				2016. Payment Services Directive (PSD2)	
				Directive (EU) 2015/2366 of 25	
				November 2015 on payments services in	
				the internal market, amending Directives	
				2002/65/EC, 2009/110/EC and	
				2013/36/EU and Regulation (EU) No	
				1093/2010, and repealing Directive	
				2007/64/EC, entered into force on 12	
				January 2016 and must be transposed into	
				national law by the Member States by 13	
				January 2018. The Directive enhances	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				consumer protection, promotes	
				innovation and improves the security of	
				payment services. It includes the	
				following provisions in this regard: (i)	
				Enhancement of consumers' rights in	
				numerous areas, including: reducing the	
				liability for non-authorised payments,	
				introducing an unconditional refund right	
				for direct debits in euro and including	
				further protection in cases of card-based	
				payment transactions where the exact	
				transaction amount is not known at the	
				moment of giving consent to execute	
				them, transparency, information and	
				format requirements for users (minimum	
				requirements to ensure that necessary,	
				sufficient and comprehensible	
				information is given with regard to the	
				payment service framework contract	
				and/or for individual payment	
				transactions), easy and updated public	
				access to the list of entities providing	
				payment services (central register	
				developed by EBA), right to receive	
				relevant information free of charge (such	
				as relevant prior information, the	
				framework contract conditions,	
				information on executed payment	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				transactions, etc.), regulation of charges	
				conditions and of the maximum execution	
				times of payment orders, regulation of	
				liabilities and contractual obligations	
				between payment service providers and	
				payment service users, regulation of	
				security measures to protect risks for	
				consumers, right to bring action to court	
				by customers as well as to access	
				alternative dispute resolution (ADR)	
				procedures, regulation of cooperation and	
				supervision by competent authorities; (ii)	
				Prohibition of surcharging (additional	
				charges for the right to pay e.g. with a	
				card); (iii) Introduction of strict security	
				requirements for the initiation and	
				processing of electronic payments and the	
				protection of consumers' financial data.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				IDD: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A3201 6L0097 MCD: http://ec.europa.eu/finance/finservices-retail/credit/mortgage/index_en.htm MiFID II http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014L00 65 PRIIPs RTS: https://goo.gl/LFJ3Qr MiFIR http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R06 00 PAD http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201 4L0092&from=EN	





XI. Source of recommendations:

Brisbane: G20 Leaders' Communique (15-16 November 2014)

St Petersburg: The G20 Leaders' Declaration (5-6 September 2013)

Los Cabos: The G20 Leaders' Declaration (18-19 June 2012)

Cannes: The Cannes Summit Final Declaration (3-4 November 2011)

Seoul: The Seoul Summit Document (11-12 November 2010)

Toronto: The G-20 Toronto Summit Declaration (26-27 June 2010)

Pittsburgh: Leaders' Statement at the Pittsburgh Summit (25 September 2009)

London: The London Summit Declaration on Strengthening the Financial System (2 April 2009)

Washington: The Washington Summit Action Plan to Implement Principles for Reform (15 November 2008)

FSF 2008: The FSF Report on Enhancing Market and Institutional Resilience (7 April 2008)

FSF 2009: The FSF Report on Addressing Procyclicality in the Financial System (2 April 2009)

FSB 2009: The FSB Report on Improving Financial Regulation (25 September 2009)

FSB 2012: The FSB Report on Increasing the Intensity and Effectiveness of SIFI Supervision (1 November 2012)

XII. <u>List of Abbreviations used:</u>