

Jurisdiction: The Netherlands

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

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



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
I.	Hedge funds		·	·	
	-	G20/FSB RecommendationsWe 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	<ul> <li>Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the high level principles in IOSCO's <u>Report on Hedge</u></li> <li><u>Fund Oversight (Jun 2009)</u>, in particular recommendations 1 and 2.</li> <li>In their response, jurisdictions should specify whether:</li> <li>Hedge Funds (HFs) and/or HF managers are subject to mandatory registration</li> <li>Registered HF managers are subject</li> </ul>	Progress to date         Implementation ongoing:         Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:         Implementation by:         I	Next steps         Next steps         If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation:         Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:         Web-links to relevant documents:
		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)	<ul> <li>to appropriate ongoing requirements regarding:</li> <li>Organisational and operational standards;</li> <li>Conflicts of interest and other conduct of business rules;</li> <li>Disclosure to investors; and</li> <li>Prudential regulation.</li> <li>Jurisdictions can also refer to Principle 28 of the 2010 IOSCO <u>Objectives and</u> <u>Principles of Securities Regulation</u>, and take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those Principles.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Inplementation completed as of: 01.07.2013</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>☑ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>□ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>□ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</li> <li>In July 2011 the European Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive (AIFMD) was published, covering a.o. those aspects. The Netherlands has implemented this directive as of July</li> </ul>	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				2013.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/	
				dossier/33235/stb-2013-	
				228?resultIndex=3&sorttype=1&sortorde	
				r=4	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
No 2 (2)	<b>Description</b> Establishment of international information sharing framework	<b>G20/FSB Recommendations</b> 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)	RemarksJurisdictions should indicate the progressmade in implementing the high levelprinciples in IOSCO's Report on HedgeFund Oversight (Jun 2009)on sharinginformation to facilitate the oversight ofglobally active fund managers.In addition, jurisdictions should statewhether they are:Signatory to the IOSCO MMoUSignatory to bilateral agreements forsupervisory cooperation that coverhedge funds and are aligned to the2010 IOSCO Principles RegardingCross-border Supervisory	<ul> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> <li>Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> <li>Draft published as of:</li> <li>Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> <li>Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :</li> <li>Implementation completed as of: 01.07.2013</li> </ul>	Next stepsIf 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:
				<ul> <li>01.07.2013</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through : <ul> <li>☑ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>□ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>□ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> </ul> </li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: <ul> <li>This is part of the AIFMD, an EU directive that also provides a European framework for cross border oversight for investment funds. The Netherlands has implemented the AIFMD as of July 2013.</li> </ul></li></ul>	
				Highlight main developments since last	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				year's survey:	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/	
				dossier/33235/stb-2013-	
				228?resultIndex=3&sorttype=1&sortorde	
				r=4	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
3	Enhancing counterparty	Supervisors should require that	Jurisdictions should indicate specific	□ Not applicable	Planned actions (if any) and expected
(3)	risk management	institutions which have hedge funds as	policy measures taken for enhancing	□ Applicable but no action envisaged	commencement date:
		their counterparties have effective risk	counterparty risk management and	at the moment	
		management, including mechanisms to	strengthening their existing guidance on	□ Implementation ongoing:	
		monitor the funds' leverage and set limits for single counterparty exposures.	the management of exposure to leveraged counterparties.	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	Web-links to relevant documents:
		(London)		0 0 11	
		(London)	In particular, jurisdictions should indicate	Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	
			whether they have implemented	$\square$ Draft published as of:	
			recommendation 3 of the IOSCO <u>Report</u> on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009).	$\Box$ Final rule or legislation approved	
				and will come into force on:	
			In their responses, jurisdictions should	$\Box$ Final rule (for part of the reform) in	
			not provide information on the portion of	force since :	
			this recommendation that pertains to	<b>Implementation completed as of:</b> 01.01.2014	
			Basel III, since it is <u>monitored separately</u>	01.01.2014	
			by the BCBS.	Issue is being addressed through :	
			Jurisdictions can also refer to Principle	Primary / Secondary legislation	
			28 of the 2010 IOSCO <u>Objectives and</u>	□ Regulation /Guidelines	
			<u>Principles of Securities Regulation</u> , and	$\Box$ Other actions (such as supervisory	
			take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against	actions), please specify:	
			those Principles.	Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:	
			those r meiples.		
				[answer below is copied from the	
		Supervisors will strengthen their existing		European Commission response to this question] EU law (Regulation (EU) No	
		guidance on the management of		575/2013, the Capital Requirements	
		exposures to leveraged counterparties.		Regulation or CRR) already includes	
		(Rec. II.17, FSF 2008)		rules on the treatment of hedge fund	



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



	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
II.	Securitisation				
(4) reg fra	trengthening of egulatory and capital ramework for nonolines	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 monoline insurers (where these exist).	<ul> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> <li>Implementation ongoing:</li> </ul>	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
			<ul> <li>See, for reference, the following principles issued by IAIS:</li> <li>ICP 13 – Reinsurance and Other Forms of Risk Transfer;</li> <li>ICP 15 – Investments; and</li> <li>ICP 17 – Capital Adequacy.</li> <li>Jurisdictions may also refer to:</li> <li>IAIS <u>Guidance paper on enterprise risk management for capital adequacy and solvency purposes (Oct 2008).</u></li> <li>Joint Forum document on <u>Mortgage insurance: market structure, underwriting cycle and policy implications (Aug2013).</u></li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>□ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> <li>□ Draft published as of:</li> <li>□ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> <li>□ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :</li> <li>☑ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2016</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>□ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>□ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>□ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline:</li> <li>[answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] The Solvency II regime introduces a risk-based supervisory regime for all (re)insurance undertakings,</li> </ul>	Web-links to relevant documents:



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



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
II.	Securitisation				
				directive 2009/138/EC)	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				[answer below is copied from the	
				European Commission response to this	
				question] Solvency II entered into	
				application on 1 January 2016.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://ec.europa.eu/finance/insurance/solv ency/solvency2/index_en.htm	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
5 (5)	Strengthening of supervisory requirements or best	Regulators of institutional investors should strengthen the requirements or best practices for firms' processes for	Jurisdictions should indicate the due diligence policies, procedures and practices applicable for investment	<ul> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> </ul>	If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation:
	practices for investment in structured products	investment in structured products. (Rec II.18, FSF 2008)	managers when investing in structured finance instruments and other policy measures taken for strengthening best practices for investment in structured finance products.	<ul> <li>□ Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>□ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> <li>□ Draft published as of:</li> </ul>	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
			Jurisdictions may reference IOSCO's report on <u>Good Practices in Relation to</u> <u>Investment Managers' Due Diligence</u> <u>When Investing in Structured Finance</u> <u>Instruments (Jul 2009).</u> Jurisdictions may also refer to the Joint Forum report on <u>Credit Risk Transfer- Developments from 2005-2007 (Jul 2008).</u>	<ul> <li>□ Draft published as of:</li> <li>□ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> <li>□ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :</li> <li>☑ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2013</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>☑ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>□ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>□ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</li> <li>In the banking sector the CRD IV reinforced the capital requirements for the risks associated with securitisation transactions, particularly when these structures involve several levels of securitisation, and increased the support</li> </ul>	Web-links to relevant documents: http://ec.europa.eu/finance/securities/secu ritisation/index_en.htm



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				given to securitisation vehicles. These	
				provisions were implemented in 2011.	
				Thereby, as of 1st of January 2013	
				financial institutions must have a product	
				approval process for financial products.	
				EU legislation relating to the	
				(re)insurance sector (Solvency II)	
				introduces requirements on insurers'	
				ability to invest in securitisation, which	
				are consistent with those being introduced	
				in the banking sector. Insurance and	
				reinsurance undertakings investing in	
				securitisation will be subject to: (i)	
				Capital Requirements for all types of	
				investments calibrated as a 99.5% value	
				at risk over a 1 year time horizon – with	
				lower risk factors on simpler, more	
				transparent and standardised	
				securitisation products ; (ii) Higher	
				market risk capital requirements for re-	
				securitization exposures; (iii) A prudent	
				person principle that limits insurance and	
				reinsurance undertakings' investments to	
				assets that they can properly identify,	
				measure, monitor, manage, control and	
				report. Insurance and reinsurance	
				undertakings are only allowed to invest	
				in securitisation after conducting	
				comprehensive due diligence; (iv)	
				insurance and reinsurance undertakings	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				should have specific governance	
				arrangements when investing in	
				securitisation (written monitoring	
				procedures, specific reporting to	
				management body); (v) In order to	
				ensure transparency, requirements to	
				publicly disclose information any	
				investments in securitisation	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Solvency II entered into application on 1	
				January 2016. A new legislative proposal	
				was presented by the European	
				Commission on 30 September 2015,	
				defining simple, transparent and	
				standardised securitisations This	
				legislation also includes all requirements	
				applicable to EU institutional investors	
				when investing in securitisations, notably	
				due diligence requirements. The Council	
				agreed on these proposals on 8 December	
				2015, see:	
				http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/	
				press-releases/2015/12/02-capital-	
				markets-union-securitisation/	
				Negotiations with European Parlement	
				have however not yet commenced	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				Directive: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201 3L0036&from=EN Regulation: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201 3R0575&from=EN	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
6 (6)	Enhanced disclosure of securitised products	Securities market regulators should work with market participants to expand information on securitised products and	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures and other initiatives taken in relation to enhancing disclosure of	<ul> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> </ul>	If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation:
		their underlying assets. (Rec. III.10- III.13, FSF 2008)	securitised products, including working with industry and other authorities to continue to standardise disclosure templates and considering measures to improve the type of information that investors receive. See, for reference, IOSCO's <u>Report on</u> <u>Principles for Ongoing Disclosure for</u> <u>Asset-Backed Securities (Nov 2012),</u> <u>Disclosure Principles for Public</u> <u>Offerings and Listings of Asset-Backed</u> <u>Securities (Apr 2010)</u> and <u>report on</u> <u>Global Developments in Securitisation</u> <u>Regulations (November 2012)</u> , in particular recommendations 4 and 5.	<ul> <li>☐ Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> <li>☐ Draft published as of:</li> <li>☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> <li>☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :</li> <li>☑ Implementation completed as of: 21.05.2013/2009</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>☑ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>□ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>□ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline:</li> <li>[answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] The disclosure framework on securitised products has been strongly enhanced since the financial crisis. Disclosure requirements for</li> </ul>	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: [answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] Commission adopted in September 2015 a Proposal for a EU Regulation on securitisation which amongst others things, aims at streamlining and improving the consistency of due diligence and disclosure requirements of different legislative frameworks (Prospectus, CRR/CRD IV, AIFMD, CRA3 and Solvency II) which are applicable to structured finance instruments. This legislative proposal is currently under interinstitutional negotiations (Council and European Parliament). ESMA's work on the implementation of art. 8b of the CRA III Regulation and the corresponding delegated Regulation will depend on the final version of the provisions on disclosure of the future EU Regulation on securitisation, as these



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



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				(CRAIII Regulation)which came into	
				force June 2013. With regard to issuers of	
				ABS, Article 8b of the CRA 3 Regulation	
				requires: - The issuer, the originator and	
				the sponsor of a structured finance	
				instrument established in the Union shall,	
				on the website set up by ESMA, jointly	
				publish information on the credit quality	
				and performance of the underlying assets	
				of the structured finance instrument, the	
				structure of the securitisation transaction,	
				the cash flows and any collateral	
				supporting a securitisation exposure as	
				well as any information that is necessary	
				to conduct comprehensive and well-	
				informed stress tests on the cash flows	
				and collateral values supporting the	
				underlying exposures. Art. 8b of the	
				CRA3 Regulation was complemented by	
				a Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/3	
				adopted by the Commission on 30	
				September 2014 (http://eur-	
				lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2015_002	
				_R_0003) which specifies: (a) the	
				information that must be published in	
				order to comply with art. 8b of the CRA	
				III Regulation;(b) the frequency with	
				which the information referred to in point	
				(a)is to be updated; (c) the presentation of	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				the information referred to in point (a) by	
				means of standardised disclosure	
				templates According to this Delegated	
				Regulation, ESMA is supposed to set up	
				a website for the publication of the	
				information on structured finance	
				instruments by 1st January 2017.	
				However ESMA's work will depend on	
				the final version of the provisions on	
				disclosure of the future EU Regulation on	
				securitisation, which might have an	
				impact on the current art. 8b of the	
				CRAIII Regulation (see right column). In	
				addition, a Task Force established under	
				the umbrella of the Joint Committee of	
				the ESAs issued a report in 2015 which	
				identifies the main inconsistencies of the	
				existing level-1 and level-2 due diligence,	
				disclosure requirements (Prospectus,	
				CRR/CRD IV, AIFMD, CRA3 and	
				Solvency II) and reporting requirements	
				concerning SFI as well as makes	
				suggestions how to mitigate them.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				[answer below is copied from the	
				European Commission response to this	
				question] As highlighted in the reply to	
				question 5, the Commission adopted on	
				30 September 2015 a legislative proposal	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				on Securitisation Regulation that will	
				apply to all securitisations and include	
				due diligence, risk retention and	
				transparency rules for all financial	
				sectors. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-	
				content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52015PC	
				0472	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				REGULATION (EU) No 462/2013 (CRA Regulation): http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201 3R0462&from=EN Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) n°2015/3 of 30 September 2015: http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2015_002 _R_0003 Regulation (EC) No 809/2004, as amended, implementing Directive 2003/71/EC as regards information contained in prospectuses (see Annexes VII & VIII) http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?qid=1402046016254& uri=CELEX:02004R0809-20130828	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
III.	<b>Enhancing supervision</b>			-	
	-		RemarksJurisdictions should indicate: (1) whetherthey have identified domestic SIFIs and,if so, in which sectors; (2) whether thenames of the identified SIFIs have beenpublicly disclosed; and (3) the types ofpolicy measures taken for implementingconsistent, consolidated supervision andregulation of the identified SIFIs.In their response to (3) above,jurisdictions should note any significantchanges in their approach, strategy orpractices to enhance SIFI supervision.	Progress to date         Implicable         Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment         Implementation ongoing:         Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:         Draft in preparation, expected publication by:         Draft published as of:         Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:         Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:[answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] On banking aspects, the Commission intends to table legislation in 2016 to implement the remaining elements of the regulatory framework pertinent to banks agreed at international level, in particular to limit bank leverage, to assure stable bank funding and to improve comparability of risk-weighted
			Jurisdictions should mention, but not provide details on, policy measures that pertain to higher loss absorbency requirements for G/D-SIBs, since these are <u>monitored separately</u> by the BCBS. See, for reference, the following documents:	<ul> <li>✓ Implementation completed as of: 01.09.2014 (CRD-IV)/01.11.2015 (BRRD)</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through : ✓ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>✓ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>☐ Other actions (such as supervisory</li> </ul>	assets, and to enable implementation by 2019 of the Financial Stability Board's recommendations on Total Loss Absorbing Capacity for banks, so that adequate resources are available for failing banks without resorting to taxpayers.
			<ul> <li>BCBS:</li> <li>Framework for G-SIBs (Jul 2013)</li> <li>Framework for D-SIBs (Oct 2012)</li> <li>IAIS:</li> <li>Global Systemically Important Insurers: Policy Measures (Jul 2013)</li> </ul>	actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: Banking sector SIFI-buffers: CRD-IV / CRR approved by the European Parliament on 16 April 2013 and the Council on 27 March 2013 and entered into force on 1 January 2014. As regards	Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
			and initial assessment methodology	G-SIBs and D-SIBs, CRDIV / CRR as	
			• IAIS SRMP guidance - FINAL (Dec	approved by the European Parliament and	
			2013)	the European Council implement in the	
				EU the BCBS' assessment methodology	
			• <i>Guidance on Liquidity management</i>	of global systemically important banks	
			and planning (Oct 2014)	and the related additional loss absorbency	
			FSB:	requirement as well as BCBS' principles	
				for dealing with domestic systemically	
			• <u>Framework for addressing SIFIs (Nov</u>	important banks. A Delegated	
			<u>2011)</u>	Regulation and an Implementing	
				Regulation on the methodology of G-SII	
				(Global Systemically Important	
				Institutions) identification and disclosure	
				were adopted by the Commission in	
				2014. EBA also adopted: - Guidelines	
				on disclosure of indicators of global	
				systemic importance, and - Guidelines	
				on criteria to assess other systemically	
				important institutions (O-SIIs). The	
				Netherlands makes use of the national	
				discretion foreseen in Capital	
				Requirements Directive IV to impose	
				Other-SIFI buffer and Systemic Risk	
				Buffers to the domestic SIFIs. Moreover,	
				Capital Requirements Directive IV also	
				requires EU Member States with a G-	
				SIFI within their jurisdiction to impose a	
				G-SIFI buffer. In the Netherlands the	
				banking supervisor (De Nederlandsche	
				Bank) has announced on 29 April 2014 it	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				will impose a systemic risk buffer of 3%	
				RWA for the three largest Dutch banks	
				and 1% RWA other-SIFI buffer for a	
				fourth bank. The build-up of the buffers	
				will formally start in 2016 and must be	
				completed by 2019. Resolution planning	
				and bail-in: As regards recovery and	
				resolution, the EU-wide Bank Recovery	
				and Resolution Directive (BRRD) has	
				been adopted and will apply from January	
				2015. It requires Member States to equip	
				authorities with the necessary tools and	
				powers to ensure that the distress or	
				failure of all banks and large investment	
				firms can be managed in an orderly way,	
				preserving financial stability and	
				protecting taxpayers in the process. The	
				BRRD will help ensure coordinated	
				resolution action regarding SIFIs in	
				Europe. For Euro Area and other	
				Member States participating in the	
				Banking Union, the rules of the BRRD	
				will be applied from 2016 by the Single	
				Resolution Mechanism. The SRM	
				integrates key aspects of the coordination	
				and decision-making structure applicable	
				to resolution planning and the resolution	
				of banks and replaces national resolution	
				funds with a Single Resolution Fund in	
				participating Member States. In the	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Netherlands, the law implementing the	
				BRRD entered into force on January 1st	
				2016. Insurance sector [the	
				following text is copied from the	
				European Commission response to this	
				question] For the insurance sector the	
				implementation of the IAIS	
				recommendations for G-SIIs is on-going	
				and addressed via supervisory actions and	
				monitoring. There is no EU legislation for	
				G-SIIs specifically, implementation is	
				dealt with at Member States level.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				The draft law implementing the BRRD in	
				the Netherlands was sent to Parliament in	
				May 2015 and was adopted in november	
				2015. In addition, since 1 January the	
				phasing in of the combined capital buffer	
				requirement has commenced, which	
				includes the buffer requirements for	
				global and other systemically important	
				institutions. As mention above, in the	
				Netherlands this means that the	
				implemenation of the systemic risk buffer	
				commenced as of 2016. Currently work	
				is ongoing on a revision of the recovery	
				and resolution regime for insurers. A new	
				comprehensive resolution regime, based	



Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
			on the BRRD, is envisioned. Entry into	
			force is foreseen for Q4 2017.	
			Web-links to relevant documents:	
			Web-links to relevant documents: Supervisory actions related to the systemic risk buffer in the Netherlands: https://www.esrb.europa.eu/pub/html/ind ex.en.html?skey=29/04/2014%20Notifica tion BRRD: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/policies/ ecofin/banking-union?tab=Single- rulebook&subTab=Bank-recovery-and- resolution⟨=en SRM: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/policies/ ecofin/banking-union?tab=Supervision- and-resolution&subTab=Single- resolution-mechanism⟨=en Commission Delegated Regulation on G- SII identification methodology: http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32 014R1222&from=EN Commission Implementing Regulation on disclosure of the values used to identify global systemically important institutions: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32 014R1030&from=EN EBA Guidelines G-SII disclosure: http://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/101 80/717755/EBA-GL-2014- 02+%28Guidelines+on+disclosure+of+in dicators+of+systemic+importance%29.pd	
			EBA Guidelines O-SIIs:	
			http://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/101	
			10+%28Guidelines+on+O-	
			SIIs+Assessment%29.pdf/964fa8c7-6f7c-	
	Description	Description       G20/FSB Recommendations         Image: Commendation of the second	Description G20/FSB Recommendations Remarks	on the BRRD, is ervisioned. Entry into force is forescen for Q4 2017. Web-links to relevant documents: Supervisory actions related to the systemic risk buffer in the Netherlands: https://www.estb.europa.eu/pub/html/ind ex.en.html?skey=2004/2014/2014/2014/2014/2014/2014/2014/



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
8 (8)	Establishing supervisory colleges and conducting risk assessments	To establish the remaining supervisory colleges for significant cross-border firms by June 2009. (London)	Reporting in this area should be undertaken solely by home jurisdictions of G-SIBs and G-SIIs.	<ul> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> </ul>	If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation:
	assessments	We agreed to conduct rigorous risk assessment on these firms [G-SIFIs] through international supervisory	Please indicate the progress made in establishing and strengthening the functioning of supervisory colleges for G- SIBs and G-SIIs, including the development of any joint supervisory	<ul> <li>☐ Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> <li>☐ Draft published as of:</li> </ul>	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
		colleges. (Seoul)	<ul><li>plans within core colleges and leveraging on supervisory activities conducted by host authorities.</li><li>See, for reference, the following</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> <li>Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :</li> </ul>	Web-links to relevant documents:
			documents: BCBS:	<ul> <li>✓ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2014 (Banking) 01.01.2016 (Banking, Insurance)</li> </ul>	
			<ul> <li><u>Principles for effective supervisory</u> <u>colleges (Jun 2014)</u></li> <li><u>Progress report on the implementation</u></li> </ul>	Issue is being addressed through :☑ Primary / Secondary legislation☑ Regulation /Guidelines	
			of principles for effective supervisory colleges (Jul 2015) IAIS:	<ul> <li>Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the</li> </ul>	
			• <u>ICPs 24 and 25, especially guidance</u> <u>25.1.1 – 25.1.6, 25.6, 25.7 and 25.8</u>	legislation/ regulation/guideline: [answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this	
			• <u>Application paper on supervisory</u> <u>colleges (Oct 2014)</u>	question] Banking aspects: The Capital Requirements Directive (2013/36/EU) provides for the mandatory establishment of colleges of supervisors for cross-	



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



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				[According to the SSM Regulation, the	
				supervisory colleges are established by	
				the SSM when the banking group has	
				subsidiary insitutions in at least one	
				Member State outsize the Eurozone area.	
				The ECB carries out the functions of	
				home supervisor for euro area banks and	
				branches of non-euro area Member	
				State's banks where these branches are	
				established in the euro area. It participates	
				in non-Eurozone colleges as a host	
				authority representing all the eurozone	
				subsidiaries of the banking group. In both	
				cases, national competent authorities have	
				a status of observers in colleges. NCA	
				staff assists in establishment and	
				functioning of colleges via SSM Joint	
				Supervisory Teams.]	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
9	Supervisory exchange of information and	To quicken supervisory responsiveness to developments that have a common effect	Jurisdictions should include any feedback received from recent FSAPs/ROSC	□ Not applicable	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
(9)	coordination	across a number of institutions,	assessments on the <u>September 2012</u> BCP	□ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	
		supervisory exchange of information and	3 (Cooperation and collaboration) and	□ Implementation ongoing:	
		coordination in the development of best practice benchmarks should be improved	BCP 14 (Home-host relationships). Jurisdictions should also indicate any	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	Web-links to relevant documents:
		at both national and international levels.	steps taken since the last assessment in	□ Draft in preparation, expected	
		(Rec V.7 , FSF 2008)	this area, particularly in response to	publication by:	
			relevant FSAP/ROSC recommendations.	□ 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 :	
		Enhance the effectiveness of core supervisory colleges. (FSB 2012)	Jurisdictions should describe any recent or planned regulatory, supervisory or legislative changes that contribute to the	✓ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2016 (Banking) 01.01.2016 (Insurance)	
			sharing of supervisory information (e.g.	Issue is being addressed through :	
			within supervisory colleges or via	Primary / Secondary legislation	
			bilateral or multilateral MoUs).	☑ Regulation /Guidelines	
				Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	
				Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:	
				[answer below is copied from the	
				European Commission response to this	
				question] The EU has put in place a	
				comprehensive set of rules concerning the	
				exchange of information and coordination	
				among competent authorities. Banking	



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



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				adopted (Reg. (EU) No 524/2014 and No	
				620/2014). Furthermore, the ESAs	
				continue developing the single rulebook	
				applicable to all 28 Member States so as	
				to ensure that supervisory practices are	
				consistent across the whole Union. In	
				particular EBA develops and maintains a	
				single supervisory handbook (a	
				non-binding collection of supervisory	
				best practices). Finally, the creation of a	
				Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM),	
				which is fully in place since 4 November	
				2014 and which is responsible for	
				supervising all banks in the euro area and	
				in Member States outside the euro area	
				which would decide to participate in the	
				SSM, supplements the monetary union by	
				further strengthening supervisory	
				consistency across the euro area. The pre-	
				SSM home/host supervisor information	
				exchange and coordination procedures	
				and colleges of supervisors continue to	
				exist, as far as coordination with	
				supervisors in non-euro area Member	
				States as well as with third country	
				supervisory authorities is concerned.	
				However, the ECB has taken over	
				supervisory tasks within the euro area.	
				The ECB carries out the functions of	
				home supervisor for credit institutions	



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



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				(2011), the Netherlands complies with the	
				October 2006 Basel Core Principles	
				(BCP). Compliance with the updated	
				BCP's (2012) will be assessed during the	
				upcoming FSAP (2016). Clarification:	
				there are no changes vis-a-vis last year.	
				Compliance with the updated BCP's	
				(2012) will be assessed during the	
				upcoming FSAP (second half of 2016).	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				[answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] Directive 2013/36/EU (CRD IV): http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32013L00 36 On the information to be exchanged in relation to the exercise of the freedom of establishment/to provide services: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/ALL/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L201 4.309.01.0001.01.ENG http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L201 4.254.01.0002.01.ENG On the exchanges of information for supervisory purposes: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2014_148 R_0003 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:JOL_2014_172 _R_0001 On the SSM: SSM Regulation: http://eur- lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do ?uri=OJ:L:2013:287:0063:0089:EN:PDF SSM Framework regulation https://www.ecb.europa.eu/ecb/legal/pdf/ celex_32014r0468_en_txt.pdf	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
<b>No</b> 10 (10)	Description           Strengthening resources           and effective           supervision	<b>G20/FSB Recommendations</b> 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)	<b>Remarks</b> Jurisdictions should indicate any steps taken on recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 (i.e. supervisory strategy, engagement with banks, improvements in banks' IT and MIS, data requests, and talent management strategy respectively) in the FSB <u>thematic peer review report on</u>	Progress to date         Not applicable         Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment         If "Not applicable " or "Applicable but no action envisaged" has been selected, please provide a brief justification:         Implementation ongoing:	<b>Next steps</b> Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
		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)	supervisory frameworks and approaches to SIBs (May 2015).	<ul> <li>☐ Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> <li>☐ Draft published as of:</li> <li>☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> <li>☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since:</li> <li>☑ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2014</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>☑ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>☑ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>☑ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: We refer to the answers provided in the comprehensive thematic peer review report on supervisory frameworks and approaches to SIBs (May 2015, pp 59,</li> </ul>	Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				72-73, 84, 97 and 111): http://www.fsb.org/wp- content/uploads/Thematic-Review-on- Supervisory-Approaches-to-SIBs.pdf As well as to the European Commission's response with regard to the European Union legal framework. [answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] The EU has put in place a comprehensive set of rules concerning effective supervision. Directive 2013/36/EU provides for the general powers and measures that supervisors shall have (art. 102-104), the power to impose penalties (art. 18 and 64) and the procedure to follow to carry out banks' supervision (art. 97-98). Among the powers entrusted to supervisors, there is the obligation to carry out stress testing at least annually (Art. 100). Legislation has been complemented principally by the EBA guidelines on supervisory review and evaluation process, applicable since January 2016. (cont.) <b>Highlight main developments since last</b> year's survey: In addition, further progress has been made with regard to recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 in the FSB thematic peer review report.	
				However, the complete answer to this question exceeds the 4000 signs limitation, therefore the answer will be submitted by email to the FSB Secretariat. Web-links to relevant documents:	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
IV.	<b>Building and implemen</b>	ting macroprudential frameworks and	d tools		
11 (11)	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	Please describe major changes in the institutional arrangements for macroprudential policy (structures,	<ul> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> </ul>	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
		the financial system including in the case of regulated banks, shadow banks <sup>1</sup> and private pools of capital to limit the build	mandates, powers, reporting etc.) that have taken place since the global financial crisis, particularly over the past	□ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	Web-links to relevant documents:
		up of systemic risk. (London)	year.	<ul> <li>Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> </ul>	http://www.dnb.nl/en/news/news-and- archive/dnbulletin-2013/dnb293046.jsp
		Ensure that national regulators possess the powers for gathering relevant information on all material financial	Please indicate whether an assessment has been conducted with respect to the adequacy of powers to collect and share relevant information among different	<ul> <li>Draft published as of:</li> <li>Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> <li>Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since:</li> </ul>	http://www.dnb.nl/en/about- dnb/duties/financial-stability/ http://www.dnb.nl/en/binaries/Stabiliteit_ tcm47-337344.pdf
		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)	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.	<ul> <li>✓ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2014</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> </ul>	
				<ul> <li>Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> </ul>	
				<b>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</b> Firstly, the Dutch central bank (DNB) is	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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
				the macroprudential authority under the	
				national implementation of the CRD-IV	
				package. This will confer several	
				macroprudential instruments upon DNB	
				to execute its recently formalized explicit	
				responsibility for financial stability.	
				These instruments include the	
				countercyclical buffer, the systemic risk	
				buffer, increasing risk weights and LGDs	
				of real estate or financial sector exposures	
				for designated groups of banks, amongst	
				others. DNB has also established a	
				special department for the surveillance of	
				macroprudential risks, and semi-annually	
				publishes a monitoring excersise of	
				financial stability risks, titeld the	
				Overview Financial Stability. The Dutch	
				central bank will also be given special	
				additional powers in a new law to request	
				more information regarding	
				macroprudential risks. Secondly, the	
				minister of Finance has established the	
				so-called Financial Stability Committee.	
				The Financial Stability Committee's task	
				is to identify risks to financial stability in	
				the Netherlands, and to make	
				recommendations with respect to these	
				risks. In this committee, representatives	
				of DNB, the Netherlandse Authority	
				Financial Markets and the Ministry of	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Finance discuss developments relating to	
				the stability of the financial system in the	
				Netherlands. The committee meets at	
				least twice a year and is chaired by DNB	
				president Klaas Knot. (Both supervisors	
				carry out their tasks and responsibilities	
				independently from the Ministry; and the	
				Ministry has no vote in the committee.)	
				The existence of the FSC strengthens the	
				structure of responsibility for	
				macroprudential analysis significantly,	
				and facilitates policy coordination and	
				consistency. Thirdly, following the	
				ESRB Regulation, the responsibility of	
				macro-prudential oversight has been	
				entrusted to the European Systemic Risk	
				Board (ESRB). In pursuing its macro-	
				prudential mandate, the ESRB performs a	
				number of key activities, namely risk	
				monitoring, risk assessment and,	
				ultimately, if deemed appropriate, it	
				adopts warnings and recommendations.	
				Going forward, with the establishment of	
				the Banking Union as of 1 November	
				2014 the ECB as single supervisor will	
				also have some macro-prudential	
				competences within the Single	
				Supervisory Mechanism (SSM). In sum,	
				the SSM Regulation provides that while	
				the initiative for macro-prudential	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				measures remains at national level, the	
				ECB can apply higher requirements if	
				deemed necessary (e.g top-up the	
				countercyclical buffer/systemic risk	
				buffer).	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				It is our intention to make use of the	
				Member State option in CRD-IV article	
				160(6) to impose a shorter transitional	
				period regarding the use of the	
				countercyclical capital buffer. Moreover,	
				DNB has been granted, by law, powers to	
				collect additional information necessary	
				for executing its financial stability task.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
No 12 (12)	Description Enhancing system-wide monitoring and the use of macro-prudential instruments	G20/FSB RecommendationsAuthorities should use quantitativeindicators and/or constraints on leverageand margins as macro-prudential tools forsupervisory purposes. Authorities shoulduse quantitative indicators of leverage asguides for policy, both at the institution-specific and at the macro-prudential(system-wide) level(Rec. 3.1, FSF2009)We are developing macro-prudentialpolicy frameworks and tools to limit thebuild-up of risks in the financial sector,building on the ongoing work of the FSB-BIS-IMF on this subject. (Cannes)Authorities should monitor substantialchanges in asset prices and theirimplications for the macro economy andthe financial system. (Washington)	RemarksPlease 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 	<ul> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> <li>Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> <li>Draft published as of:</li> <li>Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> <li>Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since:</li> <li>Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2014</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline:</li> <li>The adopted ESRB Recommendation ((ESRB/2013/1), OJ 2013/C 170/01) on intermediate objectives and instruments of macro-prudential policies proposes a list of intermediate objectives of macro-</li> </ul>	Next steps         Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:         Web-links to relevant documents:         http://www.dnb.nl/en/news/news-and-archive/dnbulletin-2013/dnb293046.jsp         http://www.dnb.nl/en/about-dnb/duties/financial-stability/         http://www.dnb.nl/en/binaries/Stabiliteit_tcm47-337344.pdf
				prudential policies and a corresponding list of instruments that can be used by macro-prudential authorities to meet the	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				intermediate objectives. The	
				Recommendation gives an indicative list	
				of instruments that national macro-	
				prudential authorities can use to fulfil	
				their mandate. These instruments, as	
				shaped in the implementation of the	
				CRD-IV, will be conferred on the Dutch	
				central bank. In the execution of its new	
				role as macroprudential authority, the	
				Dutch central bank will execute a	
				'macroprudential policy cycle',	
				consisting of the following stages: (i) the	
				risk identification stage, where	
				vulnerabilities are detected and assessed	
				(against the intermediate objectives) and	
				relevant indicators and thresholds are	
				defined; (ii) the instrument selection and	
				calibration stage; (iii) the implementation	
				and communication stage, where	
				instruments are activated; and (iv) the	
				evaluation phase, where the impact of	
				instruments is assessed in view of	
				possible adjustment/de-activation.	
				DNB's has published a plan to introduce	
				a systemic risk buffer for four of largest	
				Dutch banks, acting upon its foreseen	
				ability under the finalization of the	
				implementing law of the CRD-IV. It has	
				also sent a notification to the ESRB	
				regarding this measure, which details the	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				selection, calibration and application in	
				more detail. The Financial Stability	
				Comittee has issued a recommendation to	
				lower the loan-to-value ratio to 90%,	
				because it could provide additional	
				benefits in terms of financial stability.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	



No Description	<b>G20/FSB Recommendations</b>	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
V. Improving oversight	of credit rating agencies (CRAs)			
13 Enhancing regulation	All CRAs whose ratings are used for	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy	□ Not applicable	If this recommendation has not yet
(13) and supervision of CRAs	regulatory purposes should be subject to a regulatory oversight regime that includes	measures undertaken for enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs	□ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation:
	registration. The regulatory oversight	including registration, oversight and	□ Implementation ongoing:	
	regime should be established by end 2009 and should be consistent with the IOSCO	sharing of information between national authorities. They should also indicate	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	Planned actions (if any) and expected
	Code of Conduct Fundamentals. (London)	their consistency with the following IOSCO document:	Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	commencement date:
	National authorities will enforce	• Code of Conduct Fundamentals for	□ Draft published as of:	
	compliance and require changes to a rating agency's practices and procedures	<u>Credit Rating Agencies (Mar 2015)</u> (including governance, training and	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	Web-links to relevant documents:
	for managing conflicts of interest and	risk management)	☐ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :	
	assuring the transparency and quality of the rating process.	Jurisdictions may also refer to the following IOSCO documents:	<b>☑ Implementation completed as of:</b> 01.01.2014	
	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	<ul> <li>Principle 22 of <u>Principles and</u> <u>Objectives of Securities Regulation</u> (Jun 2010) which calls for registration and oversight programs for CRAs</li> <li><u>Statement of Principles Regarding the</u> <u>Activities of Credit Rating Agencies</u> (Sep 2003)</li> <li><u>Final Report on Supervisory Colleges</u> for Credit Rating Agencies (Jul 2013)</li> <li>Jurisdictions should take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those principles.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>☑ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>□ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>□ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</li> <li>The Regulation 462/2013 of 21 May 2013 amending Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 on credit rating agencies strengthening the rules for rating agencies. Main improvements of the amendment relate to: - reducing reliance</li> </ul>	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
		obligations for CRAs) as early as possible		on external credit ratings - strengthening	
		in 2010. (FSB 2009)		transparency of sovereign ratings	
		We encourage further steps to enhance		including indicative calendar for	
		transparency and competition among		sovereign ratings and disclosure of full	
		credit rating agencies. (St Petersburg)		research report of sovereign ratings -	
		erealt futing ageneres. (St retersourg)		conflicts of interests: introduction of	
				shareholder limitations, limitations on	
				holding shares in two CRAs at the same	
				time, and limitations of CRAs to rate	
				instruments issued by shareholders - civil	
				liability regime: investors and issuers will	
				be enabled to engage in civil claims in	
				case of gross negligence and intentional	
				violation of the CRA regulation by rating	
				agencies - enhanced transparency on	
				structured finance instruments and	
				rotation for re-securitisations.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				http://eur- lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do ?uri=OJ:L:2013:146:0001:0033:EN:PDF	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
14	Reducing the reliance	We also endorsed the FSB's principles on	Jurisdictions should indicate the steps	🗆 Not applicable	Planned actions (if any) and expected
(14)	on ratings	reducing reliance on external credit	they are taking to address the	□ Applicable but no action envisaged	commencement date:
		ratings. Standard setters, market	recommendations of the May 2014 FSB	at the moment	We would like to refer to the response of
		participants, supervisors and central	thematic peer review report on the	□ Implementation ongoing:	the European Commission. [answer
		banks should not rely mechanistically on	implementation of the FSB Principles for	Status of progress [for legislation and	below is copied from the European
		external credit ratings. (Seoul)	Reducing Reliance on Credit Ratings,	regulation/guidelines only]:	Commission response to this question] In
		Authorities should check that the roles	including by implementing their <u>agreed</u>	Draft in preparation, expected	accordance with the requirements of
		that they have assigned to ratings in	action plans. Any revised action plans	publication by:	Article 39b of the CRA3 Regulation, the
		regulations and supervisory rules are	should be sent to the FSB Secretariat so	□ Draft published as of:	European Commission is currently
		consistent with the objectives of having	that it can be posted on the FSB website.	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	working on the preparation of a report to
		investors make independent judgment of	Jurisdictions may refer to the following		the European Parliament and to the
		risks and perform their own due	documents:	□ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :	Council on: (a) the steps taken as regards
		diligence, and that they do not induce	• FSB Principles for Reducing Reliance	✓ Implementation completed as of:	the deletion of references to credit ratings
		uncritical reliance on credit ratings as a	on CRA Ratings (Oct 2010)	21.05.2013	which trigger or have the potential to
		substitute for that independent evaluation.		Terrer is heimer addressed there each a	trigger sole or mechanistic reliance
		(Rec IV. 8, FSF 2008)	• FSB <u>Roadmap for Reducing Reliance</u>	Issue is being addressed through :	thereone; (b) alternative tools to enable
		We reaffirm our commitment to reduce	on CRA Ratings (Nov 2012)	Primary / Secondary legislation	investors to make their own credit risk
		authorities' and financial institutions'	<ul> <li>BCBS Consultative Document</li> </ul>	□ Regulation /Guidelines	assessment of issuers and of financial
		reliance on external credit ratings, and	<u>Revisions to the Standardised Approach</u>	$\Box$ Other actions (such as supervisory	instruments. If Report will be based on
		call on standard setters, market	<u>for credit risk (Dec 2015)</u>	actions), please specify:	Technical advice issued by ESMA and
		participants, supervisors and central	• IAIS <u>ICP guidance</u> 16.9 and 17.8.25	Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:	will also take into account insights from an external study commissioned by the
		banks to implement the agreed FSB		0 0 0	Commission. If appropriate and if
		principles and end practices that rely	• IOSCO <u>Good Practices on Reducing</u>	The Netherlands is committed to the	alternatives to external credit ratings can
		mechanistically on these ratings.	<u>Reliance on CRAs in Asset</u>	agreements made on a global and	be identified and can be implemented by
		(Cannes)	<u>Management (June 2015)</u>	European level to reduce the sole and	market participants, the Commission will
			IOSCO Sound Practices at Large	mechanistic reliance on ratings.	consider removing remaining references
		We call for accelerated progress by	Intermediaries Relating to the	Complementary to the national action	in EU financial services legislation by
		national authorities and standard setting	Assessment of Creditworthiness and the	plan, the Netherlands participates on the	in Do interior services registation by



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations         bodies in ending the mechanistic reliance on credit ratings and encourage steps that 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)	Use of External Credit Ratings (Dec         2015).	Progress to dateEuropean level, for which we like to referto the response of the EuropeanCommission. [answer below is copiedfrom the European Commission responseto this question] The progress made byEU in reducing reliance on ratings inaccordance with the 2012 FSB Roadmapis summarised in the EU Action Plan toreduce reliance on ratings which waspublished on 12 May 2014 (see weblinkbelow). The overall framework in the EUto reduce reliance on CRA has amultilayer approach, covering EUregulation on credit rating agencies,sectoral legislation in financial services,actions by European SupervisoryAuthorities, including the EuropeanSecurities and Markets Authority(ESMA), the European BankingAuthority (EBA) and the EuropeanInsurance and Occupational PensionsAuthority (EIOPA) and by nationalcompetent sectoral authorities.Highlight main developments since lastyear's survey:Web-links to relevant documents:EU Action Planhttp://ec.europa.eu/finance/rating-agencies/docs/140512-fsb-eu-response_en.pdf	2020. Web-links to relevant documents:



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VI.	Enhancing and alignin	eg accounting standards			
15 (15)	Consistent application of high-quality accounting standards	Regulators, supervisors, and accounting standard setters, as appropriate, should work with each other and the private	Jurisdictions should indicate the accounting standards that they follow and whether (and on what basis) they are of a	<ul> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> </ul>	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
		sector on an ongoing basis to ensure consistent application and enforcement of high-quality accounting standards. (Washington)	high and internationally acceptable quality (eg equivalent to IFRSs as published by the IASB), and provide accurate and relevant information on financial performance. They should also	<ul> <li>Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> </ul>	Web-links to relevant documents:
			explain the system they have for enforcement of consistent application of those standards.	<ul> <li>Draft published as of:</li> <li>Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> </ul>	
			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-	<ul> <li>Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :</li> <li>Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2005</li> </ul>	
			world/Pages/Analysis-of-the-G20-IFRS- profiles.aspx.	Issue is being addressed through :	
			<ul> <li>Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> </ul>		
			Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: [answer below is copied from the		
			In addition, jurisdictions should set out any steps they intend to take (if appropriate) to foster transparent and consistent implementation of the new	European Commission response to this question] The EU adopted in 2002 a regulation to adopt IFRS (i.e. the IAS Regulation). Since January 2005, the	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
			accounting requirements for expected	IFRS are mandatory for the consolidated	
			loan loss provisioning for impaired loans	accounts of listed companies.	
			that are being introduced by the IASB	Enforcement of IFRS is done by National	
			and are scheduled to be introduced by the	Market Authority and coordinated by the	
			FASB.	European Securities and Markets	
			See, for reference, the following BCBS	Authority (ESMA). In that context in	
			document:	March 2016 ESMA published a Report	
				on Enforcement and Regulatory activities	
			• <u>Supervisory guidance for assessing</u>	of Accounting Enforcers in 2015. Over	
			banks' financial instrument fair value	10 years after the adoption of the IAS	
			practices (Apr 2009)	Regulation, the European Commission	
				has assessed the effects of the use of	
				IFRS in the EU against its original aims.	
				Its report on the evaluation to the	
				European Parliament was published on 18	
				June 2015. The EU endorsed the new	
				standard on Fair Value Measurement	
				(IFRS 13) in 2012. This standard has	
				been in force in Europe since the 1st	
				January 2013.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				[answer below is copied from the	
				European Commission response to this	
				question] The EU is in the process of	
				endorsing IFRS 9 for implementation in	
				the EU in 2018. The EBA has begun	
				transforming the Basel Guidance on	
				credit risk and accounting for expected	
				losses into EBA Guidelines which will	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				have a "comply or explain" status.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				[answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] Web-links to relevant documents: http://ec.europa.eu/finance/accounting/leg al_framework/regulations_adopting_ias/i ndex_en.htm http://ec.europa.eu/finance/accounting/ias -evaluation/index_en.htm https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/ files/library/2016- 410_esma_report_on_enforcement_and_r egulatory_activities_of_accounting_enfor cers_in_2015.pdf	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VII.	Enhancing risk manag	gement			
16	Enhancing guidance to	Regulators should develop enhanced	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy	🗆 Not applicable	Planned actions (if any) and expected
(17)	strengthen banks' risk management practices,	guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, in line with	measures taken to enhance guidance to strengthen banks' risk management	□ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment	commencement date:
	including on liquidity	international best practices, and should	practices.	□ Implementation ongoing:	
	and foreign currency funding risks	encourage financial firms to re-examine their internal controls and implement	Jurisdictions may also refer to the following documents:	Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	Web-links to relevant documents:
		strengthened policies for sound risk management. (Washington)	• FSB's <u>thematic peer review report on</u>	Draft in preparation, expected publication by:	
		National supervisors should closely check	<u>risk governance (Feb 2013);</u>	□ Draft published as of:	
		banks' implementation of the updated guidance on the management and	• Joint Forum's <u>Developments in credit</u> risk management across sectors:	☐ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:	
		supervision of liquidity as part of their regular supervision. If banks'	<u>current practices and</u> recommendations (June 2015); and	□ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :	
		implementation of the guidance is inadequate, supervisors will take more	<ul> <li>BCBS <u>Peer review of supervisory</u></li> </ul>	☑ Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2014	
		prescriptive action to improve practices. (Rec. II.10, FSF 2008)	authorities' implementation of stress testing principles (Apr 2012) and Principles for sound stress testing	Issue is being addressed through : ☑ Primary / Secondary legislation	
		Regulators and supervisors in emerging	practices and supervision (May	☑ Regulation /Guidelines	
		markets <sup>1</sup> will enhance their supervision of banks' operation in foreign currency	<u>2009).</u>	Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:	
		funding markets. (FSB 2009)		Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:	
		We commit to conduct robust, transparent		[answer below is copied from the	
		stress tests as needed. (Pittsburgh)		European Commission response to this	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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
				question] The Basel III agreement on an	
				international framework for the Liquidity	
				Coverage Ratio and liquidity risk	
				monitoring tools adopted in its final	
				version in January 2013 and the	
				Principles for Sound Liquidity Risk	
				Management and Supervision of	
				September 2008 are implemented into EU	
				law by the CRD IV Package which is	
				made up of a Directive (Directive	
				2013/36/EU of the European Parliament	
				and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on the	
				access to the activity of credit institutions	
				and the prudential supervision of credit	
				institutions and investment firms) and a	
				Regulation (Regulation (EU) No	
				575/2013 of the European Parliament and	
				of the Council of 26 June 2013 on	
				prudential requirements for credit	
				institutions and investment firms). These	
				prudential rules introduced in the two	
				legislative texts have been applied since 1	
				January 2014. In particular, both texts	
				contain provisions strengthening the	
				requirements regarding risk management	
				practices, including the management of	
				liquidity risks, of credit institutions and	
				investment firms. Pursuant to Directive	
				2013/36/EU supervisory authorities are	
				required to review the arrangements,	



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



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				the stress tests, which also reflect asset	
				quality reviews, were published in	
				October 2014. New stress tests are	
				currently ongoing. In December 2014,	
				EBA published Guidelines on common	
				procedures and methodologies for the	
				supervisory review and evaluation	
				process (SREP) (EBA/GL/2014/13).	
				These Guidelines aim to provide	
				supervisory authorities with a common	
				European framework for SREP and risk	
				assessment under Pillar 2. These	
				guidelines explain how to assess the	
				various risks to which banks are exposed,	
				including FX lending and liquidity risks,	
				as well the governance and internal	
				control framework of banks for	
				identifying, managing, monitoring risks.	
				These guidelines entered into force in	
				January 2016.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				Liquidity risk management is still one of	
				the key elements of our supervisory	
				practice and policy. The LCR has become	
				a legal requirement, which the banks have	
				to adhere to. The NSFR is finalized by	
				the Basel Committee and to be translated	
				into law. Furthermore, the SSM, together	
				with DNB and its other members,	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				developed (upgraded) and implemented a	
				liquidity assessment process of the banks	
				liquidity positions as part of the SREP	
				(Supervisory Review and Evaluation	
				Process). This process is based on three	
				pillars. The first pillar is the risk	
				assessment where, based on qualitative	
				information and quantitative supervisory	
				data, several liquidity metrics are	
				determined and judged by the supervisor.	
				This is complimented in the second pillar	
				with the assessment of the banks' ILAAP	
				(Internal Liquidity Adequacy Assessment	
				Procedure) – the banks own assessment	
				of its liquidity risk - and in the third pillar	
				the execution of a strong liquidity stress	
				test. If the assessment of the three pillars	
				identifies weaknesses, mitigating	
				measures are imposed on the banks.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				[answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32013L00 36 Regulation (EU) No 575/2013 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32013R05 75 Commission Delegated Regulation on the LCR: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?qid=1458140192307& uri=CELEX:32015R0061 Commission Implementing Regulation on Additional	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				Liquidity Monitoring Metrics : http://eur-	
				lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A3201	
				6R0313 EBA guidelines on capital	
				measures for foreign currency	
				lending:http://www.eba.europa.eu/regulat	
				ion-and-policy/supervisory-review-and-	
				evaluation-srep-and-pillar-2/guidelines-	
				on-capital-measures-for-foreign-	
				currency-lending A common stress test	
				methodology and scenario for 2014 EU- banks stress test:	
				https://www.eba.europa.eu/-/eba-	
				publishes-common-methodology-and-	
				scenario-for-2014-eu-banks-stress-test	
				EBA recommendations on asset quality	
				reviews:http://www.eba.europa.eu/docum	
				ents/10180/449802/EBA-Rec-2013-	
				04+Recommendations+on+asset+quality	
				+reviews.pdf/1eb0b843-0c2c-4b05-995e- f2887edb2981 ECB manual for asset	
				quality review:	
				http://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/pr/date/2	
				014/html/pr140311.en.html EBA stress	
				test https://www.eba.europa.eu/-/eba-	
				publishes-2014-eu-wide-stress-test-	
				results. EBA Guidelines on SREP	
				http://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/101 80/935249/EBA-GL-2014-	
				13+%28Guidelines+on+SREP+methodol	
				ogies+and+processes%29.pdf	



(18)       disclosures by financial institutions       enhanced risk disclosures in their reporting and disclose all losses on an ongoing basis, consistent with international best practice, as appropriate. (Washington)       implementation of the disclosures requirements of IFRSs (in particular IFRS international best practice, as appropriate. (Washington)       Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:       Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:       Web-links to relevant docume         (18)       disclosures by financial institutions       enhanced risk disclosures in their reporting and disclose all losses on an ongoing basis, consistent with international best practice, as appropriate. (Washington)       international best practice, as appropriate. (Washington)       Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:       Implementation progress       Implementation progress       Implementation by: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:       Implementation by: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:       Implementation by: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:       Implementation by: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:       Implementation by: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:       Implementation by: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:       Implementation by: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation by: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation by: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:	No	Next steps	Progress to date	DescriptionG20/FSB RecommendationsRemarks
Recommendations.       Recommendations.       Torce since :         public and private sector to enhance       financial institutions' disclosures of the       Tisks they face, including the ongoing         work of the Enhanced Disclosure Task       Force. (St. Petersburg)       Issue is being addressed through :         Primary / Secondary legislation       Recommendations.       Recommendations.         Short description of the content of the       Issue is being addressed through :       Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:         Short description of the content of the       Issue is different in the information of the content of the       Issue is different in the information of the content of the         Implementation       EU endorsed IFRS 13 and the IFRS 7       amendments.         Highlight main developments since last       year's survey:	17	Planned actions (if any) and expected	<ul> <li>□ Not applicable</li> <li>□ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> <li>□ Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>□ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> <li>□ Draft published as of:</li> <li>□ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> <li>□ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :</li> <li>☑ Implementation completed as of:</li> <li>01.01.2013</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>□ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>☑ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>□ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline:</li> <li>EU endorsed IFRS 13 and the IFRS 7 amendments.</li> <li>Highlight main developments since last</li> </ul>	Enhanced risk disclosures by financial institutionsFinancial 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)Jurisdictions should indicate the status of implementation of the disclosures requirements of IFRSs (in particular IFRS 7 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 (Dec 2015), and set out any steps they have taken to foster adoption of the EDTF Principles and Recommendations.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 TaskWe and private sector to enhance financial institutions' disclosure Task



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



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VIII.	Strengthening deposit	insurance	-		
18 (19)	Strengthening of national deposit insurance arrangements	National deposit insurance arrangements should be reviewed against the agreed international principles, and authorities	Jurisdictions should describe any revisions made to national deposit insurance system, including steps taken to	<ul> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> </ul>	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:
		should strengthen arrangements where needed. (Rec. VI.9, FSF 2008)	address the following recommendations of the FSB's February 2012 <u>thematic</u> <u>peer review report on deposit insurance</u> <u>systems:</u>	<ul> <li>□ Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>□ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> </ul>	Web-links to relevant documents:
			• Adoption of an explicit deposit insurance system (for those jurisdictions that do not have one)	<ul> <li>Draft published as of:</li> <li>Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> </ul>	
			Addressing the weaknesses and gaps to full implementation of the <u>Core</u> <u>Principles for Effective Deposit</u> <u>Insurance Systems</u> issued by IADI in	<ul> <li>Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :</li> <li>Implementation completed as of: 01.01.2012</li> </ul>	
			November 2014.	<ul> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>☑ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>□ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>□ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</li> <li>The Netherlands has a well functioning deposit guarantee scheme (DGS) in place</li> </ul>	
				which complies with the IADI principles. As for the financing of the DGS, the Directive on Deposit Guarantee Schemes	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				(DGSD) has been implemented, so that	
				credit institutions pay risk-based	
				contributions to the newly installed ex	
				ante funded Deposit Guarantee Fund,	
				which is set to reach a target level of	
				0.8% of covered deposits by July 2024.	
				The Dutch Central Bank decides on	
				contributions payable to the Fund; it also	
				decides on pay outs from the Fund to	
				depositors or the financing to be made	
				available by the Fund for resolution in	
				accordance with the Bank Recovery	
				Resolution Directive (BRRD).	
				Implementation of the DGSD has also	
				resulted in a gradually reducing deadline	
				for pay out to depositors (from 20	
				working days to 7 working days by 1	
				January 2024), and will ensure depositors	
				are adequately informed of DGS	
				coverage.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				the revised DGS Directive which was	
				adopted in April 2014 and entered into	
				force on 2 July 2014 has been completed	
				and the relevant legislation has entered	
				into force on 26 November 2015.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				The Decree on Implementation of the DGSD:	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/s tb-2015-434.html	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
IX.	Safeguarding the integ	rity and efficiency of financial markets	3		
19 (20)	Enhancing market integrity and efficiency	We must ensure that markets serve efficient allocation of investments and savings in our economies and do not pose risks to financial stability. To this end, we commit to implement initial recommendations by IOSCO on market integrity and efficiency, including measures to address the risks posed by high frequency trading and dark liquidity, and call for further work by mid-2012. (Cannes)	<ul> <li>Jurisdictions should indicate whether high frequency trading and dark pools exist in their national markets.</li> <li>Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the recommendations: <ul> <li>in relation to dark liquidity, as set out in the IOSCO <u>Report on</u> <u>Principles for Dark Liquidity (May 2011).</u></li> <li>on the impact of technological change in the IOSCO <u>Report on</u> <u>Regulatory Issues Raised by the</u> <u>Impact of Technological Changes</u> on <u>Market Integrity and Efficiency</u> (Oct 2011).</li> <li>on market structure made in the IOSCO Report on <u>Regulatory issues</u> <u>raised by changes in market</u> <u>structure (Dec 2013).</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ Not applicable</li> <li>□ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> <li>☑ Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>□ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> <li>□ Draft published as of:</li> <li>☑ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: 03.07.2016 (MAD)</li> <li>□ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :</li> <li>□ Implementation completed as of:</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>□ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>□ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>□ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline:</li> <li>Highlight main developments since last year's survey:</li> <li>[answer below is copied from the</li> </ul>	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: [answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] Work on the secondary legislation necessary for the implementation of Market Abuse Regulation (MAR) and MIFID2 is well underway; endorsement of technical advice received in December 2014 from the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) and draft technical standards delivered in by ESMA in September 2015. Following endorsement by the EC and scrutiny of the rules by co- legislators, the EU market abuse regime will be finalised by July 2016. Market Abuse Regulation and Criminal Sanctions for Market Abuse Directive will enter into application on 3 July 2016.
				European Commission response to this	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				question] The Market Abuse Regulation	
				(MAR) will increase the transparency and	
				integrity of the derivatives and the	
				commodity derivatives markets including	
				OTC transactions.	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				[answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] Market Abuse Regulation: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R05 96 Criminal Sanctions for Market Abuse Directive http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014L00 57	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
20 (21)	Regulation and supervision of commodity markets	We also call on Finance ministers to monitor of a regular basis the proper is recommendations by the end of 2012. (Cannes)	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 <i>Principles for the Regulation and</i> <i>Supervision of Commodity Derivatives</i> <i>Markets (Sep 2011)</i> . Jurisdictions, in responding to this recommendation, may also make use of the responses contained in the <u>update to</u> the survey published by IOSCO in September 2014 on the principles for the regulation and supervision of commodity derivatives markets.	<ul> <li>Not applicable</li> <li>Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> <li>✓ Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>□ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> <li>□ Draft published as of:</li> <li>✓ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on: 03.01.2018 (MIFID2) and 03.07.2016 (MAR)</li> <li>□ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :</li> <li>□ Implementation completed as of:</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>☑ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>□ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>□ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline:</li> <li>[answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] The new MIFID 2 introduces specific requirements commodity derivatives markets, including registration of market participants and</li> </ul>	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:[answer below is copied from the European Commission response to this question] Work on the secondary legislation necessary for the implementation of MAR and MIFID 2 is well underway- with technical advice from ESMA received in December 2014; and draft regulatory technical standards delivered by ESMA in September 2015. Following scrutiny of the rules by co- legislators, they should be finalised by mid- 2016. Expected commencement date: 3 January 2017 or 3 January 2018Web-links to relevant documents: http://www.esma.europa.eu/content/Tech nical-Advice-Commission-MiFID-II-and- MiFIR https://www.esma.europa.eu/policy- rules/mifid-ii-and-mifir#title-paragrah-2



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				transparency requirements. It also	
				addresses IOSCO's recommendation on	
				position management through position	
				limits and position management.	
				Together with the new MAR, it will	
				increase the transparency and the	
				integrity of the derivatives and the	
				commodity derivatives markets including	
				OTC transactions.	
				Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	
				[answer below is copied from the	
				European Commission response to this	
				question] This legislation entered into	
				force on 12 June 2014 and will enter into	
				application on 3 January 2018 (MIFID 2).	
				The EP has approved the extension of the	
				date of application to 3 January 2018.	
				Currently implementation rules regarding	
				position limits, the scope of	
				authorisations for commodity firms and	
				the delineation between financial and	
				physical instruments are being drafted,	
				and will be finalised by mid 2016. The	
				Market Abuse Regulation (MAR) entered	
				into force on 12 June 2014 and will enter	
				into application on 3 July 2016	
				Web-links to relevant documents:	
				[answer below is copied from the	



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				European Commission response to this question] http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014L00 65 MIFIR http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R06 00 Market Abuse http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R05 96	



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



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps		
X.	X. Enhancing financial consumer protection						
X. 22 (23)	Enhancing financial consumer protection	We agree that integration of financial consumer protection policies into regulatory and supervisory frameworks contributes to strengthening financial stability, endorse the FSB report on consumer finance protection and the high level principles on financial consumer protection prepared by the OECD together with the FSB. We will pursue the full application of these principles in our jurisdictions. (Cannes)	Jurisdictions should describe progress toward implementation of the OECD's <u>G-20 high-level principles on financial</u> <u>consumer protection (Oct 2011)</u> . Jurisdictions may also refer to OECD's <u>September 2013 and September 2014</u> <u>reports</u> on effective approaches to support the implementation of the High- level Principles. The effective approaches are of interest across all financial services sectors – banking and credit; securities; insurance and pensions – and consideration should be given to their cross-sectoral character when considering implementation. Jurisdictions should, where necessary, indicate any changes or additions that have been introduced as a way to support the implementation of the High-level Principles, to address particular national terminology, situations or determinations.	<ul> <li>□ Not applicable</li> <li>□ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</li> <li>□ Implementation ongoing:</li> <li>Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</li> <li>□ Draft in preparation, expected publication by:</li> <li>□ Draft published as of:</li> <li>□ Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on:</li> <li>□ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since :</li> <li>☑ Implementation completed as of:</li> <li>01.01.2006</li> <li>Issue is being addressed through :</li> <li>□ Primary / Secondary legislation</li> <li>□ Regulation /Guidelines</li> <li>☑ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</li> <li>Initiatives of the platform for financial education "Wijzer in Geldzaken"</li> <li>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline:</li> <li>Financial consumer protection is an integral part of the Financial Supervision</li> </ul>	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:We refer to the EC response on the IMN survey 2016. Mortgage Credit Directive (MCD) Transposition work is ongoing. Expected commencement date: July 2016. Payment Accounts Directive (PAD) Deadline for transposition in national law is 18 September 2016, PRIIPS: PRIIPs shall apply from 31 December 2016. Implementing measures are being prepared. MiFID II/MiFIR Expected commencement date: 3 January 2018. Insurance Distribution Directive (IDD) Deadline for transposition in national law is February 2018.Web-links to relevant documents: MCD: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201 4L0017&from=EN PAD http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:3201 4L0092&from=EN PRIIPS http://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014L00		
				legislation/ regulation/guideline:	content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:3 86 MIFID/MIFIR MiFID: http:// lex.europa.eu/legal-		



No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				secondary legislation, with supervision by a dedicated market conduct agency: Autoriteit Financiële Markten Highlight main developments since last year's survey:	content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R06 00 IDD: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A3201 6L0097
				Web-links to relevant documents: www.wijzeringeldzaken.nl ; http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0020368/ http://www.afm.nl/en/professionals/regel geving/wetten.aspx ; http://www.afm.nl/en	



### XI. Source of recommendations:

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

XII. List of Abbreviations used: