

Jurisdiction:

European Commission

2015 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 (2)	Registration, appropriate disclosures and oversight of hedge funds	We also firmly recommitted to work in an internationally consistent and non-discriminatory manner to strengthen regulation and supervision on hedge funds. (Seoul)	Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the high level principles contained in IOSCO's <i>Report on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009)</i> . In particular, jurisdictions should specify whether: - Hedge Funds (HFs) and/or HF	 □ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: 	If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation: Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
		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)	 neuge runus (nrs) and/or managers are subject to managers are subject to appropriate ongoing requirements regarding: Organisational and operational standards; Conflicts of interest and other conduct of business rules; Disclosure to investors; and Prudential regulation. 	□ 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 2003/41/EC and 2009/65/EC and Regulations (EC) No 1060/2009 and (EU) No 1095/2010 2) Commission	Web-links to relevant documents:



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. 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,	
				they still need to provide their competent	
				authorities with relevant information	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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	
				million. AIFMs have to appoint a	
				depositary which has to safeguard the	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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	
				Additional questions:	
				1. Please indicate whether Hedge Funds (HFs) are domiciled locally and, if available, the size of the industry in terms of Assets under Management and number of HFs.	
				Not applicable	
				2. Please specify the main criteria and numerical thresholds (if applicable) for subjecting HFs and/or HF managers to mandatory registration.	
				See above text	
				3. Please specify whether registered HF managers are subject to ongoing requirements regarding organisational and operational	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				standards; conflicts of interest and other conduct of business rules; disclosure to investors; and prudential regulation. If any of these requirements are not applicable, please explain.	
				Not applicable	
				4. Please describe the main challenges (where relevant) and any lessons learned in implementing this reform.	
				Not applicable	
				5. Are you monitoring the effects of this reform in your jurisdiction? If yes, please share the main findings and any related policy initiatives in response to those findings.	
				Not applicable	



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
(3)	international information sharing	for cooperation and information sharing between relevant authorities in order to	made in implementing the high level principles in IOSCO's <u>Report on Hedge</u>	☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation:
	information sharing framework	between relevant authorities in order to ensure effective oversight is maintained when a fund is located in a different jurisdiction from the manager. We will, cooperating through the FSB, develop measures that implement these principles by the end of 2009. (London)	principles in IOSCO's Report on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009) on sharing information to facilitate the oversight of globally active fund managers. In addition, jurisdictions should state whether they are: - Signatory to the IOSCO MMoU - Signatory to bilateral agreements for supervisory cooperation that cover hedge funds and are aligned to the 2010 IOSCO Principles Regarding Cross-border Supervisory Cooperation.	at the moment ☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: ☐ 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 July 2012/11 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 2003/41/EC and 2009/65/EC and Regulations (EC) No 1060/2009 and (EU) No 1095/2010 2) Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 231/2013 of 19 December 2012 supplementing	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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	



risk management institutions which have hedge funds as their counterparties have effective risk policy measures taken for enhancing counterparty risk management and at the strengthening their existing guidance on	☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment ☐ Implementation ongoing:	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
monitor the funds' leverage and set limits for single counterparty exposures. (London) In particular, jurisdictions should indicate whether they have implemented principle 2.iii of IoSCO Report on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009). Jurisdictions should also indicate the steps they are taking to implement the new standards on equity exposures (Capital requirements for banks' equity investments in funds. Dec 2013) by 1 January 2017. Supervisors will strengthen their existing guidance on the management of exposures to leveraged counterparties. (Rec. II.17, FSF 2008) The management of exposure to leveraged counterparties. BCBS Sound Practices for Banks' Interactions with Highly Leveraged Institutions (Jan 1999) BCBS Banks' Interactions with Ilighly Leveraged Institutions (Jan 1999) BCBS Banks' Interactions with Ilighly Leveraged Institutions (Jan 1999)	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: 01.01.2014 ssue is being addressed through : □ Primary / Secondary legislation □ Regulation /Guidelines □ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the egislation / regulation/guideline: EU law (the Capital Requirements Regulation CRR) includes rules on the reatment of equity investments in funds. Those rules pre-date the Basel standards and are in large part already aligned with those standards. The rules are now ontained in Regulation (EU) No (175/2013). For the recommendation 1)	Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				abovementioned Regulation. For the	
				recommendation b) see Articles 132 and	
				152.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				The CRR has been in force since	
				01.01.2014.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				Paragraph 112 of Basel III (Jun 2011) New standards on equity exposures (Capital requirements for banks' equity investments in funds, Dec 2013) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:320 13R0575&from=EN	



Strengthening of regulatory and capital framework for monolines Insurance supervisors should strengthen the regulatory and capital framework for monolines Insurance supervisors should strengthen the regulatory and capital framework for monoline insurers in relation to structured credit. (Rec II.8, FSF 2008) Status of progress: See, for reference, the following principles issued by IAIS: ICP 13 - Reinsurance and Other Forms of Risk Transfer; ICP 15 - Investments; and IcP 17 - Capital Adequacy. Jurisdictions may also refer to: IAIS Guidance paper on enterprise risk management for capital adequacy and solvency purposes (Oct 2008). Joint Forum document on Mortgage insurance: market structure. Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	TT C '''	
the regulatory and capital framework for monolines the regulatory and capital framework for monoline insurers in relation to structured credit. (Rec II.8, FSF 2008) the regulatory and capital framework for monoline insurers in relation to structured credit. (Rec II.8, FSF 2008) measures taken for strengthening the regulatory and capital framework for monolines. See, for reference, the following principles issued by IAIS: • ICP 13 — Reinsurance and Other Forms of Risk Transfer; • ICP 15 — Investments; and • ICP 17 — Capital Adequacy. Jurisdictions may also refer to: • IAIS Guidance paper on enterprise risk management for capital adequacy and solvency purposes (Oct 2008). • Joint Forum document on Mortgage the regulatory and capital framework for monoline insurers in relation to structured regulatory and capital framework for monolines. Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: Draft in preparation, expected publication by: Draft published as of: 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	II. Securitisation	
See, for reference, the following principles issued by IAIS: • ICP 13 – Reinsurance and Other Forms of Risk Transfer; • ICP 15 – Investments; and • ICP 17 - Capital Adequacy. Jurisdictions may also refer to: • IAIS Guidance paper on enterprise risk management for capital adequacy and solvency purposes (Oct 2008). • Joint Forum document on Mortgage Status of progress: Draft in preparation, expected publication by: Draft in preparation expected publication by: Draft in preparation proposes of: In primal rule or legislation and will come into force on: Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2016 Issue is being addressed through: Issue is being addressed through: Primary / Secondary legislation Regulation /Guidelines Other actions (such as supervisory)	regulatory and capital framework for	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: No specific action regarding the treatment
underwriting cycle and policy 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	monolines	of monoline insurers in Solvency II. A general review of the formula to calculate capital requirements (including the segmenting of obligations and the specific parameter for credit and suretyship insurance) should take place before end 2018 (3 years into the new regime). Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
II.	Securitisation				
				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:	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
II	. Securitisation				
				Implementing rules for Solvency II were	
				finally agreed in January 2015, including	
				the detailed calculation of capital	
				requirements and risk management and	
				governance rules (Commission Delegated	
				Regulation 2015/35).	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://ec.europa.eu/finance/insurance/solv ency/solvency2/index_en.htm	





No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				investments calibrated as a 99.5% value	
				at risk over a 1 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 any	
				investments in securitisation	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Approval in January 2015 of the	
				Solvency II implementing rules, which	
				introduce for the first time a more risk-	
				sensitive approach to simple, transparent	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				and standardised securitisation (see	
				Article 177 of Commission Delegated	
				Regulation 2015/35)	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://ec.europa.eu/finance/insurance/solv ency/solvency2/index_en.htm	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
6	Enhanced disclosure of securitised products	Securities market regulators should work with market participants to expand	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for enhancing disclosure	□ Not applicable	If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide
(8)	securitised products	information on securitised products and	of securitised products.	☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	reasons for delayed implementation:
		their underlying assets. (Rec. III.10-III.13, FSF 2008)	See, for reference, IOSCO's <u>Report on</u> Principles for Ongoing Disclosure for	☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress:	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
			Asset-Backed Securities (Nov 2012) and IOSCO's Disclosure Principles for	☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	The Delegated Regulation contains for
			Public Offerings and Listings of Asset-	☐ Draft published as of:	the moment disclosures templates only
			Backed Securities (Apr 2010).	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	for structured finance instruments backed by certain categories of assets. ESMA
				☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :	shall continue work on additional templates in order to cover all the scope
				☑ Implementation completed as of: 21 May 2013 / 2009	of application of art. 8b of the CRA III Regulation. Such new templates will be
				Issue is being addressed through:	adopted by the Commission by way of amendment of the existing Delegated
				☑ Primary / Secondary legislation	Regulation. ESMA shall set up a website
				☐ Regulation /Guidelines	for the publication of the information on
				☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	structured finance instruments (referred to in art. 8b of the CRA 3 Regulation) by
				Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:	1st January 2017. Commission is currently working on a draft legislative
				The disclosure framework on securitised products has been strongly enhanced	proposal on securitisation which amongst others things, aims at streamlining and
				since the financial crisis. Disclosure	improving the consistency of due
				requirements for sponsors/originators	diligence and disclosure requirements of
				(CRR): These requirements have been in force since the implementation of the	different legislative frameworks
				Capital Requirements Directive II	(Prospectus, CRR/CRD IV, AIFMD, CRA3 and Solvency II) which are
				(2009/111/CE) in 2009. In practice the	applicable to structured finance
				Capital Requirements Regulation (art.	Thanee



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	-			409) stipulates that institutions acting as	instruments.
				an originator, a sponsor or original lender	
				shall disclose to investors the level of	Web-links to relevant documents:
				their commitment to maintain a net	web links to relevant documents.
				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. General disclsore requirement	
				(Credit rating agencies Regulation III)	
				Regulation on Credit Rating Agencies	
				(Article 8b, CRA3) came into force June	
				2013. With regard to issuers of ABS,	
				Article 8b of the CRA 3 Regulation	
				requires: - The issuer, the originator and	
				the sponsor of a structured finance	
				instrument established in the Union shall,	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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 ESMA shall set up a website	
				for the publication of the information on	
				structured finance instruments by 1st	
				January 2017. ESMA should establish the	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				guidelines for enforcement and	
				supervision of Art. 8b of the CRA 3	
				Regulation by NCAs. In addition, A Task	
				Force established under the umbrella of	
				the Joint Committee of the ESAs issued	
				in May 2015 a report 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; - proposes several	
				recommendations to address these	
				inconsistencies.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Art. 8b of the CRA3 Regulation was	
				complemented by a Delegated Regulation	
				(EU) 2015/3 adopted by the Commission	
				on 30 September 2014 which specifies	
				the information to be published on	
				structured finance instruments, the	
				frequency of this publication and the	
				presentation of the information to be	
				published on structured finance	
				instruments by means of standardised	
				disclosure templates.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				REGULATION (EU) No 462/2013 (CRA	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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-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	



7 Consistent consolidate supervision	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
(9) consolidate supervision	hancing supervision				
	onsistent,	All firms whose failure could pose a risk to financial stability must be subject to consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation with high standards. (Pittsburgh)	Jurisdictions should indicate: (1) whether they have identified domestic SIFIs and, 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. See, for reference, the following documents: BCBS: • Framework for G-SIBs (Jul 2013) • Framework for D-SIBs (Oct 2012) • BCP 12 (Sep 2012) IAIS: • Global Systemically Important Insurers: Policy Measures (Jul 2013) • ICP 23— Group wide supervision FSB: • Framework for addressing SIFIs (Nov 2011)	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: □ 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: CRDIV / CRR approved by the European Parliament on 16 April 2013 and the Council on 27 March 2013 and entered into force on 1 January 2014. As regards G-SIBs and D-SIBs, CRDIV / CRR as approved by the European Parliament and the European Council implement in the	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: As regards the recovery and resolution of systemic institutions other than banks, Commission envisages adopting proposals in line with relevant international recommendations notably on central counterparties for late 2015. Web-links to relevant documents: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/consultations/2012/nonbanks_en.htm
				1 11	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				of global systemically important banks	
				and the related additional loss absorbency	
				requirement as well as BCBS' principles	
				for dealing with domestic systemically	
				important banks. A Delegated Regulation	
				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	
				adopted and applies from January 2015.	
				It requires Member States to equip	
				authorities with the necessary tools and	
				powers to ensure that the distress or	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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 Euro	
				Area and other Member States	
				participating in the Banking Union the	
				rules of the BRRD will be applied from	
				2016 by the Single Resolution	
				Mechanism. The SRM integrates key	
				aspects of the coordination and decision-	
				making structure applicable to resolution	
				planning and the resolution of banks and	
				replaces national resolution funds with a	
				Single Resolution Fund in participating	
				Member States. Insurance sector	
				For the insurance sector the	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				implementation of the IAIS recommendations for G-SIIs (distinct from the G-SIIs mentioned above) is on- going and addressed via supervisory actions and monitoring. There is no EU legislation for G-SIIs specifically, implementation is dealt with at Member States level.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				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: 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	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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-8c34-82d42d112d91for D-SIB identification in the Union.	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
8 (10)	Establishing supervisory colleges and conducting risk assessments	To establish the remaining supervisory colleges for significant cross-border firms by June 2009. (London) We agreed to conduct rigorous risk assessment on these firms [G-SIFIs] through international supervisory colleges. (Seoul)	Reporting in this area should be undertaken solely by home jurisdictions of G-SIBs and G-SIIs. Please indicate the progress made in establishing and strengthening the functioning of supervisory colleges for G-SIBs and G-SIIs using, as reference, the following documents: BCBS: • Principle 13 of the BCBS Core Principles for Effective Banking Supervision (Sep 2012) • Principles for effective supervisory colleges (Jun 2014) IAIS: • ICP 25 and Guidance 25.1.1 – 25.1.6 on establishment of supervisory colleges • Guidance 25.6.20 and 25.8.16 on risk assessments by supervisory colleges • Application paper on supervisory colleges (Oct 2014)	Supervisory colleges exist for all 18 G-SIBs established in the EU. This should be the answer to the first additional question and not N/A. Then for the other questions the N/A is mentioned because the European Commission is a legislator / regulator but not a (consolidating) supervisor and therefore the other questions should be answered by the respective Member State where the respective G-SIBs are established. □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: □ 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: Issue is being addressed through: □ Primary / Secondary legislation □ Regulation /Guidelines □ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation: Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	-			Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:	
				Banking Sector The Capital Requirement	
				Directive (2013/36/EU) provides for the	
				mandatory establishment of colleges of	
				supervisors for cross-border banking	
				groups. The Regulation establishing the	
				European Banking 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.	
				In the coming weeks, the European	
				Commission intends to publish two	
				pieces of secondary legislation to	
				complement the rules set out in Directive	
				2013/36/EU. These two pieces will	
				specify the functioning rules of colleges	
				of supervisors. Insurance Sector The	
				Solvency II Directive requires that	
				Colleges are set out in relation to all	
				insurance groups. Solvency II will be	
				applicable from January 2016. The	
				Regulation establishing the European	
				Insurance and Occupational Pensions	
				Authority (EIOPA) (Regulation	
				1094/2010 gives EIOPA a central role in	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				promoting and monitoring colleges of	
				supervisors. The European Supervisory	
				Authorities (ESAs, i.e. EBA, EIOPA,	
				ESMA) ensure a consistent and coherent	
				functioning of colleges across the Union,	
				promote effective and efficient	
				supervisory activities and have, under	
				certain conditions, the power to bindingly	
				settle disagreements between authorities.	
				Furthermore, the ESAs initiate and	
				coordinate EU-wide stress tests on the	
				resilience of financial institutions.	
				Guidelines on colleges of supervisors	
				have been and still continue to be	
				developed by the ESAs.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Banking Sector In the coming weeks, the	
				European Commission intends to publish	
				two pieces of secondary legislation to	
				complement the rules on supervisory	
				colleges set out in Directive 2013/36/EU.	
				These two pieces will specify the	
				functioning rules of colleges of	
				supervisors.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201	
				3L0036&from=EN	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				http://ec.europa.eu/finance/bank/regcapita	
				l/legislation-in-force/index_en.htm	
				Insurance	
				http://ec.europa.eu/finance/insurance/solv	
				ency/solvency2/index_en.htm Market	
				Infrastructures (CCP) http://eur-	
				lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201	
				2R0648&from=EN	
				Additional questions:	
				1. Please indicate whether supervisory colleges for all G-SIBs/G-SIIs headquartered in your jurisdiction have been established. If not, please explain.	
				Not applicable	
				2. Please indicate the structure of the supervisory colleges for G-SIBs/G-SIIs in your jurisdiction (core, universal, other) and the reasons why it may differ across firms.	
				Not applicable	
				3. Please indicate the frequency of meetings over the past year of the supervisory colleges (core, universal, other) for G-SIBs/G-SIIs in your jurisdiction.	
				Not applicable	
				4. Please describe the main objectives of supervisory colleges for G-SIBs/G-SIIs in your jurisdiction and the types of issues that have been discussed over the past year. (e.g.	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				specific area(s) of risk, coordinated risk assessments, joint supervisory work, coordinated supervisory plans). In your response, please indicate briefly some of the main challenges in conducting joint risk assessments and steps taken to address them.	
				Not applicable 5. Please describe the main challenges in the functioning of supervisory colleges for G-SIBs/G-SIIs in your jurisdiction and any plans to enhance the effectiveness of colleges.	
				Not applicable	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
9 (11)	Description 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: □ 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 	Next steps 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).	 ☑ Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2014 (Banking)/1 January 2016 (Insurance) 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 European Supervisory Authorities (ESAs, i.e. EBA, EIOPA, ESMA) ensure a consistent and coherent functioning of colleges across the Union, promote effective and efficient supervisory activities and have, under certain conditions, the power to bindingly settle disagreements between authorities. 	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Furthermore, the ESAs initiate and	
				coordinate EU-wide stress tests on the	
				resilience of financial institutions.	
				Guidelines on colleges of supervisors	
				have been and still continue to be	
				developed by the ESAs. Insurance sector	
				The Solvency II Directive requires the	
				Commission to adopt delegated acts on	
				Colleges, specifically on the systematic	
				exchange of information between	
				supervisors in the College. Delegated	
				acts on Colleges, specifically on the	
				systematic exchange of information	
				between supervisors in the College, were	
				adopted in January 2015. Guidelines on	
				the functioning of College are being	
				developed by EIOPA. Banking sector	
				The EU has put in place a comprehensive	
				set of rules concerning the exchange of	
				information and coordination among	
				competent authorities. 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	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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). In addition, Directive	
				2013/36/EU specifies rules governing the	
				exchange of information, 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. Furthermore, the	
				ESAs 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	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				single supervisory mechanism (SSM),	
				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	
				SSM is fully in place from 4 November	
				2014. The home/host supervisor	
				coordination procedures and colleges of	
				supervisors continue to exist as they were	
				previously, as far as coordination with	
				supervisors in non-euro area Member	
				States is concerned. However, the ECB	
				has taken over supervisory tasks. The	
				ECB carries out the functions of home	
				supervisor for euro area banks and	
				branches active in non-euro area Member	
				States and acts as host supervisor for	
				branches of non-euro area Member	
				States' banks where these branches are	
				established in the euro area. Colleges of	
				supervisors continue to be structures for	
				exchanging information and coordinating	
				supervisory tasks between the ECB and	
				national supervisors of non-euro area	
				Member States. The EBA is allowed to	
				participate in supervisory college	
				meetings and provides regular	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				assessments of the functioning of	
				supervisory colleges.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Insurance Delegated acts on Colleges,	
				specifically on the systematic exchange	
				of information between supervisors in the	
				College, were adopted in January 2015.	
				Guidelines on the functioning of College	
				are being developed by EIOPA. SSM The	
				SSM regulation is fully in place from 4	
				November 2014. Four pieces of	
				secondary legislation were adopted.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				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: https://www.ecb.europa.eu/ecb/legal/pdf/celex_32014r0468_en_txt.pdf BRRD: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/policies/ecofin/banking-union?tab=Single-rulebook&subTab=Bank-recovery-and-	



N	No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
					http://www.consilium.europa.eu/policies/ ecofin/banking-union?tab=Supervision- and-resolution&subTab=Single- resolution-mechanism⟨=en	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
10	Strengthening resources	We agreed that supervisors should have	No information on this recommendation		
(12)	and effective	strong and unambiguous mandates,	will be collected in the current IMN		
(12)	supervision	sufficient independence to act,	survey due to the recent publication of the		
		appropriate resources, and a full suite of	FSB thematic peer review report on		
		tools and powers to proactively identify	supervisory frameworks and approaches		
		and address risks, including regular stress	to SIBs.		
		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)			
		2012)			



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

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
				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 will	
				also have some macro-prudential	
				competences within the Single	
				Supervisory Mechanism (SSM). The	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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. Most of the	
				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 macro-	
				prudential institutional set-up completed.	
				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:	
				Implementation of macro-prudential	
				framework following the SSM	
				Regulation; establishment of national	
				macro-prudential authorities in Member	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	•			States, activation of macro-prudential instruments by Member States (more than 90 measures since January 2014), Review of the ESRB conducted by the Commission -jointly with the review of the ESAs – The review report was published in August 2014.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				ECRB review http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/arti cles/governance/2014-08-08- review_european_systemic_risk_board_e n.htm	
				Additional questions:	
				1. Please describe the institutional arrangements for financial stability and macroprudential policy in your jurisdiction, including whether a macroprudential authority has been explicitly identified and the respective roles and responsibilities of the central bank and other authorities.	
				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	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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 will also have 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. Most of the	
				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 macro-	
				prudential institutional set-up completed.	
				In addition the new regulations on capital	
				requirements (CRDIV/CRR) that entered	
				into force on 31 December 2013 further	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				require the Member States to designate	
				the national macro-prudential authorities	
				2. If a macroprudential authority has been explicitly identified in your jurisdiction, please describe its legal basis, mandate, composition, powers (warnings, recommendations, prudential tools, powers of direction, other) and accountability arrangements. Who provides the resources and analytical support for the authority's activities?	
				In the EU, the macro-prudential authority	
				is the ESRB; it has a very broad mandate	
				(EU wide, and across the financial	
				sector). It has preventative role: it should	
				identify risks and vulnerabilities in the	
				financial system in a forward-looking	
				manner. It has no binding powers but can	
				issue non-binding warnings and	
				recommendations to which a 'comply or	
				explain mechanism' applies. At national	
				level, Member States have established	
				macro-prudential authorities whose	
				powers and mandates vary across	
				borders. In the Banking Union, the SSM	
				Regulation has entrusted the ECB with	
				specific binding macro-prudential	
				compentences.	
				3. Is there an inter-agency body on financial stability or macroprudential matters – distinct from the designated macroprudential	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				authority – in your jurisdiction? If so, please describe its legal basis, mandate, composition, powers and accountability arrangements. Who provides the resources and analytical support for its activities?	
				Not applicable	
				4. Please describe the extent to which the macroprudential authority (or other relevant body) is able to collect information on material financial institutions, markets and instruments in order to assess potential systemic risks. In your response, please indicate whether the authorities involved in systemic risk monitoring have specific legal powers to collect information from financial institutions (whether regulated or not) for financial stability purposes, and whether there exist dedicated information gateways (e.g. Memorandum of Understanding) to share such information among relevant authorities.	
				The ESRB relies on other authorities for access to information (ECB, ESAs, national authorities).	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
No 12 (14)	Description Enhancing system-wide monitoring and the use of macro-prudential instruments	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)	Remarks 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)	Progress to date □ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: □ 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 (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:	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: According to the art.513 of the CRR the Commission - by 30 June 2014, after consulting the ESRB and EBA, to review whether the macro-prudential rules contained in the CRR/CRDIV are sufficient to mitigate systemic risks in sectors, regions and Member States. Specifically, the review will include: a. Whether the current macro-prudential tools in the Regulation and the Directive are effective, efficient and transparent; b. Whether the coverage and the possible overlap between different macro-prudential tools for targeting similar risks are adequate, and if appropriate, Commission to propose new macro-prudential rules; c. How internationally agreed standards for systemic institutions
		changes in asset prices and their	• FSB-IMF-BIS progress report to the G20 on <u>Macroprudential policy tools</u>	actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the	prudential rules; c. How internationally



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Recommendation gives an indicative list	proposal to the European Parliament and
				of instruments that national macro-	the Council. The ESRB responded to the
				prudential authorities can use to fulfil	European Commission call for advice on
				their mandate. Also with the new EU	macro-prudential rules in CRD IV. The
				prudential rules for banks (CRDIV/CRR)	EBA published in July 2014 an Opinion
				that entered into force on 1 January 2014	on the macroprudential tools laid down in
				the macro-prudential authorities in the	the Capital Requirement Regulation
				EU can apply a new set of policy	(CRR) and Directive (CRDIV). The
				instruments to address financial stability	review of the macroprudential tools of
				risks more effectively. So far several	CRDIV/CRR, that should have been
				Member States decided, or are in the	completed by December 2014 according
				process of deciding, to apply macro-	to the regulation, has been postponed to
				prudential instruments (i.e. Belgium,	take due account of an evolving
				Estonia, Croatia, the Netherlands,	institutional landscape with the
				Slovenia, Sweden). To assist the use of	implementation of the Banking Union. A
				macro-prudential instruments the ESRB	comprehensive review of the
				has prepared the following set of	macroprudential regulatory framework
				documents: the ESRB Flagship Report	covering both the toolset (ie crd IV/CRR
				that provides a first overview of the new	macroprudential rules and tools) but also
				macro-prudential policy framework in the	governance and institutional aspects (ie
				EU; the ESRB Handbook which provides	ESRB Regulations and SSM
				more detailed assistance to macro-	macroprudential tools and tasks), which
				prudential authorities on how to use the	is a more ambitious undertaking, should
				new instruments; Decision sets out the	be launched by the end of 2015.
				process and coordination framework for	
				preparing ESRB opinions or issuing	Web-links to relevant documents:
				recommendations on macro-prudential	http://www.esrb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/
				measures, notified to the ESRB by	140430 ESRB response.pdf?f2e3e1f0dc
				relevant authorities, in line with the	28ba0726aa6f51de4517fa
				CRD/CRR.	https://www.eba.europa.eu/-/eba-advises-the-european-commission-on-the-



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	macroprudential-rules-laid-down-in-the- crr-crd
				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 by the end of 2015.	
				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	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				https://www.esrb.europa.eu/pub/html/ind	
				ex.en.html?skey=28/01/2014%20framew	
				ork	
				Additional questions:	
				1. Please describe, at a high level, the types of methodologies, indicators and reports used in your jurisdiction to identify, analyse, communicate and address systemic risks.	
				The methodologies used and indicators	
				monitored vary across MS and national	
				macro-prudential authorities. Through its	
				flagship report, its recommendations and	
				its operational handbook, the ESRB	
				fosters identification of good practices	
				and convergence among authorities; The	
				ECB in its new supervisory role (micro-	
				and macro-) should also foster	
				convergence in the area.	
				2. Please describe the range of policy tools (prudential and other) currently available to the authorities for macroprudential purposes. ²	
				There are a number of macro-prudential	
				tools for banks harmonised under EU	
				law, mainly capital-related (Counter-	

An indicative list of such tools can be found in "Macroprudential Policy Tools and Frameworks – Progress Report to the G20" by the FSB, IMF and BIS (October 2011, http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/wp-content/uploads/r 111027b.pdf); "Staff Guidance on Macroprudential Policy" (December 2014, http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2014/110614.pdf) by IMF staff; and "Operationalising the selection and application of macroprudential instruments" (December 2012, http://www.bis.org/publ/cgfs48.pdf) by the CGFS.



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				cyclical Capital Buffer, Systemic Risk Buffer etc). Other tools are governed by national law (LTV, LTI etc).	
				3. Please indicate which tools have been deployed for macroprudential purposes over the past year, including the objective for their use and the process used to select, calibrate, and apply them.	
				MS have activated more than 90 macro- prudential measures since January 2014. The instruments activated target mainly the 'too big to fail' issue (i.e. systemically important banks) or the housing market.	
				4. Please describe whether and, if so, how the relevant authorities assess the <i>ex ante</i> cost and benefits of macroprudential policies and their <i>ex post</i> effectiveness.	
				The ESRB should foster good practices in the cost/benefit analysis area in its coordination role; measures have been activated too recently to be able to properly assess their effectiveness ex post. The ESRB, ECB and national	
				macro-prudential authorities are working on ways to do this.	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
V.	· •	f credit rating agencies (CRAs)			-
13 (16)	Enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs	All CRAs whose ratings are used for regulatory purposes should be subject to a regulatory oversight regime that includes	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures undertaken for enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs	☐ 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:
	CRAs	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. 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	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) Jurisdictions may also refer to the following IOSCO documents: • Principle 22 of Principles and Objectives of Securities Regulation (Jun 2010) which calls for registration and oversight programs for CRAs • Statement of Principles Regarding the Activities of Credit Rating Agencies (Sep 2003) • Final Report on Supervisory Colleges for Credit Rating Agencies (Jul 2013)	at the moment ☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: ☐ 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 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,	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Implementation of the regulatory technical standards (RTS). 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 end 2015. Web-links to relevant documents:
		appropriate, globally compatible solutions (to conflicting compliance obligations for CRAs) as early as possible		subject to authorisation and ongoing supervision. In addition, the Regulation	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
		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	
		(2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.		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.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				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	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				charged by CRAS. To this end, the	
				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	
				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- 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 _R_0002	







No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
No 14 (17)	Description Reducing the reliance on ratings	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	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. Jurisdictions may refer to the following documents:	Progress to date □ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: □ 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: 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
		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	 FSB Principles for Reducing Reliance on CRA Ratings (Oct 2010) FSB Roadmap for Reducing Reliance on CRA Ratings (Nov 2012) BCBS Consultative Document Revisions to the Standardised Approach for credit risk (Dec 2014) 	 ☐ 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: 	trigger sole or mechanistic reliance thereone; (b) alternative tools to enable investors to make their own credit risk assessment of issuers and of financial instruments. 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.
		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 bodies in ending the mechanistic reliance on credit ratings and encourage steps that		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. The overall framework in the EU to reduce reliance on CRA has a multilayer approach, covering EU regulation on credit rating agencies, sectoral legislation	Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
		would enhance transparency of and		in financial services, actions by European	
		competition among credit rating agencies.		Supervisory Authorities, including the	
		(Los Cabos)		European Securities and Markets	
				Authority (ESMA), the European	
		We call on national authorities and		Banking Authority (EBA) and the	
		standard setting bodies to accelerate		European Insurance and Occupational	
		progress in reducing reliance on credit		Pensions Authority (EIOPA) and by	
		rating agencies, in accordance with the		national competent sectoral authorities.	
		FSB roadmap. (St Petersburg)		Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				The EU Action Plan was published in	
				May 2014 (see web-link)	
				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 alignin	g accounting standards			
15 (18)	Consistent application of high-quality accounting standards	Regulators, supervisors, and accounting standard setters, as appropriate, should work with each other and the private sector on an ongoing basis to ensure consistent application and enforcement of high-quality accounting standards. (Washington)	Jurisdictions should indicate the accounting standards that they follow and whether (and on what basis) they are deemed to be equivalent to IFRSs as published by the IASB or are otherwise of a high and internationally acceptable quality, and provide accurate and relevant information on financial performance. They should also explain the system they have for enforcement of consistent application of those standards. Jurisdictions may want to refer to their jurisdictional profile prepared by the IFRS Foundation, which can be accessed at: http://www.ifrs.org/Use-around-the-world/Pages/Analysis-of-the-G20-IFRS-profiles.aspx .	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: □ 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 2005 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 adopted in 2002 a regulation to adopt IFRS (i.e. the IAS Regulation). Since January 2005, the IFRS are mandatory for the consolidated accounts of listed companies. Enforcement of IFRS is done by National Market Authority and coordinated by the	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: New standards, amendments or interpretation provided by the IASB will continue to go through due process of endorsement before becoming law in the EU. Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				European Securities and Markets	
				Authority (ESMA).	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Over 10 years after the adoption of the	
				IAS Regulation, the European	
				Commission has assessed the effects of	
				the use of IFRS in the EU against its	
				original aims. Its report on the evaluation	
				to the European Parliament was published	
				on 18 June 2015.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://ec.europa.eu/finance/accounting/ias -evaluation/index_en.htm	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
No 16 (19)	Description Appropriate application of Fair Value Accounting	Accounting standard setters and prudential supervisors should examine the use of valuation reserves or adjustments for fair valued financial instruments when data or modelling needed to support their valuation is weak. (Rec. 3.4, FSF 2009) Accounting standard setters and prudential supervisors should examine possible changes to relevant standards to dampen adverse dynamics potentially associated with fair value accounting. Possible ways to reduce this potential impact include the following: (1) Enhancing the accounting model so that the use of fair value accounting is carefully examined for financial instruments of credit intermediaries; (ii) Transfers between financial asset categories; (iii) Simplifying hedge accounting requirements. (Rec 3.5, FSF 2009)	Remarks Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for appropriate application of fair value accounting. Although not an application of fair value accounting, jurisdictions should additionally be mindful of implementation issues arising from the new accounting requirements for expected loan loss provisioning for impaired loans that are being introduced by the IASB and the FASB, and, for those jurisdictions where specific action is needed to foster transparent and consistent implementation, set out any steps they intend to take. See, for reference, the following BCBS documents: • Basel 2.5 standards on prudent valuation (Jul 2009) • Supervisory guidance for assessing banks' financial instrument fair value practices (Apr 2009)	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: □ 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 : 1 January 2013 (IFRS 13) □ 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 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.	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: Web-links to relevant documents:
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey: The IASB published IFRS 9 in 2014. This standard is now subject to	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				endorsement in the EU. ESMA is	
				considering developing a statement in	
				relation to the expected information to be	
				provided by banks during the period of	
				transition to the new standard on financial	
				instruments. The Regulatory Technical	
				Standards (RTS) on prudent valuation is	
				still being adopted as EBA made some	
				changes and re-submitted a revised draft.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				Commission Regulation 1255/2012 (for IFRS 13) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:360:0078:0144:EN:PDF	



		•	-		-
No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VII.	Enhancing risk manag	ement			
17	Enhancing guidance to	Regulators should develop enhanced	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken to enhance guidance to	□ Not applicable	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
(20)	strengthen banks' risk management practices,	guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, in line with	strengthen banks' risk management	☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	Commencement date.
	including on liquidity	international best practices, and should	practices. Jurisdictions may also refer to FSB's	☐ Implementation ongoing:	Web-links to relevant documents:
	and foreign currency funding risks	encourage financial firms to re-examine their internal controls and implement	thematic peer review report on risk	Status of progress:	
	Tunung Hoko	strengthened policies for sound risk	governance (Feb 2013) and the BCBS	☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	
		management. (Washington)	Peer review of supervisory authorities' implementation of stress testing	☐ Draft published as of:	
		National supervisors should closely check banks' implementation of the updated	principles (Apr 2012) and Principles for	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	
		guidance on the management and supervision of liquidity as part of their	sound stress testing practices and supervision (May 2009).	☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :	
		regular supervision. If banks' implementation of the guidance is		☑ Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2014	
		inadequate, supervisors will take more prescriptive action to improve practices.		Issue is being addressed through:	
		(Rec. II.10, FSF 2008)		☑ Primary / Secondary legislation	
		Regulators and supervisors in emerging		☑ Regulation /Guidelines	
		markets ³ will enhance their supervision		☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	
		of banks' operation in foreign currency funding markets. (FSB 2009)		Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline:	
		We commit to conduct robust, transparent stress tests as needed. (Pittsburgh)		The CRD IV Package transposes via a Directive (Directive 2013/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on access to the activity	

³ 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
				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) the Basel III agreement	
				on an international framework for	
				liquidity risk measurement, standards and	
				monitoring adopted in December 2010	
				into EU law. The 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 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	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				address any situations of non-compliance.	
				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	
				October 2014. 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,	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
	_			as well the governance and internal	
				control framework of banks for	
				identifying, managing, monitoring risks.	
				These guidelines will enter into force in	
				January 2016.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				In October 2014, ECB published the	
				results of its comprehensive assessment	
				of 130 significant Euro-area banks. The	
				comprehensive assessment included both	
				the asset quality review and a stress test.	
				Moreover, the EBA also simultaneously	
				published coordinate EU-wide 2014	
				stress test in 123 EU banks (on highest	
				consolidation level within the EU).	
				Finally, EBA announced that the next	
				round of EU-wide stress test will be	
				conducted in 2016. The preparatory work	
				in EBA task forces has already started.	
				*** Adoption and publication of the EBA	
				guidelines on Common Supervisory	
				review and Evaluation Process (SREP) in	
				December 2014.	
				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	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				75 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-	
				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	
				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
18	Enhanced risk	Financial institutions should provide	Jurisdictions should indicate the status of	☐ Not applicable	Planned actions (if any) and expected
(22)	disclosures by financial institutions	enhanced risk disclosures in their reporting and disclose all losses on an	implementation of the disclosures requirements of IFRSs (in particular	☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	commencement date:
		ongoing basis, consistent with	IFRS7 and 13) or equivalent.	☐ Implementation ongoing:	Web-links to relevant documents:
		international best practice, as appropriate.	Jurisdictions may also use as reference	Status of progress:	
		(Washington)	the recommendations of the October 2012 report by the Enhanced Disclosure Task	☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	
			Force on Enhancing the Risk Disclosures	☐ Draft published as of:	
			of Banks and Implementation Progress Report by the EDTF (Aug 2013), and set	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	
		We encourage further efforts by the	out any steps they have taken to foster adoption of the EDTF Principles and	☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :	
		public and private sector to enhance financial institutions' disclosures of the	Recommendations.	☑ Implementation completed as of: 1 January 2013	
		risks they face, including the ongoing		Issue is being addressed through:	
		work of the Enhanced Disclosure Task		☐ Primary / Secondary legislation	
		Force. (St. Petersburg)		☑ 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:	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://eur- lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do ?uri=OJ:L:2012:360:0078:0144:EN:PDF The extent to which Member States seek	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				to enforce the EDTF Guidelines depends on national supervisors.	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VIII.	Strengthening deposit	insurance			
19 (23)	Strengthening of national deposit insurance arrangements	National deposit insurance arrangements should be reviewed against the agreed international principles, and authorities	Jurisdictions should describe any revisions made to national deposit insurance system, including steps taken to	☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
		should strengthen arrangements where needed. (Rec. VI.9, FSF 2008)	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 Insurance Systems issued by IADI in November 2014	Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: □ 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: 3 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 new Directive on Deposit Guarantee Schemes (DGS) maintains the harmonised level of coverage (€ 100 000) and harmonises the scope of coverage (i.e. specify depositors and products being eligible or ineligible for DGS protection); gradually reduces the pay-out	Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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 and bank resolution (transfer	
				of deposits); introduces an obligation to	
				apply risk-based contributions in Member	
				States; improves depositor information	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				The new DGS Directive which was	
				adopted in April 2014 and entered into	
				force on 2 July 2014; transposed by the	
				Member States by 3 July 2015.	
				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			
20 (24)	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 recommendation in the following IOSCO reports in their regulatory framework: • Regulatory issues raised by changes in market structure (Dec 2013) • Report on Regulatory Issues Raised by the Impact of Technological Changes on Market Integrity and Efficiency (Oct 2011) • Report on Principles for Dark Liquidity (May 2011).	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress: □ 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) will increase the transparency and integrity of the derivatives and the	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; technical advice received from the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) and draft technical standards to be delivered by September 2015. Following scrutiny of the rules by colegislators, the EU market abuse regime should be finalised by early 2016. Market Abuse Regulation and Criminal Sanctions for Market Abuse Directive will enter into application on 3 July 2016. Web-links to relevant documents: Market Abuse Regulation: http://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R05 96 Criminal Sanctions for Market Abuse Directive http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014L00 57
				commodity derivatives markets including	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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
21 (25)	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: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: ☑ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: 3 January 2017 (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 commodity derivatives markets, including registration of market participants and transparency requirements. It also addresses IOSCO's recommendation on position management through position limits and position management. The new MAR will	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 advice from regulatory bodies received in December 2014; and draft regulatory technical standards to be delivered by September 2015. Following scrutiny of the rules by co-legislators, they should be finalised by early 2016. Expected commencement date: 2nd January 2017 Web-links to relevant documents: http://www.esma.europa.eu/content/Technical-Advice-Commission-MiFID-II-and-MiFIR



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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). Currently	
				implementation rules regarding position	
				limits, the scope of authorisations for	
				commodity firms and the delineation	
				between financial and physical	
				instruments are being drafted, and will be	
				finalised by January 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
22	Reform of financial	We support the establishment of the	Collection of information on this		
(26)	benchmarks	FSB's Official Sector Steering Group to	recommendation will continue to be		
(20)		coordinate work on the necessary reforms	deferred given the forthcoming FSB		
		of financial benchmarks. We endorse	progress report on implementation of the		
		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
				sellers) into the scope of the Directive	
				and by increasing the level of consumer	
				protection in insurance sales made on an	
				ancillary basis by non-insurance	
				professionals (for example travel agents	
				selling travel insurance). The directive	
				lays down minimum requirements for	
				professional qualifications and the	
				conduct of business, to ensure a high	
				level of consumer protection. It also	
				provides specific rules for the distribution	
				of insurance-based investment products	
				in order to guarantee a consistent level of	
				investor protection.	
				Mortgage Credit Directive (MCD)	
				effective since 20 March 2014 Directive	
				2014/17/EU (the Mortgage Credit	
				Directive or MCD) improves the	
				information given to the 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. In addition	
				the MCD ensures that the consumer has	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				sufficient time before being bound by the	
				credit agreement. 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. It	
				introduces the obligation for staff to	
				possess the appropriate knowledge and	
				skills in fields of relevance for carrying	
				out their activities, the obligation to	
				provide adequate explanations to the	
				consumer at pre-contractual stage, as well	
				as standards for advisory services. The	
				Directive requires Member States to	
				designate the national competent	
				authorities and grant them investigating	
				and enforcement powers and adequate	
				resources. The MCD also introduces an	
				obligation for competent authorities of	
				different Member States to cooperate	
				with each other. MIFID II 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	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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. Finally, MiFIR introduces	
				harmonised powers and conditions for	
				ESMA to prohibit or restrict the	
				marketing and distribution of certain	
				financial instruments and similar powers	
				for the European Banking Authority	
				(EBA) in the case of structured deposits.	
				Payment Accounts Directive (PAD)	
				Directive 2014/92/EU of 23 July 2014	
				will enter into force 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	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				account in one Member State and open	
				another account in a 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) Regulation The	
				Regulation on Packaged Retail and	
				Insurance Based Investment Products	
				(PRIIPs) aims to improve investor	
				protection by introducing the obligation	
				for PRIPs 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 uniform presentation that clearly	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				spells out main features, risks and	
				opportunities as well as costs associated	
				with a broad range of investment	
				products available to retail investors, such	
				as insurance-based investment products,	
				structured investment products and	
				collective investment schemes. This	
				consumer friendly document is to	
				facilitate the understanding of and	
				comparison between different investment	
				products.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Insurance Mediation Directive (IMD)	
				Progress in negotiations (agreement in	
				Council of Member States, trilogue	
				negotiations between Council and	
				European Parliament ongoing, agreement	
				expected in 2015 Mortgage Credit	
				Directive (MCD): (i) Transposition work	
				on-going. (ii) EBA guidelines on	
				creditworthiness assessment, Guidelines	
				on arrears and foreclosure; EBA opinion	
				on good practices for mortgages, (iii)	
				publication of the consultation on draft	
				EBA Guidelines on passport notifications	
				for mortgage credit intermediaries on 4	
				June 2015; (iv) Publication of the	
				Consultation on draft Joint Committee	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Guidelines for cross-selling practices on	
				22 December 2014 (to publish the final	
				guidelines Q2 2015). PAD (i)	
				Transposition work on-going with second	
				workshop organised by European	
				Commission on 25 June 2015. (ii) EBA	
				guidelines on national provisional list of	
				the most representative services linked to	
				a payment account and subject to a fee	
				was issued on 11 May 2015. (iii) NCAs	
				are expected to deliver their list of most	
				representative services linked to payment	
				accounts by 18 September 2015. From	
				the provisional lists, the EBA is mandated	
				to develop draft RTS, by 18 September	
				2016 setting out the Union standardised	
				terminology for those services that are	
				common to a majority of Member States.	
				(iv) EBA is expected to deliver RTS and	
				ITS on common terminology and format	
				of the stament of fees and of the fee	
				informacion document by 18 September	
				2016. MIFID Currently implementation	
				rules are being drafted, and will be	
				finalised by early 2016. Packaged Retail	
				and Insurance-based Investment Products	
				(PRIIPS) Regulation Currently	
				implementation rules are being drafted.	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				(i) The Joint Committee (JC) of European	
				Supervisory Authorities (EBA, EIOPA,	
				ESMA) produced a discussion paper in	
				November 2014 setting out preliminary	
				options and possible approaches, to get	
				feedback from the public. The feedback	
				received would form the basis of the	
				implementation rules that are to be	
				prepared. (ii) The JC has published on 23	
				June 2015 a Technical Discussion Paper	
				on risk, performance scenarios and cost	
				disclosures for KIDs. The deadline for	
				input is 17 August 2015.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				MCD: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201 4L0017&from=EN MIFID/MIFIR MiFID II 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 PAD http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201 4L0092&from=EN	



European Commission

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>