Jurisdiction: Indonesia

2015 IMN Survey of National Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
I.	**Hedge funds**				
1 (2)	Registration, appropriate disclosures and oversight of hedge funds	We also firmly recommitted to work in an internationally consistent and non-discriminatory manner to strengthen regulation and supervision on hedge funds. (Seoul) 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)	Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the high level principles contained in IOSCO's *Report on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009)*. In particular, jurisdictions should specify whether: - Hedge Funds (HFs) and/or HF managers are subject to mandatory registration - Registered HF managers are subject to appropriate ongoing requirements regarding: • Organisational and operational standards; • Conflicts of interest and other conduct of business rules; • Disclosure to investors; and • Prudential regulation.	☑ **Not applicable** Currently there is no hedge fund and/or hedge fund managers domiciled locally in Indonesia. ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress :* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☐ **Implementation completed as of:** **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:** **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** Based on the existing regulatory framework, Asset Management Companies (AMC) are only permitted to	**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
				manage investment products that are regulated by OJK (products must be registered and AMC must submit report to OJK). Currently there is no registered fund that has characteristic of a hedge fund domiciled locally in Indonesia. Despite this fact, to anticipate further development in the Indonesian capital market, OJK is currently conducting a research on hedge funds. This research includes comparative analysis of the practices applied across countries by also considering regulations applied by other financial sectors in Indonesia. **Web-links to relevant documents:** **Additional questions:** **1. Please indicate whether Hedge Funds (HFs) are domiciled locally and, if available, the size of the industry in terms of Assets under Management and number of HFs.** There is no Hedge Fund domiciled in Indonesia. **2. Please specify the main criteria and numerical thresholds (if applicable) for subjecting HFs and/or HF managers to mandatory registration.** Not applicable. **3. Please specify whether**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				registered HF managers are subject to ongoing requirements regarding organisational and operational standards; conflicts of interest and other conduct of business rules; disclosure to investors; and prudential regulation. If any of these requirements are not applicable, please explain. There is no Registered Hedge Fund and/ or HF manager in Indonesia. **4. Please describe the main challenges (where relevant) and any lessons learned in implementing this reform.** We cannot share a relevant challenge since there is no Hedge Fund manager registered in Indonesia. 5. **Are you monitoring the effects of this reform in your jurisdiction? If yes, please share the main findings and any related policy initiatives in response to those findings.** No.	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
2 (3)	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 the high level principles in IOSCO's *Report on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009)* on sharing information to facilitate the oversight of globally active fund managers. In addition, jurisdictions should state whether they are: - Signatory to the IOSCO MMoU - Signatory to bilateral agreements for supervisory cooperation that cover hedge funds and are aligned to the 2010 IOSCO *Principles Regarding Cross-border Supervisory Cooperation.*	☑ **Not applicable** This recommendation is not applicable for Indonesia because currently there is no hedge funds domiciled in Indonesia. For sharing information, OJK became the signatory of the IOSCO MMoU on cooperation and exchange of information among securities regulators, effectively started in January 2014. In addition, the OJK also has several bilateral MoUs with foreign counterparts that have been carried over from Bapepam-LK (a former authority of capital market and NBFIs before it was transferred to the OJK). ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☐ **Implementation completed as of:** **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation /Guidelines	**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
				☐ 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:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
3 (4)	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) Supervisors will strengthen their existing guidance on the management of exposures to leveraged counterparties. (Rec. II.17, FSF 2008)	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. In particular, jurisdictions should indicate whether they have implemented principle 2.iii of IOSCO *Report on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009)*. Jurisdictions should also indicate the steps they are taking to implement the new standards on equity exposures *(Capital requirements for banks' equity investments in funds, Dec 2013)* by 1 January 2017. For further reference, see also the following documents : • BCBS *Sound Practices for Banks' Interactions with Highly Leveraged Institutions (Jan 1999)* • BCBS *Banks' Interactions with Highly Leveraged Institutions (Jan 1999)*	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** 25/10/2011 **Issue is being addressed through :** ☑ Primary / Secondary legislation ☑ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: A regulation concerning limits for single counterparty exposures has been effectively implemented for banks. The regulation governs the maximum limit related with the provision of funds to individuals, groups of borrowers and related parties with banks. The purpose of the limits is to avoid a bank's failures as a result of concentration in the provision of funds. The regulation itself	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				seeks to address: i. The concentration of banks' fund to a single borrower or a group of borrowers (this is one of the causes of bank failures). ii. The provision of funds with increasingly complex risk structures (as a result of innovations in the banking area). Furthermore, a regulation concerning risk management, in general, has captured elements that should be considered by banks for their interactions with counterparties. In addition, through another regulation, banks are prohibited to conduct transactions with counterparties where the transaction has no underlying or the transaction is conducted for speculation purposes. There are also limitations of the transactions' underlying, i.e. the underlying must not in the forms of equity and commodity. **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:** **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** Even though the size of derivative transactions in Indonesia is small with limited types of asset classes that can be transacted by banks, the authority is now preparing a consultative paper regarding	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				the calculation of risk weight for counterparty credit risk in line with Basel III capital framework. The consultative paper is planned to be published at the end of this year. With regard to hedge fund, currently there is no hedge fund domiciled locally in Indonesia. Despite this fact, to anticipate further development in the Indonesian capital market, OJK is currently conducting a research on hedge funds. This research includes comparative analysis of practices applied across countries by also considering regulations applied by other financial sectors in Indonesia. **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
II. Securitisation					
4 (6)	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)	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for strengthening the regulatory and capital framework for monolines. See, for reference, the following principles issued by IAIS: • *ICP 13* – Reinsurance and Other Forms of Risk Transfer; • *ICP 15* – Investments; and • *ICP 17* - Capital Adequacy. Jurisdictions may also refer to: • IAIS *Guidance paper on enterprise risk management for capital adequacy and solvency purposes (Oct 2008).* • Joint Forum document on *Mortgage insurance: market structure, underwriting cycle and policy implications (Aug2013)*.	☑ **Not applicable** There is no monolines product in Indonesia. ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☐ **Implementation completed as of:** **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:** **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
5 (7)	Strengthening of supervisory requirements or best practices for investment in structured 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 product. 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** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** 02/12/2013 **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:** Banks in Indonesia are only permitted to conduct foreign exchange and interest rate derivatives transactions. The requirement also implies that the banks are only allowed to invest in structured products that meet the requirements on the foreign exchange and interest rate derivatives transactions. In addition, before investing in certain products the	**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
				banks are also required to consider requirements on assets quality regulation. The asset quality regulation governs if a bank invests in derivative products/structured products, the bank should provide information to supervisors regarding underlying of the products, rating, issuer, etc. Such information would assist the supervisors to determine and categorize risk of the products. Furthermore, if a bank plan to issue structured products, a regulation concerning Prudential Principles in the Implementation of Structured Products Activities for Commercial Banks requires the bank to understand nature and risks of the products. The bank will also be required to among others formulate/setup a business plan, perform risk management in an effective manner, determine the classification of customers, disclose product information, and submit a report to the supervisors. Moreover, if the bank failed to meet the requirements, the bank will subject to the following sanctions: • administrative warning/reprimand; • assign a lower rating to the bank; • prohibition to participate in clearing activities; • suspension and revocation of approval for	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				certain business activities, both for a specific branch office and for the Bank as a whole; • termination of the Bank's management and subsequent appointment of a temporary management replacement; and/or • put members of the bank's management, employees or, shareholders in a blacklist. The prevailing regulation is considered adequately conservative to govern structured products' activities in Indonesia. If banks place investments in structured products, banks are also required to comply with the Legal Lending Limit regulation that governs the maximum limit for each individual or connected counterparties, including exposures related with investment in structured products. In addition, the regulation concerning Business Activities and Office Networks Based on Bank Core Capital for Commercial banks governs that banks will be permitted to issue structured products if banks hold tier 1 capital above IDR 5 trillion. For capital market, a regulation No. IV.B.1 prohibits hedging transaction on the purchase of securities traded in a foreign stock exchange which is greater than the value of securities purchased. Furthermore, a regulation No. IV.C.4	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				regarding Guidelines for the Management of Protected, Guaranteed, and Index Fund stipulates that an investment manager may invest in derivative securities without any obligation to own the securities that become the underlying asset of such derivative, provided that the basis for protection value is investment in debt securities. This regulation also stipulates that when an investment manager invests in derivatives securities, the investment manager must provide additional disclosure information concerning such investments and explains the criteria used for selecting the securities. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
6 (8)	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 taken for enhancing disclosure of securitised products. See, for reference, IOSCO's *Report on Principles for Ongoing Disclosure for Asset-Backed Securities (Nov 2012)* and IOSCO's *Disclosure Principles for Public Offerings and Listings of Asset-Backed Securities (Apr 2010)*.	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** 07/11/2014 **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:** A regulation concerning Monthly Report of Collective Investment Contract of Asset Backed Securities is intended to require investment managers to submit a monthly report to regulator regarding their activities on the ABS. In addition, investment managers have also been required to provide a report to investors	**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
				for their information. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** A regulation concerning Monthly Report of Collective Investment Contract of Asset Backed Securities was issued and has been effectively implemented in November 2014. The regulation is intended to require investment managers to submit a monthly report to regulator regarding their activities on the ABS. **Web-links to relevant documents:** http://www.ojk.go.id/peraturan-otoritas-jasa-keuangan-tentang-laporan-bulanan-kontrak-investasi-kolektif-efek-beragun-aset	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
III.	**Enhancing supervision**				
7 (9)	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. (Pittsburgh)	Jurisdictions should indicate: (1) whether they have identified domestic SIFIs and, if so, in which sectors; (2) whether the names of the identified SIFIs have been publicly disclosed; and (3) the types of policy measures taken for implementing consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of the identified SIFIs. See, for reference, the following documents: BCBS: • *Framework for G-SIBs (Jul 2013)* • *Framework for D-SIBs (Oct 2012)* • *BCP 12 (Sep 2012)* IAIS: • *Global Systemically Important Insurers: Policy Measures (Jul 2013)* • *ICP 23– Group wide supervision* FSB: • *Framework for addressing SIFIs (Nov 2011)*	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☑ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☑ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: August 2015 ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☐ **Implementation completed as of:** **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☑ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:** According to OJK Law, the main function of OJK is to establish an integrated regulation and supervision system for all activities in the financial services sector. To support its function, OJK has issued regulations concerning integrated risk management and integrated governance for financial	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				conglomerates in 2014. The regulation on integrated risk management governs that financial conglomerates are required to implement integrated risk management comprising of the following pillars: (i) oversight by Lead Entities' directors and board of commissioners; (ii) adequacy of policy, procedures, and setting of limits with regards to integrated risk management; (iii) adequacy of identification, assessment, monitoring and integrated risk control processes, as well as an integrated risk management information system; and (iv) a comprehensive internal control system for the purpose of integrated risk management. In addition, the regulation on integrated governance governs that financial conglomerates are required to implement integrated governance comprising of the following pillars: (i) criteria for the appointment of Lead Entity directors and board of commissioners; (ii) roles and responsibilities of Lead Entity directors and board of commissioners; (iii) roles and responsibilities of an Integrated Governance Committee; (iv) roles and responsibilities of a Integrated Compliance Unit; (v) roles and	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				responsibilities of an Integrated Internal Audit Unit; (vi) implementation of integrated risk management; (vii) creation and implementation of a Integrated Governance Policy. According to those regulations, parent companies which are commercial banks with core capital above IDR 30 trillion (BUKU 4) are required to provide the semi-annual reports; the first reporting will use June 2015 data. For other banks, the first reporting will use December 2015 data. Indonesian authorities also apply more intensive supervision towards large banks that are considered as systemically important in Indonesia. These banks are now under the supervision of OJK (as a microprudential authority) and BI (as a macroprudential authority). For banks that are considered posing systemic impacts, Indonesian authorities also have specific measures and tools to deal with the possible failures of these banks since the Indonesian authorities differentiate resolution measures applied for systemic and non-systemic banks. Application of capital surcharge to D-SIBs has been stipulated in Basel III capital framework issued in 2013 and is planned to be imposed starting January 2016.	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey: To further clarify the implementation of D-SIBs surcharge requirements as stipulated in the Basel III capital regulation issued in 2013, a more detailed regulation on D-SIB framework has been developed and will be issued by the end of this year. To support OJK's function on integrated supervision, OJK has issued new regulations concerning the implementation of integrated risk management of financial conglomerates and the implementation of integrated governance on financial conglomerates in 2014, These regulations will require parent companies (BUKU 4 banks) to submit semi-annual reports to OJK; the first reporting will use June 2015 data. For other banks, the first reporting will use December 2015 data. In addition, to maintain and improve financial conglomerate's capital level as buffer against risks, a new regulation on integrated minimum capital requirement for financial conglomerates will be issued this year. **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
8 (10)	Establishing supervisory colleges and conducting risk assessments	To establish the remaining supervisory colleges for significant cross-border firms by June 2009. (London) We agreed to conduct rigorous risk assessment on these firms [G-SIFIs] through international supervisory colleges. (Seoul)	Reporting in this area should be undertaken solely by home jurisdictions of G-SIBs and G-SIIs. Please indicate the progress made in establishing and strengthening the functioning of supervisory colleges for G-SIBs and G-SIIs using, as reference, the following documents: BCBS: • Principle 13 of the BCBS *Core Principles for Effective Banking Supervision (Sep 2012)* • *Principles for effective supervisory colleges (Jun 2014)* IAIS : • *ICP 25 and Guidance 25.1.1 – 25.1.6 on establishment of supervisory colleges* • *Guidance 25.6.20 and 25.8.16 on risk assessments by supervisory colleges* • *Application paper on supervisory colleges (Oct 2014)*	☑ **Not applicable** Indonesia is not a home jurisdiction of significant cross-border firms. ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress :* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☐ **Implementation completed as of:** **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:** **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** **Web-links to relevant documents:** **Additional questions:** **1. Please indicate whether supervisory colleges for all G-SIBs/G-SIIs headquartered in your jurisdiction have been established. If not, please**	**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
				explain. **2. Please indicate the structure of the supervisory colleges for G-SIBs/G-SIIs in your jurisdiction (core, universal, other) and the reasons why it may differ across firms.** **3. Please indicate the frequency of meetings over the past year of the supervisory colleges (core, universal, other) for G-SIBs/G-SIIs in your jurisdiction.** **4. Please describe the main objectives of supervisory colleges for G-SIBs/G-SIIs in your jurisdiction and the types of issues that have been discussed over the past year. (e.g. specific area(s) of risk, coordinated risk assessments, joint supervisory work, coordinated supervisory plans). In your response, please indicate briefly some of the main challenges in conducting joint risk assessments and steps taken to address them.** 5. **Please describe the main challenges in the functioning of supervisory colleges for G-SIBs/G-SIIs in your jurisdiction and any plans to enhance the effectiveness of colleges.**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
9 (11)	Supervisory exchange of information and coordination	To quicken supervisory responsiveness to developments that have a common effect across a number of institutions, supervisory exchange of information and coordination in the development of best practice benchmarks should be improved at both national and international levels. (Rec V.7 , FSF 2008) 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 (Home-host relationships). Jurisdictions should also indicate any steps taken since the last assessment in this area, particularly in response to relevant FSAP/ROSC recommendations. Jurisdictions should describe any recent or planned regulatory, supervisory or legislative changes that contribute to the sharing of supervisory information (e.g. within supervisory colleges or via bilateral or multilateral MoUs).	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** June 2015 **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation /Guidelines ☑ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: MoUs **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:** At national level, an FKSSK MoU was signed by Minister of Finance, Governor of Bank Indonesia, Chairman of OJK's Board of Commissioners, and Chairman of LPS's Board of Commissioners. The MoU facilitates the sharing of information and data among authorities	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				that are required to maintain and promote financial system stability. In addition to the FKSSK's MoU, bilateral MoUs between relevant Indonesian authorities have also been put in place, such as bilateral MoUs between OJK and BI, OJK and Indonesian Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Center (INTRAC/PPATK), OJK and the Directorate General of Tax, OJK and the Attorney General, National Police, etc. Moreover, a bilateral MoU between OJK and Indonesia Deposit Insurance Corporation has been signed in July 2014. At international level, until the first semester of 2015, OJK has signed several MOUs with foreign supervisors (Japan FSA, Dubai FSA, FSC and FSS Korea and CBRC) concerning the supervisory cooperation. The scope of the cooperation comprises of the sharing of supervisory information, licensing, on-going supervision and on-site examinations, etc. As for capital market, the OJK became a signatory to the IOSCO MMoU on cooperation and exchange of information among securities regulators, effective since January 2014. The OJK also has several MoUs with foreign counterparts that have been	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				renewed from the previous MoUs carried over from the Bapepam-LK (a former authority of capital market and NBFIs before it was transferred to the OJK). **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** Several bilateral MoUs between OJK and foreign supervisors concerning the supervisory cooperation have been signed in March 2015 (OJK and Dubai FSA), in April 2015 (OJK and FSC and FSS Korea) and in June 2015 (OJK and CBRC). **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
10 (12)	Strengthening resources and effective supervision	We agreed that supervisors should have strong and unambiguous mandates, sufficient independence to act, appropriate resources, and a full suite of tools and powers to proactively identify and address risks, including regular stress testing and early intervention. (Seoul) Supervisors should see that they have the requisite resources and expertise to oversee the risks associated with financial innovation and to ensure that firms they supervise have the capacity to understand and manage the risks. (FSF 2008) Supervisory authorities should continually re-assess their resource needs; for example, interacting with and assessing Boards require particular skills, experience and adequate level of seniority. (Rec. 3, FSB 2012)	No information on this recommendation will be collected in the current IMN survey due to the recent publication of the FSB thematic peer review report on supervisory frameworks and approaches to SIBs.		

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
IV.	**Building and implementing macroprudential frameworks and tools**				
11 (13)	Establishing regulatory framework for macro-prudential 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[1] and private pools of capital to limit the build up of systemic risk. (London) 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 describe major changes in the institutional arrangements for macroprudential policy (structures, mandates, powers, reporting etc.) that have taken place since the financial crisis, including over the past year. Please indicate whether an assessment has been conducted with respect to the adequacy of powers to collect and share relevant information among different authorities on financial institutions, markets and instruments to assess the 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.	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress :* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** December 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:** Following the transfer of banking supervisory functions to OJK on 31 December 2013, BI assumes the responsibility as the macro prudential	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

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

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				authority to conduct macro prudential surveillance and to issue macro prudential regulations. The mandate and powers are stipulated in the OJK Law. As stipulated in the OJK Law, sharing information arrangement among different authorities in Indonesia is conducted through FKSSK (Financial System Stability Coordination Forum). An FKSSK MoU was signed by four financial sector authorities in Indonesia (MoF, BI, OJK, and LPS) to further govern the arrangement of information sharing both in normal and crisis times. The sharing of data and information within the FKSSK is not limited to indicators of crisis management protocol, but also results of surveillance by each authority and other data and information that are required to perform each authority's tasks and responsibilities. With regard to the power to collect data/information, OJK has the authority to require banks, NBFIs, and capital market to report information and data, both in regular and in ad-hoc basis. The data/information can be shared with relevant authorities, including BI. Information sharing between BI and OJK will be conducted in accordance with a protocol mechanism under an MoU	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				between BI and OJK. As a macroprudential authority, BI has continuously used the information and data to assess the potential failure or severe stress of financial institutions that will contribute to systemic risk. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** **Web-links to relevant documents:** **Additional questions:** **1. Please describe the institutional arrangements for financial stability and macroprudential policy in your jurisdiction, including whether a macroprudential authority has been explicitly identified and the respective roles and responsibilities of the central bank and other authorities.** According to the OJK Law, the stability of financial system should be maintained through a coordination forum (FKSSK) whose members consist of the Minister of Finance (coordinator), Governor of Bank Indonesia, Chairman of the Board of the Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of the OJK. The duties of the forum are among others to conduct regular monitoring and evaluation of the financial	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				system stability in normal time; and to determine and implement necessary policies required for preventing and handling of crisis in the financial system in accordance with each member's respective authorities. The forum meeting shall be conducted at least once every three months. As for macroprudential authority, this role is assumed by BI as stipulated in the OJK Law and its elucidation. According to the OJK Law, the OJK is authorised to perform microprudential regulation and supervision, whereas BI is authorised to perform macroprudential regulation and supervision. **2. If a macroprudential authority has been explicitly identified in your jurisdiction, please describe its legal basis, mandate, composition, powers (warnings, recommendations, prudential tools, powers of direction, other) and accountability arrangements. Who provides the resources and analytical support for the authority's activities?** BI's role as the macroprudential authority is stipulated in the OJK Law. According to the OJK Law, BI has the authority to perform macroprudential regulation and supervision. These were further elaborated in a BI regulation concerning	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				macroprudential surveillance and regulation. According to the Law and the regulation, BI has the authority to conduct macroprudential surveillance and regulation in order to prevent and reduce systemic risk, promote intermediation function, and improve financial system efficiency and financial access. Please also refer our response below for further explanation regarding the coverage of prudential tools that can be introduced/utilized by BI for macroprudential purposes. BI has the authority to require banks to comply with macroprudential regulation and to impose sanctions such as issuing reprimand letter and imposing penalty. BI has also the authority to require banks to comply and to follow up the result of macroprudential surveillance conducted by BI and to impose various sanctions such as limitation or prohibition to participate in monetary operation, temporary suspension to all or a part of card payment activities, etc. The resources and analytical support for macroprudential surveillance and regulation are provided by BI. In principle, a macroprudential policy that will require views from OJK will be	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				shared and discussed with the OJK through a coordination mechanism as stipulated in an MoU between BI and OJK. Furthermore, the FKSSK serves as an avenue to discuss and gather inputs from all financial sector authorities regarding any policy and issue that require joint views from other authorities, this is in line with the function of the FKSSK as a coordinating forum among financial sector authorities in Indonesia that is mandated to promote financial stability (please refer our response above for further information regarding the FKSSK). **3. Is there an inter-agency body on financial stability or macroprudential matters – distinct from the designated macroprudential authority – in your jurisdiction? If so, please describe its legal basis, mandate, composition, powers and accountability arrangements. Who provides the resources and analytical support for its activities?** FKSSK is an inter-agency body responsible for financial stability. The legal basis of its establishment is OJK Law. The mandate is to promote financial stability. Members of the forum consist of the Minister of Finance (coordinator), Governor of Bank Indonesia, Chairman	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				of the Board of the Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of the OJK. The duties of the forum are among others to conduct regular monitoring and evaluation of the financial system stability in normal time; and to determine and implement necessary policies required for preventing and handling of crisis in the financial system in accordance with each member's respective authorities. The day-to-day process of the FKSSK and its supporting activities are managed by a Secretariat which is led by the Head of the Fiscal Policy Agency. Other institutions also support the FKSSK's Secretariat in the area of supporting activities such as by supporting the FKSSK's Secretariat in organizing international seminars and workshops on Crisis Management, conducting the crisis simulation process, developing a national crisis binder, etc. **4. Please describe the extent to which the macroprudential authority (or other relevant body) is able to collect information on material financial institutions, markets and instruments in order to assess potential systemic risks. In your response, please indicate whether the authorities involved in systemic risk monitoring have specific legal powers to collect**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				information from financial institutions (whether regulated or not) for financial stability purposes, and whether there exist dedicated information gateways (e.g. Memorandum of Understanding) to share such information among relevant authorities. As mentioned above, OJK has the authority to collect information and data from banks, NBFIs, and capital market, both in regular and in ad-hoc basis. The data/information can be shared with relevant authorities, including BI. Information sharing between BI and OJK will be conducted in accordance with a protocol mechanism under an MoU between BI and OJK. BI uses the information and data to assess the potential failure or severe stress of financial institutions that will contribute to systemic risk. As a macroprudential authority, BI also has the authority to require banks to provide relevant data and information.	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
12 (14)	Enhancing system-wide monitoring and the use of macro-prudential instruments	Authorities should use quantitative indicators and/or constraints on leverage and margins as macro-prudential tools for supervisory purposes. Authorities should use quantitative indicators of leverage as guides for policy, both at the institution-specific and at the macro-prudential (system-wide) level…(Rec. 3.1, FSF 2009) We are developing macro-prudential policy frameworks and tools to limit the build-up of risks in the financial sector, building on the ongoing work of the FSB-BIS-IMF on this subject. (Cannes) Authorities should monitor substantial changes in asset prices and their implications for the macro economy and the financial system. (Washington)	Please describe at a high level (including by making reference to financial stability or other reports, where available) the types of methodologies, indicators and tools used to assess systemic risks. Please indicate the use of macroprudential tools in the past year, including the objective for their use and the process used to select, calibrate, and apply them. See, for reference, the following documents: • CGFS report on Operationalising the selection and application of macroprudential instruments (Dec 2012) • FSB-IMF-BIS progress report to the G20 on Macroprudential policy tools and frameworks (Oct 2011) • IMF staff papers on Macroprudential policy, an organizing framework (Mar 2011), Key Aspects of Macroprudential policy (Jun 2013), and Staff Guidance on Macroprudential Policy (Dec 2014)	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress :* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since: ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** June 2015 **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☑ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:** In identifying systemic risks, BI monitors risk indicators, events, and/or behaviours that may present potential risks in the financial system. The monitoring process aims to detect and provide signals of imbalances and vulnerabilities that may pose systemic impacts. BI considers various indicators both endogenous and exogenous indicators. For endogenous	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				indicators BI consider various indicators within financial markets, financial institutions, and payment system. For exogenous indicators, BI will consider domestic macroeconomic indicators, real sector, global, and event risks. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** In 2015, BI issued a revised regulation on loan to value ratio. While in the past the regulation was issued to moderate the excessive mortgage and car loan growth, the revised regulation was issued to respond the need for a countercyclical regulation that can support banking intermediation and provide incentive to the demand side of the economy. **Web-links to relevant documents:** **Additional questions:** **1. Please describe, at a high level, the types of methodologies, indicators and reports used in your jurisdiction to identify, analyse, communicate and address systemic risks.** In identifying systemic risks, BI monitors risk indicators, events, and/or behaviours that may present potential risks in the financial system. BI considers various indicators both endogenous and exogenous indicators. For endogenous	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				indicators BI consider various indicators within financial markets, financial institutions, and payment system. For exogenous indicators, BI will consider domestic macroeconomic indicators, real sector, global, and event risks. BI publishes Financial Stability Review twice a year to inform its analysis to its stakeholders. The Financial Stability Review will cover BI's analysis regarding the current state of Indonesia's financial system stability. It will also present BI's analysis on potential risks in financial markets, household and corporate, banking and non-banking, as well as financial system infrastructures. **2. Please describe the range of policy tools (prudential and other) currently available to the authorities for macroprudential purposes.**[2] A wide range of macroprudential policy tools can be introduced to serve the following objectives: a. improving capital resilience and preventing excessive leverage; b. maintaining intermediation function and mitigating	

[2] An indicative list of such tools can be found in "Macroprudential Policy Tools and Frameworks – Progress Report to the G20" by the FSB, IMF and BIS (October 2011, http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/wp-content/uploads/r_111027b.pdf); "Staff Guidance on Macroprudential Policy" (December 2014, http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2014/110614.pdf) by IMF staff; and "Operationalising the selection and application of macroprudential instruments" (December 2012, http://www.bis.org/publ/cgfs48.pdf) by the CGFS.

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				potential systemic risk; c. limiting the exposure concentration; d. improving financial infrastructure resilience; and e. improving financial system efficiency and financial access. Examples of macroprudential policy tools that can be introduced are among others countercyclical capital buffer, macroprudential leverage ratio, requirements on LTV ratio, debt to income ratio, macroprudential reserve requirement, macroprudential LCR, hedging requirement, credit limitation on a certain sector, etc. **3. Please indicate which tools have been deployed for macroprudential purposes over the past year, including the objective for their use and the process used to select, calibrate, and apply them.** Macroprudential instruments that have been implemented by BI are among others: • LTV ratio, BI issued a revised regulation on LTV ratio in 2015. This regulation was issued to respond the need for a countercyclical regulation that can support banking intermediation and provide incentive to the demand side of the economy. BI applies different risk weight for residential property loans for different LTV ratios. • LDR-based	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				reserve requirement (RR) ratio, this requirement is as a measure to balance a bank's intermediation role and its liquidity state. According to this regulation, the bank will get disincentive of higher RR if its LDR falls outside the range of the required LDR. • A requirement on the publication of base lending rates for four credit segments (corporate, retail, mortgages and non-mortgages consumer loan). The objective of this policy is, among others, to enhance good governance and to promote sound competition in the banking industry by improving market discipline. • A regulation concerning prudential principles in managing non-financial corporate external debt, this regulation requires non-financial corporates to meet requirements on minimum hedging ratio, liquidity ratio, and credit rating. It is expected that these requirements will help non-financial corporate to mitigate various risks that may arise from their external debt (such as curreny, liquidity, and overleverage risks) and will strengthen non-bank corporate risk management. When selecting a macroprudential instrument to be used in a particular situation, the authority will	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				assess an instrument that can deliver the best outcome to address potential risks with the least negative impacts to the economy. A research will be conducted to analyse the cost and benefit of implementing potential instruments. Continuous monitoring and assessment will also be conducted to identify the need to recalibrate the requirement or to introduce a new requirement. **4. Please describe whether and, if so, how the relevant authorities assess the *ex ante* cost and benefits of macroprudential policies and their *ex post* effectiveness.** As mentioned above, a research will be conducted to assess the ex-ante cost and benefits of potential macroprudential policies to address/mitigate particular situation and sources of risks. Continuous monitoring and evaluation will also be conducted to measure the effectiveness of macroprudential policies and, if needed, to recommend necessary adjustments. The newest example of these processes is the revision of the 2013 LTV ratio regulation in 2015. The revised regulation was issued in June 2015 to respond the need of a countercyclical regulation that can support banking intermediation and	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				provide incentive to the economy.	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
V.	**Improving oversight of credit rating agencies (CRAs)**				
13 (16)	Enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs	All CRAs whose ratings are used for regulatory purposes should be subject to a regulatory oversight regime that includes registration. The regulatory oversight regime should be established by end 2009 and should be consistent with the IOSCO Code of Conduct Fundamentals. (London) National authorities will enforce compliance and require changes to a rating agency's practices and procedures for managing conflicts of interest and assuring the transparency and quality of the rating process. CRAs should differentiate ratings for structured products and provide full disclosure of their ratings track record and the information and assumptions that underpin the ratings process. The oversight framework should be consistent across jurisdictions with appropriate sharing of information between national authorities, including through IOSCO. (London) Regulators should work together towards appropriate, globally compatible solutions (to conflicting compliance obligations for CRAs) as early as possible	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures undertaken for enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs including registration, oversight and sharing of information between national authorities. They should also indicate their consistency with the following IOSCO document: • *Code of Conduct Fundamentals for Credit Rating Agencies (Mar 2015)* Jurisdictions may also refer to the following IOSCO documents: • Principle 22 of *Principles and Objectives of Securities Regulation (Jun 2010)* which calls for registration and oversight programs for CRAs • *Statement of Principles Regarding the Activities of Credit Rating Agencies (Sep 2003)* • *Final Report on Supervisory Colleges for Credit Rating Agencies (Jul 2013)*	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** 22/12/2011 **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:** In Indonesia, banks are only permitted to use the services of Credit Rating Agency (CRA) that meets requirements governed by a regulation concerning recognition of Credit Rating Agency (CRA) whose rating is used for prudential regulation purposes (such as regarding asset quality,	**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
		in 2010. (FSB 2009) We encourage further steps to enhance transparency and competition among credit rating agencies. (St Petersburg)		market risk, and credit risk assessment). Monitoring will be conducted by the Indonesia banking authority to ensure that the CRA meets eligibility criteria. For capital market, before OJK assumed the authority of Bapepam-LK as a regulator of credit rating agency in Indonesia, the Bapepam-LK had issued six regulations on CRAs including a regulation concerning registration of CRA in June 2009 to meet the IOSCO Code of Conduct Fundamentals. These regulations remain effective and sufficient to regulate CRAs and consistent with IOSCO Code of Conduct Fundamentals for Credit Rating Agencies. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
14 (17)	Reducing the reliance on ratings	We also endorsed the FSB's principles on reducing reliance on external credit ratings. Standard setters, market participants, supervisors and central banks should not rely mechanistically on external credit ratings. (Seoul) Authorities should check that the roles that they have assigned to ratings in regulations and supervisory rules are consistent with the objectives of having investors make independent judgment of risks and perform their own due diligence, and that they do not induce uncritical reliance on credit ratings as a substitute for that independent evaluation. (Rec IV. 8, FSF 2008) We reaffirm our commitment to reduce authorities' and financial institutions' reliance on external credit ratings, and call on standard setters, market participants, supervisors and central banks to implement the agreed FSB principles and end practices that rely mechanistically on these ratings. (Cannes) We call for accelerated progress by national authorities and standard setting bodies in ending the mechanistic reliance on credit ratings and encourage steps that	Jurisdictions should indicate the steps they are taking to address the recommendations of the May 2014 FSB thematic peer review report on the implementation of the FSB Principles for Reducing Reliance on Credit Ratings, including by implementing their agreed action plans. Jurisdictions may refer to the following documents: • FSB *Principles for Reducing Reliance on CRA Ratings (Oct 2010)* • FSB *Roadmap for Reducing Reliance on CRA Ratings (Nov 2012)* • BCBS Consultative Document *Revisions to the Standardised Approach for credit risk (Dec 2014)*	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** 22.12.2011 **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:** Considering that most of the credit exposures are unrated, we view that several safeguards that have been required by the existing regulation (such as minimum requirements to CRA to be recognized by the Indonesian authority as eligible CRAs for regulatory purposes) and the supervisory approach to assess the adequacy of the banks' own credit	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
		would enhance transparency of and 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)		assessment processes are currently sufficient to address concern on our existing regulations with regard to external CRA ratings. For reserve management purposes, CRA rating is used as an input along with other parameters. With regard to the reference to CRA rating to determine eligibility of non-government securities as collateral, BI has required that the non-government securities should also be actively traded in a liquid market. To this date, the majority of securities held by our banks are securities issued by the Government of Indonesia and BI. For Capital Market industry, the authority does not regulate in detail about the selection mechanisms or the methods that could be utilized by Investment Managers or Securities Companies in selecting their portfolios. However each portfolio selection should be supported by a solid foundation and professional judgment. The selected method or the requirements in selecting the portfolio highly depend on the internal policy of the asset managers or security company itself. Several safeguards have been implemented to reduce reliance on ratings such as: investment managers must maintain	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				investment and research functions to assist portfolio management (OJK Rule No. 24/POJK.04/2014 regarding Guidelines for the Functions of Investment Managers). The regulation also regulates the competence of human resource which manages the research function, namely employees who have license as an investment manager and fulfill the minimum of 3 years working experience in the field of investment management. This regulation ensures that investment managers do not solely depend on ratings by CRAs, but instead making their reliable judgment from the results of their own research. For NBFI CRA will be utilized as one of references for the purpose of valuation on investment instruments for financial statements. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VI.	**Enhancing and aligning accounting standards**				
15 (18)	Consistent application of high-quality accounting standards	Regulators, supervisors, and accounting standard setters, as appropriate, should work with each other and the private sector on an ongoing basis to ensure consistent application and enforcement of high-quality accounting standards. (Washington)	Jurisdictions should indicate the accounting standards that they follow and whether (and on what basis) they are deemed to be equivalent to IFRSs as published by the IASB or are otherwise of a high and internationally acceptable quality, and provide accurate and relevant information on financial performance. They should also explain the system they have for enforcement of consistent application of those standards. Jurisdictions may want to refer to their jurisdictional profile prepared by the IFRS Foundation, which can be accessed at: http://www.ifrs.org/Use-around-the-world/Pages/Analysis-of-the-G20-IFRS-profiles.aspx.	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** January 2015 **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☑ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:** The Indonesia authority has adopted a plan to converge the Indonesian Generally Accepted Accounting Principles with IFRS in December 2008. The first phase of the convergence program, which was to align Indonesian accounting standards (PSAK) to IFRS as	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				of 1 January 2009, was largely achieved in 2012. The second phase was intended to reduce the lag in adoption of IFRS to one year, resulted in the convergence of PSAK with IFRS (as they stood on 1 January 2014) as of 1 January 2015. Although the compliance of Indonesian banks to IFRSs, i.e. by the adoption of PSAKs, will be assessed by their external auditors, the banking authority also enforces the implementation of the Indonesian accounting standards. For example, under the regulation on the Transparency and Publication of Commercial Banks' Report, sanctions will be imposed to banks if the Quarterly Published Financial Report and Annual Report of the Banks do not conform to the financial accounting standards.. Regulations for banks that are related with the implementation of PSAKs are continuously being revised in order to align the regulations' requirements with the PSAKs requirements. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** Several standards that were issued in 2013 and 2014 as part of the second phase of the Indonesian accounting standard convergence program with	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				IFRS, have been effectively implemented started on 1 January 2015. The issuance of the regulation on the Transparency and Publication of Commercial Banks' Report in March 2015 is also intended to in line the regulation's requirements with the adjustment on financial reporting required under PSAK 1 which has been aligned with IFRS. The regulation has been effectively implemented starting on 1 April 2015. Furthermore, as a response to the revision of IAS 1, IAS 16 and IAS 38, the Board of Indonesia Accounting Standard (DSAK) is currently revising PSAK 16 and PSAK 19, which will be effectively implemented on 1 January 2016. **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
16 (19)	Appropriate application of Fair Value Accounting	Accounting standard setters and prudential supervisors should examine the use of valuation reserves or adjustments for fair valued financial instruments when data or modelling needed to support their valuation is weak. (Rec. 3.4, FSF 2009) Accounting standard setters and prudential supervisors should examine possible changes to relevant standards to dampen adverse dynamics potentially associated with fair value accounting. Possible ways to reduce this potential impact include the following: (1) Enhancing the accounting model so that the use of fair value accounting is carefully examined for financial instruments of credit intermediaries; (ii) Transfers between financial asset categories; (iii) Simplifying hedge accounting requirements. (Rec 3.5, FSF 2009)	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for appropriate application of fair value accounting. Although not an application of fair value accounting, jurisdictions should additionally be mindful of implementation issues arising from the new accounting requirements for expected loan loss provisioning for impaired loans that are being introduced by the IASB and the FASB, and, for those jurisdictions where specific action is needed to foster transparent and consistent implementation, set out any steps they intend to take. See, for reference, the following BCBS documents: • *Basel 2.5 standards on prudent valuation (Jul 2009)* • *Supervisory guidance for assessing banks' financial instrument fair value practices (Apr 2009)*	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** January 2015 **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☑ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:** For banking sector, following the adoption and implementation of IAS 39, especially the extensive use of fair valuation, a comprehensive revision to the format and content of prudential reporting ("call reports"), including the addition of valuation reserves or adjustments accounts, was issued by the banking authority in 2008. In practice, the	**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
				valuation reserves or adjustments accounts are mostly used in the FX derivatives transactions, whereby all instruments are valued using middle rate and are adjusted accordingly at reporting dates through the adjustment accounts. In addition, banks are also required to include the valuation reserves or adjustments (including non-accounting valuation adjustment, e.g. liquidity concerns) to calculate/determine the regulatory capital. With regard to IFRS 13, Indonesia has adopted it through the issuance of PSAK 68 which has been effectively implemented starting on 1 January 2015. Fair value accounting has also been adopted on several regulations for other financial sectors. For insurance industry, the financial solvency regulation for the insurance industry was published in 2012. The regulation requires the valuation of investment that is in line with the requirement of fair value accounting according to PSAK 50 (IFRS 32) and PSAK 55 (IFRS 39). The reserve valuation has been governed further in another specific regulation that is in line with PSAK 62 concerning insurance contract. For pension funds, the requirement to apply fair value	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				accounting as required by PSAK has been governed through a regulation concerning financial statement guidelines and investment valuation of pension funds. For capital market, investment managers are required to comply with regulation No. IV.C.2 to determine fair market valuation. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** IFRS 13 has been adopted in Indonesia through the application of PSAK 68, which has been effectively implemented since January 2015. **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VII.	**Enhancing risk management**				
17 (20)	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[3] will enhance their supervision of banks' operation in foreign currency funding markets. (FSB 2009) We commit to conduct robust, transparent stress tests as needed. (Pittsburgh)	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken to enhance guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices. Jurisdictions may also refer to FSB's *thematic peer review report on risk governance (Feb 2013)* and the BCBS *Peer review of supervisory authorities' implementation of stress testing principles (Apr 2012)* and *Principles for sound stress testing practices and supervision (May 2009).*	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☑ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☑ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: August 2015 ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☐ **Implementation completed as of:** **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☑ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:** A regulation concerning risk management requires banks to improve and maintain bank's risk management including information systems and internal controls	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

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

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				with respect to credit, market, liquidity, operational, legal, reputational, and other risks. The regulation also requires banks to have written policies, procedures, and limit to address such risks. An integrated risk management is also required for banks that own subsidiaries and sister companies in financial sector. Stress testing has been required to be conducted by banks such as through a regulation concerning risk management. Indonesian authorities are also conducting stress testing regularly. With regard to risk governance, the prevailing regulations on good corporate governance for banking sector have met most expectations of sound risk governance as showed by the result of a peer review on risk governance. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** A new regulation concerning integrated risk management and integrated governance for financial conglomerates has further strengthened the expectation of banks' risk governance practices. The regulation on integrated risk management was issued and has been effectively implemented in November 2014. The	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				regulation on integrated governance for financial conglomerates was also issued and has been effectively implemented in November 2014. The first reporting for both regulations will use June 2015 data. Further, with regard to liquidity risk, the authority is in the midst of finalising the LCR regulation. As requested by the regulator, selected banks have calculated and published their LCRs. **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
18 (22)	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 international best practice, as appropriate. (Washington) 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)	Jurisdictions should indicate the status of implementation of the disclosures requirements of IFRSs (in particular IFRS7 and 13) or equivalent. Jurisdictions may also use as reference the recommendations of the October 2012 report by the Enhanced Disclosure Task Force on *Enhancing the Risk Disclosures of Banks* and *Implementation Progress Report by the EDTF (Aug 2013)*, and set out any steps they have taken to foster adoption of the EDTF Principles and Recommendations.	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** January 2015 **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☑ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: **Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:** Indonesia has adopted the IFRS 7 requirements through the application of an Indonesia Accounting Standard (PSAK 60) since 2010. Indonesian banks have been required to comply with the PSAK 60's disclosure requirements. Following several annual improvements made by the IASB on IFRS 7, the Board of Indonesia Accounting Standard	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				(DSAK) has also issued several revisions on PSAK 60. The latest version is implemented effectively on 1 January 2015. IFRS 13 has also been adopted through PSAK 68 and implemented on 1 January 2015. For banking industry, Pillar 3 disclosure requirements have also been effectively implemented in Indonesia. The Pillar 3 disclosure has been revised in 2015 to accommodate capital disclosure requirements under Basel III. The revised regulation was issued on 31 March 2015. The regulation governs that banks are required to disclose and publish Basel III capital in the banks' website on a quarterly basis. The regulation will come into force for December 2015 data. The prudential supervision over securities companies is conducted among others through the implementation of a rule concerning Adjusted Net Working Capital (ANWC). This rule describes forms that must be and have been filled by the securities companies to disclose their assets and liabilities as well as their risk measurements to assets and their activities/liabilities. In addition, the sufficiency of the adjusted net working capital is a requirement that must be met	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				by securities companies in a daily basis to enable them to trade in the stock exchange. Disclosure requirements of financial instruments have been implemented since 2012 for NBFIs (insurance industry). The financial reporting for insurance industry are required to be prepared in accordance with Indonesia Accounting Standard (SAK) and Statutory Accounting Principles (SAP) to assess valuation of insurers' assets and liabilites. The insurance companies are required to disclose all of their assets and to measure the risks associated to their assets to meet the required solvency ratio. Moreover, NBFIs are required to conduct risk assessments (such as regarding board risk, governance risk, strategy risk, asset and liability risk, insurance/finance risk, capital support risk). The requirement has been implemented since 2014. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** IFRS 7 has been adopted in Indonesia through PSAK 60. The latest revision on PSAK 60 has been implemented on 1 January 2015. IFRS 13 has also been effectively implemented since 1 January 2015. In addition, OJK has issued the	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Basel III capital disclosure regulation and it will come into force for December 2015 data. **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VIII. Strengthening deposit insurance					
19 (23)	Strengthening of national deposit insurance arrangements	National deposit insurance arrangements should be reviewed against the agreed international principles, and authorities should strengthen arrangements where needed. (Rec. VI.9, FSF 2008)	Jurisdictions should describe any revisions made to national deposit insurance system, including steps taken to address the following recommendations of the FSB's February 2012 *thematic peer review report on deposit insurance systems:* • Adoption of an explicit deposit insurance system (for those jurisdictions that do not have one) • Addressing the weaknesses and gaps to full implementation of the *Core Principles for Effective Deposit Insurance Systems* issued by IADI in November 2014	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☑ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☑ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☐ **Implementation completed as of:** **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:** In line with the requirements of IADI Core Principles No. 11 regarding Funding of DIC, LPS has conducted a study on the implementation of a differential premium system (DPS) to replace the current flat rate system. The consultative paper of DPS has already been circulated and discussed with respective parties	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				including the banking industry, BI, OJK, and MoF. The LPS would gather inputs and consider concerns from each party in formulating the DPS, in particular from MoF since the finalisation of regulation framework will remain under the MoF's authority. The final concept of the DPS regulation is planned to be consulted with Parliament. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
IX. Safeguarding the integrity and efficiency of financial markets					
20 (24)	Enhancing market integrity and efficiency	We must ensure that markets serve efficient allocation of investments and savings in our economies and do not pose risks to financial stability. To this end, we commit to implement initial recommendations by IOSCO on market integrity and efficiency, including measures to address the risks posed by high frequency trading and dark liquidity, and call for further work by mid-2012. (Cannes)	Jurisdictions should indicate whether high frequency trading and dark pools exist in their national markets. Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the recommendation in the following IOSCO reports in their regulatory framework: • *Regulatory issues raised by changes in market structure (Dec 2013)* • *Report on Regulatory Issues Raised by the Impact of Technological Changes on Market Integrity and Efficiency (Oct 2011)* • *Report on Principles for Dark Liquidity (May 2011)*.	☑ **Not applicable** This recommendation is not applicable. According to the existing regulation, HFT is not permitted, considering that our regulation does not permit the existence of co-location required in the implementation of HFT. Furthermore, based on our Capital Market Law, a party that offers buying and selling in the capital market is a Stock Exchange. Alternative trading system such as Dark Pool is not permitted in Indonesia. ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☐ **Implementation completed as of:** **Issue is being addressed through :** ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation /Guidelines	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				☐ 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:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
21 (25)	Regulation and supervision of commodity markets	We need to ensure enhanced market transparency, both on cash and financial commodity markets, including OTC, and achieve appropriate regulation and supervision of participants in these markets. Market regulators and authorities should be granted effective intervention powers to address disorderly markets and prevent market abuses. In particular, market regulators should have, and use formal position management powers, including the power to set 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 encourage broader publishing and unrestricted access to aggregated open interest data. (St. Petersburg)	Jurisdictions should indicate whether commodity markets of any type exist in their national markets. Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken to implement the principles found in IOSCO's report on *Principles for the Regulation and Supervision of Commodity Derivatives Markets (Sep 2011)*. Jurisdictions, in responding to this recommendation, may also make use of the responses contained in the update to the survey published by IOSCO in September 2014 on the principles for the regulation and supervision of commodity derivatives markets.	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** 2011 **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:** Commodity derivatives market in Indonesia has been governed by the Indonesia's Commodity Futures Trading Regulatory Agency (CoFTRA). The primary legislation is Law No. 32 of 1997 which was amended by Law No. 10 of 2011. Several related regulations/guidelines (Government regulations, Presidential Decree, Head of	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				CoFTRA's Decree) have been issued to govern regulations and supervisions of the commodity derivatives market in Indonesia. The regulations have adopted the IOSCO principles such as regarding design of physical commodity derivatives contract, surveillance of commodity derivative markets, disorderly markets, enforcement and information sharing, and enhancing price discovery and transparency. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

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

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
X.	**Enhancing financial consumer protection**				
23 (27)	Enhancing financial consumer protection	We agree that integration of financial consumer protection policies into regulatory and supervisory frameworks contributes to strengthening financial stability, endorse the FSB report on consumer finance protection and the high level principles on financial consumer protection prepared by the OECD together with the FSB. We will pursue the full application of these principles in our jurisdictions. (Cannes)	Jurisdictions should describe progress toward implementation of the OECD's *G-20 high-level principles on financial consumer protection (Oct 2011)*. Jurisdictions may also refer to OECD's September 2013 and September 2014 reports on effective approaches to support the implementation of the High-level Principles.	☐ **Not applicable** ☐ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment** ☐ **Implementation ongoing:** *Status of progress:* ☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: ☐ Draft published as of: ☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: ☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since : ☑ **Implementation completed as of:** December 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:** OJK Law that was issued in 2011 further governs consumer protection issues. According to this Law, the OJK is mandated to protect the interests of financial institutions' consumers. For banking industry, several regulations have also addressed consumer protection	**Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				issues such as regulations concerning mediation, complaint handling, product transparency and customers' data and privacy. In principles, all requirements on consumer protection, governed by the prevailing Laws and regulations, have been in line with G-20 high-level principles on financial consumer protection. In order to improve the level of public literacy, the Indonesia National Strategy on Financial Literacy has been implemented through the inclusion of financial literacy issues on educational materials for formal education level and for general public, as well as materials for national campaigns on financial literacy. In addition to the aforementioned program, OJK has launched what so called as Financial Market Education for Public to increase the financial literacy of society by introducing the financial industry, financial products and services, and promoting financial inclusion, targeting the event to the middle to low-income society. The Financial Market Education for Public was also launched with the objectives to introducethe range of microfinance products to improve financial planning awareness, encourage saving and investment, and introducing	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				alternative choices of affordable financial products such as gold investments, micro insurance and low cost mutual funds. Furthermore, on 14 Feb 2014, OJK issued a circular regarding the implementation of financial education to improve customers' and/or public's financial literacy and a circular regarding services and settlement of consumer complaints of financial services businesses. Furthermore, on 24 July 2014 OJK issued a circular concerning the presentation of information in marketing financial services and/or products. Finally, on 20 August 2014, OJK also issued a circular concerning standard contract and a circular concerning confidentiality and security of data and/or personal information of consumers. **Highlight main developments since last year's survey:** **Web-links to relevant documents:**	

XI. Source of recommendations:

Brisbane: G20 Leaders' Communique (15-16 November 2014)
St Petersburg: The G20 Leaders' Declaration (5-6 September 2013)
Los Cabos: The G20 Leaders' Declaration (18-19 June 2012)
Cannes: The Cannes Summit Final Declaration (3-4 November 2011)
Seoul: The Seoul Summit Document (11-12 November 2010)
Toronto: The G-20 Toronto Summit Declaration (26-27 June 2010)
Pittsburgh: Leaders' Statement at the Pittsburgh Summit (25 September 2009)
London: The London Summit Declaration on Strengthening the Financial System (2 April 2009)
Washington: The Washington Summit Action Plan to Implement Principles for Reform (15 November 2008)
FSF 2008: The FSF Report on Enhancing Market and Institutional Resilience (7 April 2008)
FSF 2009: The FSF Report on Addressing Procyclicality in the Financial System (2 April 2009)
FSB 2009: The FSB Report on Improving Financial Regulation (25 September 2009)
FSB 2012: The FSB Report on Increasing the Intensity and Effectiveness of SIFI Supervision (1 November 2012)

XII. List of Abbreviations used:

BI : Bank Indonesia
FKSSK: Financial System Stability Coordination Forum
LPS : Lembaga Penjamin Simpanan (Indonesia Deposit Insurance Corporation)
MoF: Ministry of Finance
OJK : Otoritas Jasa Keuangan (Indonesia Financial Services Agency)
PSAK: Indonesian accounting standards