

Jurisdiction: France

- 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	Registration,	We also firmly recommitted to work in	Implementation of this recommendation		
(1)	appropriate disclosures and oversight of hedge funds	an internationally consistent and non-discriminatory manner to strengthen regulation and supervision on hedge funds. (Seoul) Hedge funds or their managers will be registered and will be required to disclose appropriate information on an ongoing basis to supervisors or regulators, including on their leverage, necessary for assessment of the systemic risks they pose individually or collectively. Where appropriate registration should be subject to a minimum size. They will be subject to oversight to ensure that they have adequate risk management. (London)	was reported to be completed by all FSB jurisdictions in the 2016 IMN survey. Given this, the reporting of progress with respect to this recommendation will take place every 2-3 years henceforth (i.e. in 2019 or 2020).		

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
2 (2)	Establishment of international information sharing framework	We ask the FSB to develop mechanisms for cooperation and information sharing 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)	Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing recommendation 6 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 in relation to cooperation in enforcement - Signatory to bilateral agreements for supervisory cooperation that cover hedge funds and are aligned to the 2010 IOSCO Principles Regarding Cross-border Supervisory Cooperation. Jurisdictions can also refer to Principle 28 of the 2010 IOSCO Objectives and Principles of Securities Regulation, and take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those Principles.	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: □ Implementation completed as of: 22.07.2013 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: As part of the requirements of Directive 2011/61/EU (AIFM Directive) concerning third countries (Chapter VII), ESMA had, as of 16 September 2016, negotiated 44 cooperation arrangements, on behalf of EU Member States, with non-EU authorities. These cooperation arrangements – taking the form of bilateral Memoranda of	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
				Understanding (MoUs) – provide for cooperation and information sharing mechanisms between EU and non-EU authorities in a wide range of situations (e.g. delegation of investment management to non-EU entities, marketing of non-EU AIFs in France, etc.) including in cases where a passport for non-EU AIFs may apply (its introduction is not expected before the beginning of 2016 at the earliest). These agreements gradually entered into force. In addition, articles 50 and 53 of the AIFM Directive set some general principles of cooperation between competent authorities of EU Member States when carrying out their duties under the AIFM Directive, and in the context of monitoring the potential systemic consequences of AIFM activities. 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: https://www.esma.europa.eu/convergence/i nternational-cooperation	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
3 (3)	Enhancing counterparty risk management	Supervisors should require that institutions which have hedge funds as their counterparties have effective risk management, including mechanisms to monitor the funds' leverage and set limits for single counterparty exposures. (London)	Jurisdictions should indicate specific policy measures taken for enhancing counterparty risk management and strengthening their existing guidance on the management of exposure to leveraged counterparties.	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification:	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
		Supervisors will strengthen their existing guidance on the management of exposures to leveraged counterparties. (Rec. II.17, FSF 2008)	In particular, jurisdictions should indicate whether they have implemented recommendation 3 of the IOSCO Report on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009). In their responses, jurisdictions should not provide information on the portion of this recommendation that pertains to Basel III, since it is monitored separately by the BCBS. Jurisdictions can also refer to Principle 28 of the 2010 IOSCO Objectives and Principles of Securities Regulation, and take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those Principles.	□ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: ☑ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2014 Issue is being addressed through: □ Primary / Secondary legislation ☑ Regulation / Guidelines ☑ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: see below Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: As of the 1st of January 2014, the institutions (in the sense of CRD4) are subject to enhanced counterparty credit risk requirements as specified in the legislative texts transposing Basel III requirements in the European banking legislation (the socalled "CRD IV package"). These texts impose risk management that enable	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				institutions to assess the counterparty risks of exposures at both individual and portfolio levels. It also requires institutions to establish and maintain a comprehensive and effective counterparty credit risk management framework and set internal credit and trading limits. The French Prudential Supervision and Resolution Authority (ACPR) conducts a semi-annual review of French banks' exposures to leverage counterparties based on data provided by banks. Highlight main developments since last	
				year's survey: Web-links to relevant documents:	
				CRR: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:02013 R0575-20130628&from=EN CRD IV: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:176:0338:0436:EN:PDF	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps			
I	II. Securitisation							
4 (4)	Strengthening of 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)	Implementation of this recommendation was reported to be completed by all FSB jurisdictions in the 2016 IMN survey. Given this, the reporting of progress with respect to this recommendation will take place every 2-3 years henceforth					
			(i.e. in 2019 or 2020).					

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
5 Str (5) sup req pra inv	trengthening of appervisory equirements or best ractices for avestment in ructured products	Regulators of institutional investors should strengthen the requirements or best practices for firms' processes for investment in structured products. (Rec II.18, FSF 2008)	Jurisdictions should indicate the due diligence policies, procedures and practices applicable for investment managers when investing in structured finance instruments and other policy measures taken for strengthening best practices for investment in structured finance products. Jurisdictions may reference IOSCO's report on Good Practices in Relation to Investment Managers' Due Diligence When Investing in Structured Finance Instruments (Jul 2009). Jurisdictions may also refer to the Joint Forum report on Credit Risk Transfer-Developments from 2005-2007 (Jul 2008).	□Not applicable □Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: □Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □Draft published as of: □Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: ☑Implementation completed as of: 01.2016 Issue is being addressed through: □Primary / Secondary legislation □Regulation /Guidelines □Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline: EU legislation relating to the (re)insurance sector (Solvency II) introduces requirements on insurers' ability to invest in securitisation, which are consistent with those being introduced in the banking sector. Insurance and reinsurance undertakings investing in securitisation will	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:



1		11. 6	
		all types of 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-	
		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	
		association In the healting asset on The	
		securitisation In the banking sector: The	
		CRD III reinforced the capital requirements	
		for the risks associated with securitisation	
		transactions, particularly when these	
		structures involve several levels of	
		securitisation, and increased the support	
		given to securitisation vehicles. These	
		provisions were implemented in 2011.	
		They are maintained in the CRR, which is	
		now the applicable legal framework. Please	
		now the applicable legal framework. Please	
		note that here Structured Finance	
		Instruments is understood more broadly	
		than securitisation. In the Asset	
		management sector Article 17 of	
		2011/61/EU (AIFM Directive) and articles	
		50 to 53 of the AIFM implementing	
		regulation set requirements for AIF	
		managers investing in securitised products,	
		including the requirement for retained	
		interest by the originator, and qualitative	
		requirements applicable to managers	
		assuming exposure to such products	



	(monitoring of the credit risk of a securitisation position, stress tests).	
	Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
	year's survey: The European Commission adopted on 30 September 2015 a package of two legislative proposals: 1) A Securitisation Regulation that will apply to all securitisations and include due diligence, risk retention and transparency rules together with the criteria for Simple, Transparent and Standardised ("STS") Securitisations. STS criteria are in line with the BCBS-IOSCO principles adopted in July 2015; 2) A proposal to amend the Capital Requirements Regulation to make the capital treatment of securitisations for banks and investment firms more risk-sensitive and able to reflect properly the specific features of STS securitisations. As the prudential treatment of securitisations for insurers is laid down in level 2 texts, future adjustments will come during the second half of 2017. The same applies to banks and investment firms as regards the prudential treatment for liquidity purposes which is included in a Delegated Act that will be amended at a later stage. For insurance sector: Solvency II entered into application on 1 January 2016. In addition,	
	the European Commission adopted on 30 September 2015 a Securitisation Regulation that will apply to all securitisations and	
	include due diligence, risk retention and transparency rules together with the criteria for Simple, Transparent and Standardised	
	("STS") Securitisations. STS criteria are in line with the BCBS-IOSCO principles adopted in July 2015. This Regulation will	
	be followed later this year by an amendment to the prudential treatment of	
	securitisations for insurers in the Delegated Regulation of the Solvency II Directive.	



	Web-links to relevant documents:	
	For insurance sector: http://ec.europa.eu/finance/insurance/solven cy/solvency2/index_en.htm AIFM Directive implementing regulation: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investm ent/docs/20121219-directive/delegated- act_en.pdf IOSCO Final report on the Regulation of Retail Structured Products: http://www.iosco.org/library/pubdocs/pdf ESMA's Opinion "Structured Retail Products - Good practices for product governance arrangements" (27/03/14): https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/fil es/library/2015/11/2014- 332_esma_opinion_u_structured_retail_pro ductsgood_practices_for_product_governance_ arrangements.pdf CRR: http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?qid=1401901268658&ur i=CELEX:32013R0575 AMF Position n° 2010-05 on the marketing of complex financial instruments: http://www.amf- france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doctri ne-list/Doctrine.html?category=IV+- +Commercialisation+- +Relation+client&docld=workspace%3A% 2F%2FSpacesStore%2F8f1c7f9a-90bc- 4afa-94cf-4b5db749a747	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
6 (6)	Enhanced disclosure of securitised products	Securities market regulators should work with market participants to expand information on securitised products and their underlying assets. (Rec. III.10-III.13, FSF 2008)	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures and other initiatives taken in relation to enhancing disclosure of securitised products, including working with industry and other authorities to continue to standardise disclosure templates and considering measures to improve the type of information that investors receive.	□Not applicable □Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: □Implementation ongoing:	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:
			See, for reference, IOSCO's Report on Principles for Ongoing Disclosure for Asset-Backed Securities (Nov 2012), Disclosure Principles for Public Offerings and Listings of Asset-Backed Securities (Apr 2010) and report on Global Developments in Securitisation Regulations	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since:	web mins to relevant documents.
			(November 2012), in particular recommendations 4 and 5.	 ☑ Implementation completed as of: 20.06.2013 Issue is being addressed through:	
				established in the Union shall jointly disclose to the public information on the credit quality and performance of the underlying assets of the structured finance	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				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 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. This also complies with "IOSCO Report on Global Developments in Securitisation Regulation's recommendations" to provide standardisation and transparency of securitisation products to assist investors in making informed decisions (a) by working domestically with other authorities (such as central banks) and (b) by making sure that investors are provided with the necessary information to make an informed investment decision at the point of sale and on an on-going basis.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				As highlighted in the reply to question 5, the Commission adopted on 30 September 2015 a legislative proposal on Securitisation Regulation that will apply to all securitisations and include due diligence, risk retention and transparency rules for all financial sectors. This	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				regulation is still being discussed but should be adopted in 2017.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/3 Securitisation Regulation proposal	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
III.	Enhancing supervision				
7 (7)	Consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of SIFIs	All firms whose failure could pose a risk to financial stability must be subject to consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation with high standards.	Jurisdictions should indicate: (1) whether they have identified domestic SIFIs and, if so, in which sectors (banks, insurers, other etc.); (2) whether the names of the	☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
	regulation of our is	(Pittsburgh)	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.	If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: Implementation ongoing:	Web-links to relevant documents:
			Jurisdictions should not provide details on policy measures that pertain to higher	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	
			loss absorbency requirements for G/D-SIBs, since these are monitored	☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	
			separately by the BCBS.	☐ Draft published as of:	
			See, for reference, the following documents:	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	
			BCBS:	☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since:	
			• Framework for G-SIBs (Jul 2013)	⊠ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2016	
			• Framework for D-SIBs (Oct 2012)	Issue is being addressed through:	
			IAIS:	⊠ Primary / Secondary legislation	
			Global Systemically Important	⊠ Regulation /Guidelines	
			Insurers: Policy Measures (Jul 2013) and revised assessment	Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: see below	
			methodology (updated in June	Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline:	
			• <u>IAIS SRMP guidance - FINAL (Dec 2013)</u>	In the banking sector: all the international requirements applicable to G-SIBs and D-SIBs are part of the EU regulatory framework and have come into force 1st of January 2016. All the G-SIFIs and D-SIFIs are supervised on a	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
			 Guidance on Liquidity management and planning (Oct 2014) FSB: Framework for addressing SIFIs (Nov 2011) 	consistent and consolidated basis. ACPR contributes actively to the Data Gaps Initiative, developed by FSB. French G-SIBs report data to the International Data Hub is managed by the BIS. Solvency II has entered in force and will improve the consolidated supervision of insurance groups on several aspects, and since 2013 the preparation of this new framework has been a priority for ACPR. In the insurance sector, AXA was publicly identified as a GSII. There is a Crisis Management Group, recovery plan, resolution plans, LRMP, SRMP that comply with international standards (FSB / IAIS), but nothing is yet provided in the "hard" French law. Consolidated supervision of AXA is performed by the College of Supervisors —independently of the designation of AXA as GSII.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey: G-SIBs designation by ACPR took place for the 4th consecutive year. The list follows the FSB list and the fully phased-in G-SIB buffers are the same as last year. D-SIBs have also been identified in France for the 2nd year and a D-SIB buffer is applicable to them since 01/01/16. The fully phased-in D-SIB buffers are the same as last year.	
				Web-links to relevant documents: GSIB 2015. http://acpr.banque-france.fr/fileadmin/user_upload/acp/publ ications/registre-officiel/Liste_EISm_2016_au_titre_de-2015.pdf D-SIB 2015. http://acpr.banque-france.fr/fileadmin/user_upload/acp/publ ications/registre-officiel/20161213 Liste_AEIS.PDF	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Methodology for assessing D-SIBs http://acpr.banque-france.fr/fileadmin/user_upload/acp/publ ications/registre-officiel/20161213_methodologie_A-EIS.PDF	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
8 (8)	Establishing supervisory colleges and conducting risk assessments	To establish the remaining supervisory colleges for significant cross-border firms by June 2009. (London) 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 global systemically important insurers (G-SIIs). The BCBS is separately monitoring implementation progress in this area with respect to banks. Please indicate the progress made in establishing and strengthening the functioning of supervisory colleges for G-SIIs, including the development of any joint supervisory plans within core colleges and leveraging on supervisory activities conducted by host authorities. See, for reference, the following IAIS documents: • ICPs 24 and 25, especially guidance 25.1.1 – 25.1.6, 25.6, 25.7 and 25.8 • Application paper on supervisory colleges (Oct 2014)	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: □ Implementation completed as of: January 2014 for the banking sector. January 2016 for the insurance sector. 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: 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	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
				1093/2010) gives EBA a central role in promoting and monitoring colleges of supervisors. More than 100 supervisory colleges are established in the European Economic Area (EEA). Most EEA cross border banking groups had a college of supervisors in place by the end of 2010. The European Commission published two pieces of secondary legislation to complement the rules set out in Directive 2013/36/EU. These two pieces specify the functioning rules of colleges of supervisors. Risk assessments comprise mainly the supervisory review and evaluation process and stress testing, which have a legal basis in the CRD and are carried out based on EBA Guidelines (see point 10 for detailed information). In the insurance sector, EU Solvency 2 Directive, Delegated regulation and EIOPA guidelines provide for the mandatory establishment of colleges of supervisors for international insurance groups. Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Web-links to relevant documents: The RTS specifying the general conditions for the functioning of colleges of supervisors have been published in the OJ: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2016_02 1_R_0002, along with the ITS determining the operational functioning of colleges of supervisors: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2016_02 1_R_0003	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
9 (9)	Description Supervisory exchange of information and coordination	G20/FSB Recommendations 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) Enhance the effectiveness of core supervisory colleges. (FSB 2012)	Jurisdictions should include any feedback received from recent FSAPs/ROSC assessments on the September 2012 BCP 3 (Cooperation and collaboration) and BCP 14 (Homehost relationships). Jurisdictions should also indicate any steps taken since the last assessment in this area, particularly in response to relevant FSAP/ROSC recommendations. 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	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in	Next steps Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
		supervisory colleges. (FSB 2012)	legislative changes that contribute to the sharing of supervisory information (e.g.	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	
				Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline: Between EEA countries, EU directives have established a legal framework for the exchange of information which is mandatory (including colleges of supervisors). For cooperation with other countries, ACPR has also the power to	



conclude bilateral agreements with the authorities of these countries subject to the condition that these authorities are entrusted with duties similar to those entrusted in France to the ACPR and provided that such authorities are themselves bound by an obligation of professional secrecy. In the banking sector: the ACPR has concluded a number of bilateral agreements for banking supervision with non FEA countries, among which Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Quitar, Duthors, and the Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Quitar, Duthors, and the Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Quitar, Duthors, and the Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Quitar, Duthors, and the Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Quitar, Duthors, and the Canada, and the Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Quitar, Duthors, and the Canada, and the Ca	No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
the condition that these authorities are entrusted with duties similar to those entrusted with duties similar to those entrusted in France to the ACPR and provided that such authorities are themselves bound by an obligation of professional secreey. In the banking sector: the ACPR has concluded a number of bilateral agreements for banking supervision with non EEA countries, among which Canada, the U.S. Switzerland, Korea, Qatar, Dubai, Montiengero, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Taïwan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Montery Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solveney II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EFA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group. EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also semenber of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral Molts with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed bilatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination and the formational initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination and the framework of the					conclude bilateral agreements with the	
entrusted with duties similar to those entrusted in France to the ACPR and provided that such authorities are themselves bound by an obligation of professional secrecy. In the banking sector: the ACPR has concluded a number of bilateral agreements for banking supervision with non EEA countries, among which Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Qatar, Dubai, Monténègro, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Tarwan, Morocco, China, Gumea, West African Monetary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisions involved in the supervision of each said international agroup, EIOPA is also signatory of most of coordination Agrangements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signatory of most of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoL9 with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance. Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU, ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
entrusted in France to the ACPR and provided that such authorities are themselves bound by an obligation of professional secrecy. In the banking sector: the ACPR has concluded a number of bilateral agreements for banking supervision with non EEA countries, among which Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Qatar, Dubai, Montenegro, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Taiwan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Monetary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Victnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group, EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs, ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MOL3 with non FEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance. Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international intuitives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
provided that such authorities are themselves bound by an obligation of professional secrecy. In the banking sector: the ACPR has concluded a number of bilaterial agreements for banking supervision with non EEA countries, among which Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Otatra, Dubat' Monténégro, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Tañvan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Monteney Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all FEA and main non EEA supervision of each said international group, EUGPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMOU. ACPR is fally involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination.						
themselves bound by an obligation of professional secrecy. In the banking sector: the ACPR has concluded a number of bilateral agreements for banking supervision with non EEA countries, among which Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Qatar, Dubar, Monténégro, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Tarwan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Monctary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non FEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMOU, ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
professional secrecy. In the banking sector: the ACPR has concluded a number of bilateral agreements for banking supervision with non EEA countries, among which Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Ogatar, Dubar, Monténégro, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Talwan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Monetary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group, EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisors. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisors signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives a simed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
number of bilateral agreements for banking supervision with non EFA countries, among which Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Qatar, Dubaï, Monténégro, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Taïwan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Monetary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all FEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA). APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMOU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					professional secrecy. In the banking	
banking supervision with non EEA countries, among which Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Qatar, Dubai, Monténégro, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Taïwan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Monetary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs, ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa), More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMOU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international intitutives aimed at enhancing supervisor for the						
countries, among which Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Qatar, Dubaï, Monténégro, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Tatwan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Monetary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group, EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signatory of most EEA supervisor without international group in the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is ally involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination in the framework of the						
Switzerland, Kořea, Qatar, Dubař, Monténégro, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Talwan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Monetary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa), More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
Monténégro, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Taïwan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Monetary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Victnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMOU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
Taïwan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Monetary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
African Monetary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMOU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
African Banking Commission, India and Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives a timed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs, ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMOU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					Vietnam. In the insurance sector: for	
ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMOU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					subject to the Solvency II Directive, the	
Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					ACPR, as group supervisor, has	
non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					established a global Coordination	
supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					non FFA supervisors involved in the	
group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of	
has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor of 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					Coordination Agreements for groups	
EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR	
the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					has also signed bilateral MoUs with non	
Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					the New York State Incurrence	
and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the						
IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					countries of West & Central Africa).	
IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					More globally ACPR has also signed the	
aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the					IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in	
coordination. In the framework of the						
					aimed at enhancing supervisory	
AIFM Directive, cooperation between						
EU and non-EU authorities in the						
supervision of alternative investment						



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				fund managers was fostered through ESMA's negotiation of cooperation arrangements with non-EU authorities (bilateral MoUs)	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				https://acpr.banque- france.fr/international/la-cooperation-au- niveau-international/les-accords-de- cooperation.html	
				france.fr/international/la-cooperation-au- niveau-international/les-accords-de-	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
10 (10)	Strengthening resources and effective supervision	We agreed that supervisors should have strong and unambiguous mandates, sufficient independence to act, appropriate resources, and a full suite of tools and powers to proactively identify and address risks, including regular stress testing and early intervention. (Seoul)	Jurisdictions should indicate any steps taken on recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 (i.e. supervisory strategy, engagement with banks, improvements in banks' IT and MIS, data requests, and talent management strategy respectively) in the FSB thematic peer review report on supervisory frameworks and	□Not applicable □Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification:	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
		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)	approaches to SIBs (May 2015). Jurisdictions should also indicate any steps taken or envisaged in terms of resources/expertise, supervisory measures and/or regulation to strengthen the oversight of risks associated with financial innovation (FinTech).	□ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: ☑ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2016 for the insurance sector and 01/01/2014 for the banking sector 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: Insurance Sector: Solvency 2 Directive	
				and delegated regulation, which provide a comprehensive set of rules concerning effective insurance supervision, entered into force on 01.01.2016. This directive has been completed by a number of	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				guidelines. Banking Sector: The EU has put in place a comprehensive set of rules concerning effective supervision. Directive 2013/36/EU provides for the general powers and measures that supervisors shall have (art. 102-104), the power to impose penalties (art. 18 and 64) and the procedure to follow to carry out banks' supervision (art. 97-98). Among the powers entrusted to supervisors, there is the obligation to carry out stress testing at least annually (Art. 100). Primary legislation has been complemented principally by the EBA guidelines on supervisory review and evaluation process, applicable since January 2016.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				For the banks directly supervised by the ECB, the SSM has adopted three high-level priorities to guide its supervision throughout 2017. The aim is to ensure that directly supervised banks address key risks effectively. The priorities are: (i) Business models and profitability drivers, (ii) Credit risk, with a focus on NPLs and concentrations, (iii) Risk management. In addition, all significant institutions in the euro area are assessed against a common yardstick and following a harmonized SREP methodology. Quantitative and qualitative elements were combined through a constrained expert judgement approach, which ensures consistency, avoided supervisory forbearance and accounted for institutions' specificities.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				https://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/10 180/935249/EBA-GL-2014-	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				13+(Guidelines+on+SREP+methodologi es+and+processes).pdf).	
				1 /1 /	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
IV.	Building and implement	ing macroprudential frameworks and too	ls		
11 (11)	Establishing regulatory framework for macroprudential oversight	Amend our regulatory systems to ensure authorities are able to identify and take account of macro-prudential risks across the financial system including in the case of regulated banks, shadow banks and private pools of capital to limit the build up of systemic risk. (London)	Please describe major changes in the institutional arrangements for macroprudential policy (structures, mandates, powers, reporting etc.) that have taken place in your jurisdiction since the global financial crisis.	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification:	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
		Ensure that national regulators possess the powers for gathering relevant information on all material financial institutions, markets and instruments in order to assess the potential for failure or severe stress to contribute to systemic risk. This will be done in close coordination at international level in order to achieve as much consistency as possible across jurisdictions. (London)	Please indicate whether an assessment has been conducted with respect to the adequacy of powers to collect and share relevant information among national authorities on financial institutions, markets and instruments to assess the potential for systemic risk. If so, please describe identified gaps in the powers to collect information, and whether any follow-up actions have been taken.	□ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: ☑ Implementation completed as of: June 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: Macroprudential authority mandate and powers have been set up through primary and secondary legislation, all binding powers are effectively applicable.	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey: Following an assessment: - information collection powers have been further specified and strengthened - binding powers have been extended to cover credit origination by non banks (funds) and to address potential sector wide/systemic developments in the insurance sector Web-links to relevant documents:	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
12 (12)	Enhancing system- wide monitoring and the use of macro-	Authorities should use quantitative indicators and/or constraints on leverage and margins as macro-prudential tools	Please describe at a high level (including by making reference to financial stability or other reports, where available) the	☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
	prudential instruments	for supervisory purposes. Authorities should use quantitative indicators of leverage as guides for policy, both at the institution-specific and at the macroprudential (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,	types of methodologies, indicators and tools used to assess systemic risks. Please indicate the use of tools for macroprudential purposes over the past year, including: the objective for their use; the process to select, calibrate and apply them; and the approaches used to assess their effectiveness. See, for reference, the following	If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	Web-links to relevant documents:
		building on the ongoing work of the FSB-BIS-IMF on this subject. (Cannes)	 FSB-IMF-BIS progress report to the G20 on <u>Macroprudential policy</u> tools and frameworks (Oct 2011) CGFS report on <u>Operationalising</u> 	□ 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:	
		Authorities should monitor substantial changes in asset prices and their implications for the macro economy and the financial system. (Washington)	 the selection and application of macroprudential instruments (Dec 2012) IMF staff papers on Macroprudential policy, an organizing framework (Mar 2011), Key Aspects of Macroprudential policy (Jun 2013), and Staff Guidance on Macroprudential Policy (Dec 2014) IMF-FSB-BIS paper on Elements of 	Dec 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: Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
			Effective Macroprudential		



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
			Policies: Lessons from International Experience (Aug 2016) CGFS report on Experiences with the ex ante appraisal of macroprudential instruments (Jul 2016) CGFS report on Objective-setting and communication of macroprudential policies (Nov 2016)	Web-links to relevant documents:	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
V.	Improving oversight of c	eredit rating agencies (CRAs)			
13 (13)	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 registration. The regulatory oversight regime should be established	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures undertaken for enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs including registration, oversight and sharing of information between national	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been	If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation: Planned actions (if any) and expected
		by end 2009 and should be consistent with the IOSCO Code of Conduct Fundamentals. (London)	authorities. They should also indicate their consistency with the following IOSCO document:	selected, please provide a brief justification:	commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
			• <u>Code of Conduct Fundamentals for</u>	☐ Implementation ongoing:	
		National authorities will enforce compliance and require changes to a	<u>Credit Rating Agencies (Mar 2015)</u> (including on governance, training	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	
		rating agency's practices and procedures for managing conflicts of interest and	and risk management)	☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	
		assuring the transparency and quality of	Jurisdictions may also refer to the following IOSCO documents:	☐ Draft published as of:	
		the rating process.	• Principle 22 of <i>Principles and</i>	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	
		CRAs should differentiate ratings for structured products and provide full	Objectives of Securities Regulation (Jun 2010) which calls for registration	☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since:	
		disclosure of their ratings track record and the information and assumptions that	and oversight programs for CRAs	Implementation completed as of: 20.06.2013	
		underpin the ratings process.	• <u>Statement of Principles Regarding</u>	Issue is being addressed through:	
		The oversight framework should be	the Activities of Credit Rating Agencies (Sep 2003)	☑ Primary / Secondary legislation	
		consistent across jurisdictions with appropriate sharing of information		☐ Regulation / Guidelines	
		between national authorities, including through IOSCO. (London)	• <u>Final Report on Supervisory</u> <u>Colleges for Credit Rating Agencies</u>	☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	
		((Jul 2013) Jurisdictions should take into account the	Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:	
		Regulators should work together towards appropriate, globally compatible solutions (to conflicting compliance	outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those principles.	The AMF is no longer competent as ESMA has exclusive powers for supervision (registration and oversight) of CRAs since entry into force of Regulation 513/2011 (CRA 2). Reform	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
		obligations for CRAs) as early as possible in 2010. (FSB 2009) We encourage further steps to enhance transparency and competition among credit rating agencies. (St Petersburg)		effective with implementation of EU CRA Regulation 1060/2009 (CRA 1), 513/2011 (CRA 2) and lastly of 462/2013 (CRA3) entered into force on 21 May 2013. Starting with CRA 1, reforms in the EU implements regulatory requirements to ensure IOSCO Code of Conduct's main objectives regarding quality and integrity of the rating process, independence and conflicts of interest management/prevention, transparency and timeliness of ratings disclosure, management of confidential information. CRA 2 reinforces enforcement and sanctioning powers (conferred to ESMA). CRA 3 is adding new rules for CRAs, but goes beyond by also introducing measures for actors other than CRAs (notably regarding reduction of reliance on credit ratings and securitisation disclosure).	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey: The AMF still participates in policy developments at ESMA level as a member of the Technical Committee and at IOSCO level as a member of CRA Policy Committee (Committee 6). Hence, as a member of the TC CRA, AMF took notably part to the development of the Guidelines on validation and review of CRAs' methodologies under article 8(3) and 8(5) of the CRA Regulation and the launch of the European Ratings Platform to provide access to free, up-to-date information on credit ratings and rating outlooks. The technical committee is working on the practical supervision of Articles 8c and 8d of the CRA Regulation, this last article aims to increase competition in the markets for	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				credit ratings by encouraging issuers to use smaller credit rating agencies (CRAs) when they use multiple CRAs. As a member of the C6, the AMF has participated to the on-going work on Other CRA Products. The publication of the report is planned for the first half of 2017.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				EU legislation on credit rating agencies: • Text of the Directive: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:320 13L0014&from=EN • http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:320 13R0462&from=EN • http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:282:0023:0026:en:PDF ESMA's guidelines: • https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/files/library/2016- 1575_final_report_on_guidelines_on_the_validation_and_review_of_cras_method ologies_4.pdf European Rating Platform: https://www.google.fr/search?q=%E2%8 0%A2%09https%3A%2F%2Fregisters.es ma.europa.eu%2Fpublication%2Fsearch Register%3Fcore%3Desma_registers_ra dar&sourceid=ie7&rls=com.microsoft:fr -FR:IE- Address&ie=&oe=&gfe_rd=cr&ei=ZnK hWPj-PM7S8AfQwIGYBA&gws_rd=ssl	
				For further information, you can consult the ESMA's supervision of CRA, trade repositories and monitoring of third	
				country central counterparties: https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default /files/library/supervision_annual_report_ 2016_and_work_program_2017_0.pdf IOSCO code/report on CRAs: • Code:	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				https://www.iosco.org/news/pdf/IOSCO NEWS375.pdf • Consultation Report – Other CRA Products https://www.iosco.org/library/pubdocs/p df/IOSCOPD547.pdf	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps		
14 (14)	Reducing the reliance on ratings	We also endorsed the FSB's principles on reducing reliance on external credit ratings. Standard setters, market	Jurisdictions should indicate the steps they are taking to address the recommendations of the May 2014 FSB	☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:		
		participants, supervisors and central banks should not rely mechanistically on external credit ratings. (Seoul) Authorities should check that the roles	thematic peer review report on the implementation of the FSB Principles for Reducing Reliance on Credit Ratings, including by implementing	If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification:	Web-links to relevant documents:		
		that they have assigned to ratings in regulations and supervisory rules are consistent with the objectives of having	that they have assigned to ratings in regulations and supervisory rules are	that they have assigned to ratings in regulations and supervisory rules are consistent with the objectives of having	their <u>agreed action plans</u> . Any revised action plans should be sent to the FSB Secretariat so that it can be posted on the FSB website.	☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	
		risks and perform their own due diligence, and that they do not induce uncritical reliance on credit ratings as a	Jurisdictions may refer to the following documents:	□ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:□ Draft published as of:			
		substitute for that independent evaluation. (Rec IV. 8, FSF 2008)	• FSB Principles for Reducing Reliance on CRA Ratings (Oct 2010)	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in			
		We reaffirm our commitment to reduce authorities' and financial institutions' reliance on external credit ratings, and	• FSB <u>Roadmap for Reducing</u> <u>Reliance on CRA Ratings (Nov</u> 2012)	force since: Implementation completed as of: 06.2013			
		call on standard setters, market participants, supervisors and central	BCBS Consultative Document	Issue is being addressed through: ⊠ Primary / Secondary legislation			
		banks to implement the agreed FSB principles and end practices that rely	Revisions to the Standardised Approach for credit risk (Dec 2015)	☑ Regulation /Guidelines☐ Other actions (such as supervisory			
		mechanistically on these ratings. (Cannes)	 IAIS <u>ICP guidance</u> 16.9 and 17.8.25 IOSCO <u>Good Practices on Reducing</u> 	actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline:			
		We call for accelerated progress by national authorities and standard setting bodies in ending the mechanistic reliance on credit ratings and encourage steps that would enhance transparency of and	Reliance on CRAs in Asset Management (Jun 2015) • IOSCO Sound Practices at Large Intermediaries Relating to the Assessment of Creditworthiness and	At the European level, the "CRA III 3 package" comprised of notably the Directive 2013/14/UE and Regulation N°462/2013 came into force in June 2013. This Regulation provided that financial entities should assess the creditworthiness of the assets or issuers			



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
		competition among credit rating agencies. (Los Cabos) We call on national authorities and standard setting bodies to accelerate progress in reducing reliance on credit rating agencies, in accordance with the FSB roadmap. (St Petersburg)	the Use of External Credit Ratings (Dec 2015).	they invest in and should not overly or mechanistically relies on external credit ratings. At the national level, these regulatory developments led to the following modifications: - the French Monetary and Financial Code – Comofi (article L. 533-10-1) – primary legislation which now mentions that asset managers should not rely exclusively on external ratings provided by CRAs to assess the credit quality of their assets; - the AMF General Regulation (Book III, article 1 and 1bis) section on risk management – to reflect the provisions included in the Comofi; - and the instructions 2011-19, 2011-20, 2011-21, 2011-22, 2011-23 which apply to UCITS, AIFs, employee savings funds, venture capital, real estate funds, private equity funds respectively, where the references to external credit ratings have been removed and replaced by the need for the manager to assess the credit risk of the assets included in the fund portfolio. Finally, the AMF supervision teams have the responsibility to ensure that these changes were duly reflected in the prospectus and legal documentation of the funds. To raise managers' awareness, they have organized a series of calls and meetings sent a letter to trade bodies and developed guidance to accompany asset managers in their efforts in that regard. Highlight main developments since last year's survey: As a member of the TC CRA, the AMF has participated in drafting the report on good supervisory practices for reducing sole and mechanistic reliance on credit ratings by the Joint Committee of the three European Supervisory Authorities	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				(ESMA – EIOPA – EBA). This report is directed at the Sectorial Competent Authorities for a wide range of financial institutions, such as credit institutions, investment firms, asset management companies and insurance undertakings. The purpose of the Report is to provide for a level of cross sectoral consistency in the implementation of elements of the CRA Regulation regarding overreliance on credit ratings. To achieve this, the Report recommends a common framework of non-binding good supervisory practices for SCAs. The supervisory practices are structured into two groups. The first set of good practices proposes a general framework for SCAs with regards to how they should monitor the use of credit ratings by their supervised entities, what alternative and complementary measures are available and how SCAs can address issues of nature, scale and complexity. The second set of good practices provides greater detail on how mechanistic reliance on credit ratings can be addressed within the different business processes of SCAs' supervised entities.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				EU Regulation No 462/2013: http://eurlex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:320 13R0462&from=FR EU Directive 2013/14/UE http://eurlex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:320 13L0014&from=FR Art L533-10-1 of the French Monetary and Financial Code: http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichCodeArticle.do?cidTexte=LEGITEXT00000	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				6072026&idArticle=LEGIARTI0000277	
				94628 AMF General Regulation:	
				http://www.amf- france.org/Reglementation/Reglement-	
				general-et-instructions/Reglement-	
				general-en-vigueur/Reglement-	
				general.html?category=Livre+III+-	
				+Prestataires¤tLivreRG=3 AMF	
				Instruction No 2011-19: http://www.amf-	
				france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doc	
				trine-list/Doctrine.html?category=II+-	
				+Produits+de+placement&docId=worksp	
				ace%3A%2F%2FSpacesStore%2F39201 cb5-fd7b-4826-9b6c-0023dbac0540	
				AMF Instruction No 2011-20:	
				http://www.amf-	
				france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doc	
				trine-list/Doctrine.html?category=II+-	
				+Produits+de+placement&docId=worksp	
				ace%3A%2F%2FSpacesStore%2F00607	
				a73-d096-4172-9847-289099a61eb6 AMF Instruction No 2011-21:	
				http://www.amf-	
				france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doc	
				trine-list/Doctrine.html?category=II+-	
				+Produits+de+placement&docId=worksp	
				ace%3A%2F%2FSpacesStore%2F3ba57	
				388-e504-49a1-978e-189e3d6af277	
				AMF Instruction No 2011-22:	
				http://www.amf- france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doc	
				trine-list/Doctrine.html?category=II+-	
				+Produits+de+placement&docId=worksp	
				ace%3A%2F%2FSpacesStore%2F65c46	
				ccb-9cfb-4543-8e17-d70ca47cfc13	
				AMF Instruction No 2011-23:	
				http://www.amf-	
				france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doc	
				trine-list/Doctrine.html?category=II+-	
				+Produits+de+placement&docId=worksp ace%3A%2F%2FSpacesStore%2Fa031d	
				387-ef15-4ada-a10e-769ccaaa0243	
				Final Report: Good Supervisory	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Practices for Reducing Mechanistic Reliance on Credit Rating https://esas- joint- committee.europa.eu/Publications/Report s/JC%202016%2071%20Final%20Repor t%20Good%20Supervisory%20Practices %20for%20Reducing%20Mechanistic% 20Reliance%20on%20Credit%20Ratings .pdf	

of high-quality accounting standards sectors, 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) Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment of high-quality each of a high and internationally acceptable quality (e.g. equivalent to IFRSs as published by the IASB), and provide accurate and relevant information on financial position and 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/Pagecs/Analysis-of-the-G20-IFRS-profiles.aspx. As part of their response on this recommendation, jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for appropriate application of fair value recognition, measurement and disclosure. In addition, jurisdictions should set out any steps they intend to take (if appropriate) to foster transparent and consistent implementation of the new accounting requirements for the consistent implementation of the consistent sare are set of a high and internationally acceptable to a high and internationally acceptable to a high and internationally acceptable to inches as published as the moment of "Not applicable to a the moment of "Not applicable to "or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment of the moment of the moment of high and internationally acceptable to a published as the moment of the moment of the moment of the moment of high and internationally acceptable to a substitution and regulations guidelines only? Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulations] Daraft in preparation, expected publication by: Daraft in prepar	No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
accounting standards 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) **Summer of the private sector on an ongoing basis to ensure consistent application and enforcement of high-quality accounting standards. (Washington) **Summer of the private sector on an ongoing basis to ensure consistent application and reformance. They should also explain the system they have for enforcement of consistent application of those standards. **Jurisdictions may want to refer to their jurisdiction approach 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. As part of their response on this recommendation, jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for fair value recognition, measurement and disclosure. In addition, jurisdictions should a consistent implementation of the new and well-are the moment **Summer of progress ffor legislation and regulation/guidelines only;** Draft published as of: Implementation oppored and will come into force on: Pinial rule (for part of the reform) in force since: Implementation completed as of: 01.0.2005 10.1.2005 1	VI.	Enhancing and aligning	accounting standards			
consistent implementation of the new accounting requirements for the ACCOUNTING REGULATION IN FRANCE In France, statutory annual financial statements are	VI. 15	Enhancing and aligning Consistent application of high-quality	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.	Jurisdictions should indicate the accounting standards that they follow and whether (and on what basis) they are of a high and internationally acceptable quality (e.g. equivalent to IFRSs as published by the IASB), and provide accurate and relevant information on financial position and 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 . As part of their response on this recommendation, jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for appropriate application of fair value recognition, measurement and disclosure. In addition, jurisdictions should set out any steps they intend to take (if	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: □ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2005 Issue is being addressed through: □ Primary / Secondary legislation □ Regulation /Guidelines □ Other actions (such as supervisory	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
financial assets that are being introduced by the IASP and EASP hyperbolic financial assets that are being introduced by the IASP and EASP hyperbolic financial assets that are being introduced accounting standards (IFRS have not been authorized), which are				indicate the policy measures taken for appropriate application of fair value recognition, measurement and disclosure. In addition, jurisdictions should set out any steps they intend to take (if appropriate) to foster transparent and consistent implementation of the new accounting requirements for the measurement of expected credit losses on	Issue is being addressed through: □ Primary / Secondary legislation □ Regulation /Guidelines □ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: ACCOUNTING REGULATION IN FRANCE In France, statutory annual financial statements are prepared in accordance with French accounting standards (IFRS have	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
			See, for reference, the following BCBS documents: • Supervisory guidance for assessing banks' financial instrument fair value practices (Apr 2009) • Guidance on credit risk and accounting for expected credit losses (Dec 2015)	Consolidated financial statements are prepared according to French accounting standards or IFRS, depending on whether the company is listed on a regulated market or not: IFRS are applicable to consolidated financial statements of publicly traded companies on a regulated market. This results from the European IAS regulation 1606/2002. In addition, France also authorises (on the basis of the option provided by the European Regulation) other companies to establish their consolidated financial statements under IFRS. The Autorité des Normes Comptables (ANC), the French accounting standard setter, was created by Ordinance in January 2009 and its missions relate both to French accounting standards, ANC is responsible for establishing the authoritative accounting regulations applicable to: • French entities issuing statutory accounts: businesses of all size, banks, insurance, asset management entities, associations (not-for-profit), trade unions, cooperatives • Consolidated accounts of French groups that are not subject to the European IFRS Regulation (not listed on a regulated market). There are three tiers of authoritative sources in French accounting standards: 1) the legal level (limited and general), 2) the regulatory level (detailed, decided at ANC's Board level, enforceable following official publication by Minister's decision),	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				3) The commentary level (more detailed, decided at ANC's Board level, guidance nature, currently under review). With regards to international standards, ANC is	
				Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:	
				participating in international and European debates/negotiations relating to IFRS. Pursuant to the Maystadt reform (2014), ANC is a member of the European Financial Reporting Advisory Group (EFRAG), providing support and expertise to the EU Commission in the assessment of the endorsement of IFRS. ANC is represented at each of the 3 tiers of the EFRAG's governance (General Assembly, Board, Technical Expert Group). ANC is also the supporting advisor of the French government to the ARC (Accounting Regulatory Committee). ANC is shaped as a platform to gather all different views in relation to the IFRS. ANC's positions supported by all interested French stakeholders reflect the general interest and answer to the various consultations of the IASB, IFRIC or IFRS Foundation (Discussion Papers, Exposure Drafts). ANC has been a member of the Accounting Standards Advisory Forum (ASAF) of IASB since July 2015. ASAF	
				is the advisory forum gathering the 12 main accounting standards setting players (national and regional) organised	
				by the IASB and meeting every three months. ANC also regularly liaises with other accounting national standards-	
				setters (NSS) through international accounting bodies related to the IFRS Foundation (International Forum of	
				Accounting Standards Setters, World	



s also building vith other rope (US, Australia). relationships w of views on major ds, governance t to stimulate
rope (US, Australia). relationships w of riews on major ds, governance to stimulate
Australia). relationships w of views on major ds, governance to stimulate
relationships w of views on major ds, governance to stimulate
w of views on major ds, governance to stimulate
views on major ds, governance to stimulate
ds, governance to stimulate
to stimulate
to stilluate
iate. As
NC actively
preparation of
n IFRS 9, the
instruments
's assessment
ed analysis of
ncluding
sideration
sion. Among
nterrelationship
ew expected fair value,
US-GAAP and
ional criteria
tadt report)
ssessing
is conducive to
the new
ger financial
er the
the Union.
nd financing
tters in order to
sitions. Since
cing more than
ojects
ANC organises Accounting
sium was held
Paris and its
and
is a member of
is of the



	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
		French National Standard Setter. The	
		AMF also actively participates in ESMA	
		and IOSCO working groups, the roles of	
		which are to analyse and comment the	
		IASB's proposals. The AMF serves as	
		observer representing IOSCO on the	
		IFRS Interpretation Committee. As chair	
		of the group European Enforcers	
		Coordination Sessions (EECS) since	
		August 2016 and chair of the IFRS PG	
		(permanent group preparing the comment letters to IASB/EFRAG	
		namely) at ESMA, the AMF also participates in bilateral meetings on	
		accounting issues between ESMA, and	
		the IASB, the large audit firms. As a	
		stakeholder in the development of high-	
		quality standards, the ACPR and Banque	
		de France -namely through the Basel	
		Committee (BCBS) and the International	
		Association of Insurance Supervisors	
		(IAIS)- closely monitored the IASB	
		works relating to its project on financial	
		instruments review as well as on	
		insurance contracts in order to achieve	
		the G20 recommendations of April 2009.	
		In particular, the ACPR answered to	
		consultation papers relating to IFRS 9	
		(financial instruments) and IFRS 4	
		(insurance contract). Moreover at each	
		year-end, ANC, ACPR and AMF	
		participate in the annual meetings	
		organised by audit firms with a view to	
		encourage auditors to pay special	
		attention to some important accounting issues for the year end consolidated	
		accounts, prepared under IFRS by the	
		major banking and insurance groups, and	
		to ensure consistent application of	
		accounting standards. ENFORCEMENT	
		The preparation, publication and audit of	
		statutory and consolidated financial	
		statements is generally required by law	



for private entities exceeding a certain threshold. Those legal requirements concur to a consistent application of accounting standards as well as the enhancement of the business security. Compliance with French GAAP is enforceable before the Commercial Court. Enforcement of accounting standards against listed companies is done by National Market Authorities (AMF in France) and coordinated by the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA). The AMF also chairs the IFRS Project Group within the Corporate Reporting Standing Committee of ESMA, which is the group mandated to follow regulatory developments in the EU in the field of accounting and auditing. The IFRS PG is in charge of preparing comment letters to IASB and EFRAG projects. Through this group, ESMA contributes to the issuance of relevant and enforceable
standards by the IASB. AMF is also an active member of the ESMA, EECS group. Via EECS, ESMA fosters technical discussions on situations dealing with the application of IFRS which NCAs encounter in their review work on issuers' financial statements. The aim is to build a common understanding of how the accounting standards should be applied to specific situation. A sub-group of the EECS (AMF is also a member of this group), "EECS financial instruments" has been especially tasked with the accounting treatment of financial instruments by banks. In addition, the AMF publishes annually recommendations for financial
statements. These recommendations are aligned with the "Common Enforcement Priorities" set annually by ESMA to

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				promote consistent application of IFRS throughout the EU. ESMA has set in place a reporting from NCAs on topics selected as common enforcement priorities in order to assess whether listed entities comply, at European level, with the standards. It also allows to monitor the enforcement actions taken by NCAs on these topics.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Continued close technical dialogues between ANC and the international accounting standard setters (IASB, IFRS IC), the European bodies (EFRAG, ARC) and the European regulators (ESMA, EBA, EIOPA) on ongoing projects and enhancement of international accounting standards, especially regarding the endorsement of IFRS 9 (Financial instruments) and IFRS 16 (Leases) and the preparation of IFRS 17 (insurance contracts). ANC also held its 6th annual Symposium with the French and international Accounting Community. AMF published its yearend recommendations focussing mainly on performance and new standards. AMF also published specific recommendations on the journey to IFRS 9 and information to be given to the market during that period.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://www.anc.gouv.fr/cms/sites/anc/acc ueil/recherche/etats-generaux-de-la- recherche-c/6emes-etats-generaux 2016.html http://www.anc.gouv.fr/cms/sites/anc/acc ueil/normes-internationales/historique- des-	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				positions.default.html?displayTab=2016	
				α	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VII.	Enhancing risk manager	nent			
16 (16)	Enhancing guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, including on liquidity and foreign currency funding risks	Regulators should develop enhanced guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, in line with international best practices, and should encourage financial firms to re-examine their internal controls and implement strengthened policies for sound risk management. (Washington) National supervisors should closely check banks' implementation of the updated guidance on the management and supervision of liquidity as part of their regular supervision. If banks' implementation of the guidance is inadequate, supervisors will take more prescriptive action to improve practices. (Rec. II.10, FSF 2008) Regulators and supervisors in emerging markets ² will enhance their supervision of banks' operation in foreign currency funding markets. (FSB 2009)	Jurisdictions should indicate the measures taken in the following areas: • guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, including BCBS good practice documents (Corporate governance principles for banks, External audit of banks, and the Internal audit function in banks); • measures to monitor and ensure banks' implementation of the BCBS Principles for Sound Liquidity Risk Management and Supervision (Sep 2008); • measures to supervise banks' operations in foreign currency funding markets;¹ and • extent to which they undertake stress tests and publish their results. Jurisdictions should not provide any updates on the implementation of Basel III liquidity requirements (and other recent standards such as capital	□ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: □ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2014 Issue is being addressed through: □ Primary / Secondary legislation □ Regulation /Guidelines □ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:

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

² 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
No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations We commit to conduct robust, transparent stress tests as needed. (Pittsburgh)	Remarks requirements for CCPs), since these are monitored separately by the BCBS.	Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The Basel III agreement 2008 are implemented into EU law by the CRD IV Package which is made up of a Directive (Directive 2013/36/EU and a Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 575/2013 These prudential rules introduced in the two legislative texts have been applied since 1 January 2014. In particular, both texts contain provisions strengthening the requirements regarding risk management practices, including the management of liquidity risks, of credit institutions and	Next steps
				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 address any situations of non-compliance. Other Regulations complementing the CRDIV package have been adopted, amongst which a Commission Implementing Regulation on additional liquidity monitoring	
				metrics that entered into force in March 2016. In December 2013, EBA adopted guidelines on Pillar 2 capital measures for lending in foreign currencies. These guidelines, incorporated in those related to SREP, 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	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				lending risk is deemed to be material and	
				where capital measures are deemed to be	
				an appropriate method of treating this	
				risk. În December 2014, EBA published	
				Guidelines on common procedures and	
				methodologies for the supervisory	
				review and evaluation process (SREP) (EBA/GL/2014/13). These Guidelines	
				aim to provide supervisory authorities with a common European framework for	
				SREP and risk assessment under Pillar 2.	
				These guidelines explain how to assess	
				the various risks to which banks are	
				exposed, including FX lending and	
				liquidity risks, as well as the governance	
				and internal control framework of banks	
				for identifying, managing, monitoring	
				risks. These guidelines entered into force	
				in January 2016. The provisions of the	
				Regulation on liquidity coming from the	
				Regulation (EU) No 575/2013 have been	
				complemented by the adoption of the	
				Commission Delegated Regulation (EU)	
				No 2015/61 of 10 October 2014 to	
				supplement Regulation (EU) 575/2013	
				with regard to liquidity coverage	
				requirement for credit institutions that	
				specifies the method of calculation of the	
				LCR and that entered into force in	
				October 2015 and by the adoption of the Commission Implementing Regulation	
				(EU) 2016/313 of 1 March 2016	
				amending Implementing Regulation	
				(EU) No 680/2014 with regard to	
				additional monitoring metrics for	
				liquidity reporting that entered into force	
				in March 2016. Highlight main	
				developments since last year's survey:	
				The EBA published on 3 November	
				2016 Guidelines on ICAAP and ILAAP	
				information. These Guidelines introduce	
				a common approach and specify what	
				information regarding ICAAP and	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				ILAAP Competent Authorities should collect from institutions in order to perform their assessments of ICAAP and ILAAP frameworks as well as the reliability of ICAAP and ILAAP capital and liquidity estimates in a consistent manner following the criteria specified in the EBA SREP Guidelines. In 2016, EBA has issued Guidelines on communication between competent authorities and auditors (EBA/GL/2016/05) in order to facilitate an effective dialogue. ACPR has already started to implement these guidelines and has declared to be compliant in January 2017. In both sectors, stress tests are regularly carried out, through in particular coordinated exercises, at the EU level, by the 2 relevant authorities, the EIOPA and EBA. This was the case in 2016. The outcome of the EBA' stress tests (covering 51 banks - including 6 French ones, all supervised by the ECB/SSM-) were published in July 2016; the results of EIOPA's stress tests (236 firms, including 17 French ones) were published in December 2016. In 2017, EBA has started to review its methodology in view of the next European-wide exercise (2018). Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Web-links to relevant documents: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32013L0 036 Regulation (EU) No 575/2013	
				http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32013R0 575 Commission Delegated Regulation on the LCR: http://eur-	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1458140192307& uri=CELEX:32015R0061 Commission Implementing Regulation on Additional Liquidity Monitoring Metrics: http://eurlex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32016R0313 EBA Guidelines on SREP http://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/10180/935249/EBA-GL-2014-13+%28Guidelines+on+SREP+methodologies+and+processes%29.pdf EBA Guidelines on ICAAP and ILAAP: https://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/10180/1645611/Final+report+on+Guidelines+on+ICAAP+ILAAP+%28EBA-GL-2016-10%29.pdf https://www.eba.europa.eu/regulation-and-policy/accounting-and-auditing/guidelines-on-communication-between-competent-authorities-and-auditors stress test/EIOPA https://eiopa.europa.eu/pages/financial-stability-and-crisis-prevention/stress-test-2016.aspx EBA stress test: http://www.eba.europa.eu/risk-analysis-and-data/eu-wide-stress-testing/2016	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
17 (17)	Enhanced risk disclosures by financial institutions	Financial institutions should provide enhanced risk disclosures in their reporting and disclose all losses on an ongoing basis, consistent with	Jurisdictions should indicate the status of implementation of the disclosures requirements of IFRSs (in particular IFRS 7 and 13) or equivalent.	☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
		international best practice, as appropriate. (Washington)	Jurisdictions may also use as reference the recommendations of the October 2012 report by the Enhanced Disclosure	If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification:	Web-links to relevant documents:
		We encourage further efforts by the public and private sector to enhance financial institutions' disclosures of the risks they face, including the ongoing work of the Enhanced Disclosure Task Force. (St. Petersburg)	Task Force on Enhancing the Risk <u>Disclosures of Banks</u> and <u>Implementation Progress Report by</u> <u>the EDTF (Dec 2015)</u> , and set out any steps they have taken to foster adoption of the EDTF Principles and Recommendations.	☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of:	
		Toree. (St. Tetersourg)	In addition, in light of the new IASB and FASB accounting requirements for expected credit loss recognition, jurisdictions should set out any steps they intend to take (if appropriate) to foster disclosures needed to fairly depict a bank's exposure to credit risk, including its expected credit loss estimates, and to provide relevant information on a bank's underwriting practices. Jurisdictions may use as reference the recommendations in the report by the Enhanced Disclosure Task Force on the <i>Impact of Expected Credit Loss Approaches on Bank Risk Disclosures (Nov 2015)</i> , as well as the recommendations in Principle 8 of the BCBS <i>Guidance on credit risk and</i>	□ 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: 01.01.2013 and 01.01.2016 for insurance sector 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: Banking sector - Pillar 3 At an international level, the ACPR is still	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
			accounting for expected credit losses (Dec 2015)	deeply involved in the ongoing work undertaken by the BCBS in order to enhance the "Pillar 3" framework, while maintaining the "Pillar 3" as a single and coherent package. As a result of this work a 1rst revision of the standard of Pillar 3 was published in January 2015, focused in particular on the enhancement of transparency of risk weighted assets. Regarding EDTF recommendations, the ACPR focused rather on the BCBS standard, which, while recognizing that the scope and objective of the EDTF (Enhanced Disclosure Task Force) differed from that of "Pillar 3", has carefully considered EDTF recommendations when developing its proposals and incorporated, where relevant, the recommendations made by EDTF. A second document was published for consultation in April 2016 with the revised Pillar 3 standard to be published soon and a 3rd revision of the standard is in development. The ACPR participated in the European implementation of the Phase I of the BCBS revised Pillar 3 standard, published in January 2015, through the elaboration of EBA guidelines published in December 2016 to supplement the part 8 of the CRR on Pillar 3 disclosures. The ACPR contributed also to the European implementation of the BCBS Guidance on credit risk and accounting for expected credit losses published in December 2015 including the recommendations in Principle 8 through its participation to the drafting of the EBA guidelines which are going to be published during S1 2017. Insurance sector For ease of reference, Solvency 2 has entered into force January, 1st 2016. Pillar 3 of Solvency 2 requires from	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				insurers to publicly disclose the risks they face, included in narrative report (SFCR). Under Solvency II, prudential information will start to be publicly disclosed in 2017 (based on 2016 figures). To be noted that SFCR will not be audited nor reviewed by statutory auditors. Besides, in September 2015, EIOPA released its Guidelines on reporting and public disclosure. The Board of the ACPR decided, at a meeting held on 22 October 2015, to comply with all the requirements included in these guidelines through the issuance on the ACPR website of three documents: - «Notice Solvabilité II - Communication d'informations à l'autorité de contrôle et informations à destination du public (RSR / SFCR)»; - «Notice - Solvabilité II - Système de gouvernance »; - «Communication d'informations narratives Solvabilité II».	
				https://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/10 180/1696202/Final+report+on+the+Guid elines+on+disclosure+requirements+und er+Part+Eight+of+Regulation+575+201 3+%28EBA-GL-2016-11%29.pdf https://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/10 180/1532063/EBA-CP-2016-10+%28CP+on+Guidelines+on+Account ing+for+Expected+Credit%29.pdf/33a54 bcc-f462-4749-a982-5a53bb3e8c03 In their reviews, AMF closely reviews the disclosures provided by financial institutions on IFRS 13 and IFRS 7. AMF is currently participating to an ESMA review of the IFRS 13 application. Regarding IFRS 9, AMF issued in October a recommendation underlining the elements to be taken into account during the first application of the	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				standard and encouraging issuers to provide detailed disclosures (quantitative and qualitative) on its impact. AMF will follow the application of its recommendation and the disclosures given.	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps	
VIII.	Strengthening deposit in	surance				
18 (18)	Strengthening of national deposit insurance arrangements	National deposit insurance arrangements should be reviewed against the agreed international principles, and authorities	Jurisdictions that have not yet adopted an explicit national deposit insurance system should describe their plans to introduce	☐ 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)	I clich a cyclem	any significant design changes in their national deposit insurance system since the issuance of the revised IADI <u>Core</u>	If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification:	Web-links to relevant documents:
			Principles for Effective Deposit Insurance Systems (November 2014).	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:		
			In addition, jurisdictions should indicate if they have carried out a self-assessment	☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:		
		of compliance with the revised Core	☐Draft published as of:			
			Principles:If so, jurisdictions should	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:		
			highlight the main gaps	☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since:		
			identified and the steps proposed to address these gaps;	Implementation completed as of: 03.07.2015		
			If not, jurisdictions should	Issue is being addressed through:		
			indicate any plans to undertake a	⊠Primary / Secondary legislation		
			self-assessment exercise.	☐ Regulation / Guidelines		
				☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:		
				Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:		
				The French Deposit Guarantee Scheme is already largely in line with the IADI Principles (latest change to regulations in September 2010). France has an explicit scheme managed by an autonomous structure (Fonds de Garantie		



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				des Dépôts - FGD). This scheme is	
				compulsory for all banks licensed in	
				France (Art. L. 312-14, Monetary and	
				Financial Code). In addition to payout,	
				the FGD can take preventative action,	
				including the granting of liquidity lines	
				or guarantees and the purchase of shares in a credit institution. The FGD is	
				governed by a supervisory board made of	
				elected representatives of the banking	
				sector. The Chairperson of the Executive	
				board has a specific agreement by the	
				Ministry of Finance. Laws and	
				regulations clearly define eligible	
				deposits: up to a limit of EUR 100 000	
				per person and per institution, the FGD	
				guarantees both on demand and time	
				deposits in the currencies of the	
				European Economic Area for both residents and non-residents. Non-	
				financial companies are covered, but not	
				banks, other non-bank financial	
				companies, government and central	
				administrative authorities. It is funded by	
				ex-ante risk-based premiums levied from	
				banks and taking into account the level	
				of eligible deposits. The FGD can also	
				borrow and raise additional premiums.	
				Payout is triggered by the supervisor	
				(ACP) and should occur within 20 to 30	
				days. The FGD has access to deposit data	
				upon a request to intervene.	
				Communication to the public includes an	
				FGD website and information provided	
				by banks. The FGD is subrogated in the	
				rights of the beneficiaries of its	
				intervention (Article L312-6) and thus	
				shares in the proceeds of recoveries from	
				the estate of the failed bank. The FGD	
				may bring any action for damages	
				against the de facto and de jure	
				executives of the institutions it intervenes	
				in to secure repayment of some or all of	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				the sums it has paid (Article L.312-6). Finally, its mission had been reinforced since the FGD has become the French Resolution Fund (FGDR, Fonds de garantie des dépôts et de résolution) on 26 July 2013. Act n° 2013-672 of 26 July 2013 of banking separation and regulation gave it the capacity to intervene in resolution with new tools. 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 should be transposed by the Member States by 3 July 2015. The main modifications which have been carried out to French scheme in accordance to this directive relate to: - the funding of the FGDR; - the shortening to 7 days of legal proceedings for payout; - the extension of covered deposit to funds left in account in any currency; - the ability to conclude written cooperation agreements with other scheme given to FGDR. Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Web-links to relevant documents: Relevant provisions of the Monetary and Financial Code (in French): http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichCode.do;jsessionid=E7C20F10DC9F933ADDCD0870D1D66A42.tpdjo12v1?idSectionTA=LEGISCTA000006170368&cidTexte=LEGITEXT000006072026&dateTexte=20130428DGSDirective published in the OJ on 12/6/2014: http://eurlex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014L0049&from=EN	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
IX.	Safeguarding the integri	ty and efficiency of financial markets			
			Jurisdictions should indicate whether high frequency trading and dark pools exist in their national markets. Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the recommendations: • in relation to dark liquidity, as set out in the IOSCO Report on Principles for Dark Liquidity (May 2011). • on the impact of technological change in the IOSCO Report on Regulatory Issues Raised by the Impact of Technological Changes on Market Integrity and Efficiency (Oct 2011). • on market structure made in the IOSCO Report on Regulatory issues raised by changes in market structure (Dec 2013).	Progress to date □ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: MiFID 2 (Revised Markets in Financial Instruments Directive) was approved on 15 of April 2014 and will come into force on January 2017 - 1 year delay still under discussion - and 3 July 2016 for Market Abuse Regulation). □ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: □ Implementation completed as of:	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
				Issue is being addressed through:	
				☐ Regulation / Guidelines	
				☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	

Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:
MiFID 2 aims at limiting dark trading and other broker crossing networks by
setting a trading obligation for equities and by framing more strictly the waivers
to pre-trade transparency for equity instruments. MiFID 2 also includes
measures to address the risks posed by high frequency trading: firstly
organisational requirements for trading venues and investment firms requiring
effective systems and controls (for example "circuit breakers") and specific
record keeping for high frequency trading; secondly a dynamic tick size
regime enabling regulators to control
high frequency trading activity through constraints on tick size. The Market
Abuse Regulation (MAR) will also increase the transparency and integrity of
the derivatives and the commodity derivatives markets including OTC
transactions.
Highlight main developments since last year's survey:
Web-links to relevant documents:
MiFID 2 (level 1) http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal-
content/FR/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L201 4.173.01.0349.01.FRA http://eur-
lex.europa.eu/legal- content/FR/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L .201
4 .173.01.0084.01.FRA Delegated directive (level 2)
http://ec.europa.eu/finance/securities/isd/mifid2/index_en.htm_MAR: http://eur-
lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R0
596 Criminal Sanctions for Market
Abuse Directive http://eur-



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014L0	
				057	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
No 20 (20)	Description 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 ex-ante 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	Remarks 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.	Progress to date □ Not applicable □ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: □ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □ Draft published as of: □ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: 03.01.2018 (MIFID2 and 03.07.2016 (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	Next steps Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
		for the regulation and supervision on		⊠ Primary / Secondary legislation	
				revised MiFID, alongside with the revised Market Abuse Directive (MAD) aims at ensuring enhanced market transparency and integrity for commodity derivatives markets. In	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Europe, MiFID 2 introduces position reporting and position limits both on listed and OTC derivatives, in order to prevent market abuse and support orderly pricing and settlement conditions. MIFID 2 also introduced an ancillary activity exemption. MAD extends and adjusts the market abuse regime for commodity markets, in particular, towards market abuses across spot and financial markets. In France, the 2013 Banking law has already transposed by anticipation these tools for agricultural commodity derivatives. Highlight main developments since	
				Institute that developments since last year's survey: RTS 20 and RTS 21 have been endorsed by the EC, and have not been opposed by the Council and the Parliament, after much discussion. Web-links to relevant documents: French banking law (July 2013): http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichText	
				e.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT00002775453 http://ec.europa.eu/finance/securities/docs/isd/mifid/its-rts-overview-table_en.pdf (RTS 20 and 21)	



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

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
X.	Enhancing financial con	sumer protection			
			Jurisdictions should describe progress toward implementation of the OECD's G-20 high-level principles on financial consumer protection (Oct 2011). Jurisdictions may also refer to OECD's September 2013 and September 2014 reports on effective approaches to support the implementation of the Highlevel Principles. The effective approaches are of interest across all financial services sectors – banking and credit; securities; insurance and pensions – and consideration should be given to their cross-sectoral character when considering implementation. Jurisdictions should, where necessary, indicate any changes or additions that have been introduced as a way to support the implementation of the High-level Principles, to address particular national terminology, situations or determinations.	□Not applicable □Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification: □Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: □Draft in preparation, expected publication by: □Draft published as of: □Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: □Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: ☑Implementation completed as of: 2012 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: Insurance Distribution Directive (ex.	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
				"Insurance Mediation Directive") The Insurance Distribution Directive (IDD) aims at deepening the internal market in insurance distribution and provides for a	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				more effective protection of consumers when purchasing insurance products. Further rules are expected to specify the principles laid down in the Directive, and Technical Advice by EIOPA is expected on these points by February 2017. 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 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:	
				We stress that all developments outlined below constitute a progress in France's regulatory framework and underscore the full implementation of recommendation 22 as was the case in the 2016 survey. France has transposed into French law legal provision of Directive 2014/17/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 February 2014 on credit agreements for consumers relating to residential immovable property and amending Directives 2008/48/EC and	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				2013/36/EU and Regulation (EU) No	
				1093/2010. All implemented provisions	
				were published. The European commission was informed. France has	
				transposed into French law legal	
				2014/92/EU of the European Parliament	
				and of the Council of 23 July on the	
				comparability of fees related to payment	
				accounts, payment account switching and	
				access to payment accounts with basic	
				features –the Payment Accounts	
				Directive (PAD or 'the Directive'). All	
				implemented provisions were published.	
				The European commission was informed. The transparency, anti-	
				corruption and economic modernsiation	
				bill, published in december 2016,	
				contains measures for modernising the	
				economy while adequately protecting	
				investors and consumers: i) enhances	
				financial stability and the protection of	
				citizens with savings by expanding the	
				powers of the financial regulatory authorities; ii) establishes a prudential	
				regime for retirement insurance policies	
				while maintaining the current level of	
				protection for the insured; status as of	
				may 19th 2017: the drafting of the legal	
				and regulatory implementation	
				framework (ordinances and decrees) has	
				been finalized and is under publication	
				process. iii) prohibites advertising by	
				online platforms that offer high-risk financial instruments; status as of may	
				19th 2017: implementation complete as	
				of dec 15th 2016 with the adoption of	
				new article 314-31-1 of the AMF	
				General Rules. Mmoreover the AMF has	
				published in january a FAQ to clarify the	
				extent of these measures to the public.	
				iv) supports the expansion of new means	
				of payment by creating a level	
				competitive playing-field for all	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				categories of payment service providers. Status as of may 19th 2017: Trasposition in French law of european directive n° 2015/2366 is mandated before 13 january. We anticipate to achieve that legislative process by end summer or fall 2017.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	



Source of recommendations XI.

Hangzhou: G20 Leaders' Communique (4-5 September 2016)

Antalya: G20 Leaders' Communique (15-16 November 2015)

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)

List of abbreviations used XII.