

Jurisdiction : **The Netherlands**

2013 IMN Survey of National Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations

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

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
I. Refining the regulatory perimeter					
1 (2)	Review of the boundaries of the regulatory framework including strengthening of oversight of shadow banking	We will each review and adapt the boundaries of the regulatory framework to keep pace with developments in the financial system and promote good practices and consistent approaches at an international level. (London)	Jurisdictions should indicate the steps taken to expand the domestic regulatory framework to previously unregulated entities, for example, non-bank financial institutions (e.g. finance companies, mortgage insurance companies, credit hedge funds) and conduits/SIVs etc.	Implementation ongoing or completed <i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i> Issue is being addressed through : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: see below Status of progress : Reform effective (completed) as of : July 2013 (date of AIFMD enforcement) Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: EU level While the notion of "shadow banking" has only recently been formally defined in the G20 discussions, the risks related to it are not new. The European Commission has already implemented, and is in the process of implementing, a number of measures to provide a better framework for these risks such as the rules governing hedge fund activity (Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive), reinforcing the relationship	Planned actions (if any): Expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
1 (1)		We agree to strengthen the regulation and oversight of the shadow banking system. ¹ (Cannes)	Jurisdictions should indicate policy measures to strengthen the regulation and oversight of the shadow banking system. See, for reference, the recommendations discussed in section 2 of the October 2011 FSB report: Shadow Banking: Strengthening Oversight and Regulation.		

¹ This recommendation 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
				<p>between banks and unregulated actors (Capital Requirements Directives and Regulation), strengthening the regulation and transparency of derivatives instruments (EMIR), aligning incentives in securitisation transactions (CRD), enhancing rating agencies (CRA I, II and III), adjusting accounting standards.</p> <p>National initiatives At the national level, the Dutch central bank has identified and plotted shadow banking activities in the Netherlands in an occasional paper: http://www.dnb.nl/en/publications/dnb-publications/dnb-occasional-studies/dnb281219.jsp We are open to consider proposals to further regulate shadow banking provided that real benefits of shadow banking are kept. In response to the Green Paper on shadow banking of the European Commission the Netherlands we have submitted a response. (http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2012/04/24/kamerbrief-over-kabinetsreactie-groenboek-schaduwbankieren.html). An English version is available on demand. We are also reconsidering those parts of the Financial Supervision Act that determine the need for a license for</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>group finance companies, so that possible improper use of the Financial Supervision Act will be prevented.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
II. Hedge funds					
2 (3)	Registration, appropriate disclosures and oversight of hedge funds	<p>We also firmly recommitted to work in an internationally consistent and non-discriminatory manner to strengthen regulation and supervision on hedge funds ...(Seoul)</p> <p>Hedge funds or their managers will be registered and will be required to disclose appropriate information on an ongoing basis to supervisors or regulators, including on their leverage, necessary for assessment of the systemic risks they pose individually or collectively. Where appropriate registration should be subject to a minimum size. They will be subject to oversight to ensure that they have adequate risk management. (London)</p>	<p>Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the high level principles contained in IOSCO’s Report on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009) that inter-alia included mandatory registration and on-going regulatory requirements such as disclosure to investors.</p>	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : july 2013 (date of AIFMD enforcement)</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>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 2013.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
3 (4)	Establishment of international information sharing framework	We ask the FSB to develop mechanisms for cooperation and information sharing between relevant authorities in order to ensure effective oversight is maintained when a fund is located in a different jurisdiction from the manager. We will, cooperating through the FSB, develop measures that implement these principles by the end of 2009. (London)	Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the high level principles in IOSCO's Report on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009) on sharing information to facilitate the oversight of globally active fund managers.	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : july 2013</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>This is part of the AIFMD, an EU directive that also provides a European framework for cross border oversight for investment funds. The implementation of this directive will take place in national legislation. The legislative proposal has been sent to parliament in April 2012.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p> <p>http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/financieel-toezicht/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2012/04/19/voorstel-van-wet-aifm-richtlijn.html</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
4 (5)	Enhancing counterparty risk management	Supervisors should require that institutions which have hedge funds as their counterparties have effective risk management, including mechanisms to monitor the funds' leverage and set limits for single counterparty exposures. (London)	Jurisdictions should indicate specific policy measures taken for enhancing counterparty risk management and strengthening their existing guidance on the management of exposure to leveraged counterparties. See, for reference, the following BCBS documents :	Implementation ongoing or completed <i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i> Issue is being addressed through : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Status of progress : Reform effective (completed) as of : 17-7-2013 Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: Capital Requirements Directive IV (in force since 17-7-2013) will transpose the Basel 3 rules on counterparty credit risk to European legislation. Counterparty credit risk of banks will be enhanced across the board, including hedge fund exposures. Also, the application of prudent person principle for any investments in such counterparties and the large exposure requirements are in force. Web-links to relevant documents: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st07/st07746.en13.pdf Regulation:	Planned actions (if any): Expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
(6)		Supervisors will strengthen their existing guidance on the management of exposures to leveraged counterparties. (Rec. II.17,FSF 2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound Practices for Banks' Interactions with Highly Leveraged Institutions (Jan 1999) • Banks' Interactions with Highly Leveraged Institutions (Jan 1999) • Basel III (June 2011) – relevant references to counterparty credit risk standards 		

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st07/sto7747.en13.pdf	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
III. Securitisation					
5 (7)	Improving the risk management of securitisation	<p>During 2010, supervisors and regulators will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement IOSCO’s proposals to strengthen practices in securitisation markets. (FSB 2009) 	<p>Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the recommendations contained in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IOSCO’s Report on Global Developments in Securitisation Regulation (Nov 2012) including justification for any exemptions to IOSCO requirements; and 	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p>
5 (8)		<p>The BCBS and authorities should take forward work on improving incentives for risk management of securitisation, including considering due diligence and quantitative retention requirements by 2010. (London)</p> <p>Securitization sponsors or originators should retain a part of the risk of the underlying assets, thus encouraging them to act prudently. (Pittsburgh)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BCBS’s Basel 2.5 standards on exposures to securitisations (Jul 2009), http://www.bis.org/publ/bcbs157.pdf and http://www.bis.org/publ/bcbs158.pdf 	<p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : 1.12.2010 for securitisation positions, 31.12.2011 for resecuritisations</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>European Capital Requirements Directives II and III address stricter measures with respect to securitisation and re-securitisations. CRD II requires originators to retain 5% of economic exposure on their books. At the same time, firms investing in securitisations are required to conduct comprehensive due diligence, whereby failure to comply is subject to capital penalties. CRD III applies the same capital treatment to re-securitisations. Additionally, it tightens disclosure requirements on securitisation</p>	<p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>exposures. CRD II has come into force on 31.12.2010, CRD III on 31.12.2011.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents: CRD II and III regulation in force: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/bank/regcapital/index_en.htm</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
6 (9)	Strengthening of regulatory and capital framework for monolines	Insurance supervisors should strengthen the regulatory and capital framework for monoline insurers in relation to structured credit. (Rec II.8 ,FSF 2008)	<p>Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for strengthening the regulatory and capital framework for monolines.</p> <p>See, for reference, the following principles issued by IAIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICP 13 – Reinsurance and Other Forms of Risk Transfer • ICP 15 – Investments, and • ICP 17 - Capital Adequacy. <p>Jurisdictions may also refer to the IAIS Guidance paper on enterprise risk management for capital adequacy and solvency purposes (Oct 2008).</p>	<p>Not applicable</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>In the NL there are no monoliners with structured credit business</p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</p> <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>[No response]</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
7 (10)	Strengthening of supervisory requirements or best practices for investment in structured products	Regulators of institutional investors should strengthen the requirements or best practices for firms' processes for investment in structured products. (Rec II.18 ,FSF 2008)	<p>Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for strengthening best practices for investment in structured product.</p> <p>See, for reference, the principles contained in IOSCO's report on Good Practices in Relation to Investment Managers' Due Diligence When Investing in Structured Finance Instruments (Jul 2009) and Suitability Requirements for Distribution of Complex Financial Products (Jan 2013).</p> <p>Jurisdictions may also refer to the Joint Forum report on Credit Risk Transfer-Developments from 2005-2007 (Jul 2008).</p>	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If " Not applicable " or "Applicable but no action envisaged ..." has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : 1-1-2013</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>In the banking sector The CRD III reinforced the capital requirements for the risks associated with securitisation transactions, particularly when these structures involve several levels of securitisation, and increased the support given to securitisation vehicles. These provisions were implemented in 2011. Thereby, as of 1st of January 2013 financial institutions must have a product approval process for financial products. For insurance companies EU legislation relating to the (re)insurance sector (Solvency II) introduces requirements on insurers' ability to invest in repackaged</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>loans, which are consistent with those being introduced in the banking sector. Under these proposals, insurance and reinsurance undertakings investing in ABS will likely 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; (ii) Higher market risk capital requirements for re-securitization exposures, especially when only one or none external credit assessment is available (currently being discussed in the context of the draft implementing measures); (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. In particular, provisions are currently being discussed that will require insurance and reinsurance undertakings that invest in the securities to be allowed to make their decisions only after conducting comprehensive due diligence in the context of the Solvency II implementing measures; (iv) Important enhancements regarding how insurance and reinsurance undertakings should manage the risks of securitization positions (written monitoring procedures, specific reporting</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>to management body...) that are currently being discussed in the context of the Solvency II implementing measures; and (v) In order to ensure transparency, requirements to publicly disclose information about any investments in repackaged loans.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
8 (11)	Enhanced disclosure of securitised products	Securities market regulators should work with market participants to expand information on securitised products and their underlying assets. (Rec. III.10-III.13, FSF 2008)	<p>Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for enhancing disclosure of securitised products.</p> <p>See, for reference, IOSCO’s Report on Principles for Ongoing Disclosure for Asset-Backed Securities (Nov 2012) that complements IOSCO’s Disclosure Principles for Public Offerings and Listings of Asset-Backed Securities (Apr 2010).</p>	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : 1.12.2010 for securitisation positions, 31.12.2011 for resecuritisations</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>European Capital Requirements Directives II and III address stricter measures with respect to securitisation and re-securitisations. CRD II requires originators to retain 5% of economic exposure on their books. At the same time, firms investing in securitisations are required to conduct comprehensive due diligence, whereby failure to comply is subject to capital penalties. CRD III applies the same capital treatment to re-securitisations. Additionally, it tightens disclosure requirements on securitisation exposures. CRD II has come into force</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>on 31.12.2010, CRD III on 31.12.2011.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents: CRD II and III regulation in force: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/bank/regcapital/index_en.htm</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
IV. Enhancing supervision					
9 (12)	Consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of SIFIs	All firms whose failure could pose a risk to financial stability must be subject to consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation with high standards. (Pittsburgh)	<p>Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for implementing consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of SIFIs.²</p> <p>See, for reference, the following documents:</p> <p>Joint Forum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles for the supervision of financial conglomerates (Sep 2012) <p>BCBS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework for G-SIBs (Nov 2011) • Framework for D-SIBs (Oct 2012) • BCP 12 (Sep 2012) <p>IAIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICP 23 – Group wide supervision <p>FSB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework for addressing SIFIs (Nov 2011) 	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>recovery and resolution plans, setting up of crisis management groups</p> <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : 17-7-2013</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>Netherlands is a.o. working on recovery and resolution plans (RRPs), has set up crisis management groups (CMGs) for the SIBs, is working on harmonizing the resolution regime in the European context (through the Bank Recovery and Resolution Directive; BRRD) and will introduce buffers for systemically important institutions. Regarding the</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

² The scope of the follow-up to this recommendation will be revised once the monitoring framework on policy measures for G-SIFIs, which is one of the designated priority areas under the CFIM, is established.

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>RRPs, these should be finished end of 2013 (though RRP are typically documents that need regular work and update), The CMGs are already in place. The BRRD, which will presumably be implemented around January 2015, will harmonise resolution regimes in Europe, and will ensure coordinated resolution action regarding SIFIs in Europe. Finally, Currently, regarding the SIFI-buffers, the parliamentary scrutiny of the legislative proposal is currently being prepared underway to that end. Beside the requirement in Capital Requirements Directive (CRD) IV to impose a G-SIFI-buffer to G-SIFIs within the jurisdiction, The Netherlands makes use of the national discretion foreseen in CRD Capital Requirements Directive IV to impose Other-SIFI buffer and Systemic Risk Buffer to the domestic SIFIs. Moreover, Capital Requirements Directive IV also requires EU Member States with a G-SIFI within their jurisdiction to also impose a G-SIFI buffer. CRD IV has been in force since July 2013. The supervisor will be able to set SIFI buffer requirements from 2014. The build-up of the buffers by the SIFIs will be phased in during the period from 2016 to must be completed by 2019.</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>With regard to financial conglomerates, the Netherlands has implemented the EU 2002 Financial Conglomerates Directive (2002/87/EG) and will have implemented the amending Directive (2011/89/EU) by end 2013. The Netherlands therefore complies largely with the Principles for the Supervision of Financial Conglomerates of 2012. Any new elements included in the 2012 Principles in comparison to the 1999 Principles will be implemented in NL legislation as soon as a revision of the EU Directive takes account of those elements.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st07/st07746.en13.pdf (CRD IV : Directive) en http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st07/st07747.en13.pdf (CRD IV: Regulation).</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
10 (13)	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 significant cross-border firms. Relevant jurisdictions should indicate the steps taken and status of establishing remaining supervisory colleges and conducting risk assessments.	Implementation ongoing or completed <i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i>	Planned actions (if any):
14		We agreed to conduct rigorous risk assessment on these firms through international supervisory colleges ...(Seoul)	See, for reference, the following documents: BCBS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good practice principles on supervisory colleges (Oct 2010) • Report and recommendations on cross-border bank resolution (Mar 2010) IOSCO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles Regarding Cross-Border Supervisory Cooperation (May 2010) IAIS : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICP 25 and Guidance 25.1.1 – 25.1.6 on establishment of supervisory colleges • Guidance 25.6.20 and 25.8.16 on risk assessments by supervisory colleges 	Issue is being addressed through : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Dutch primary legislation (which is based on the CRD) establishes the obligation for DNB to create supervisory colleges. DNB has established these colleges based on the primary legislation and on the guidelines written by the EBA. Status of progress : Reform effective (completed) as of : December 31, 2010 Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The college requirements in the Netherlands are based on the specific articles in the CRD (articles 129 and 130) and on the EBA guideline GL 34 “operational functioning of supervisory colleges”.	Expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>Web-links to relevant documents: Guideline GL 34 on supervisory colleges: http://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/Publications/Standards---Guidelines/2010/Colleges/CollegeGuidelines.aspx Guideline GL 39 on joint risk assessment and decision: http://www.eba.europa.eu/cebs/media/Publications/S</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
<p>11 (15)</p> <p>New</p>	<p>Supervisory exchange of information and coordination</p>	<p>To quicken supervisory responsiveness to developments that have a common effect across a number of institutions, supervisory exchange of information and coordination in the development of best practice benchmarks should be improved at both national and international levels. (Rec V.7 , FSF 2008)</p> <p>Enhance the effectiveness of core supervisory colleges. (FSB 2012)</p>	<p>Jurisdictions should include any feedback received from recent FSAPs/ROSC assessments on the October 2006 Basel Core Principle (BCP) 25 (Home-host relationships) or, if more recent, the September 2012 BCP 3 (Cooperation and collaboration) and BCP 14 (Home-host relationships). Jurisdictions should also indicate any steps taken since the last assessment in this area, particularly in response to relevant FSAP/ROSC recommendations.</p> <p>Jurisdictions should describe any regulatory, supervisory or legislative changes that will contribute to the sharing of supervisory information within core colleges (e.g. bilateral or multilateral MoUs).</p>	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Draft approved and in force / to be in force from / by : 2nd half of 2014 (single supervisory mechanism, proposal adopted by the European Council on 12-9-12).</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>The European Supervisory Authorities (ESAs, i.e. EBA, EIOPA, ESMA) ensure a consistent and coherent functioning of colleges across the Union, promote effective and efficient supervisory activities and have, under certain conditions, the power to bindingly settle disagreements between authorities. Furthermore, the ESAs initiate and coordinate EU-wide stress tests on the resilience of financial institutions. Guidelines on colleges of supervisors</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>have been and still continue to be developed by the ESAs. The ESAs are also tasked to carry out peer reviews of the activities of supervisory authorities in the EU and make identified best practices publicly available. The ESAs can develop guidelines and recommendations on the basis of peer reviews.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insurance sector The Solvency II Directive requires the Commission to adopt delegated acts on Colleges, specifically on the systematic exchange of information between supervisors in the College. Guidelines on the functioning of College are being developed by EIOPA. • Banking The creation of a single supervisory mechanism (SSM) which will be responsible of supervision of all banks in the euro area and in participating Member States outside the euro area will further strengthen supervisory consistency. The SSM is expected to be fully in place by the 2nd half of 2014. Furthermore, the ESAs will continue developing the single rulebook applicable to all 27 Member States and make sure that supervisory practices are consistent across the whole Union. EBA in particular will develop a single supervisory handbook • Market infrastructure The EMIR requires the establishment of colleges for CCPs. 	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>ESMA is currently preparing for the work on colleges which will be established in 2013</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
12 (16)	Strengthening resources and effective supervision	We agreed that supervisors should have strong and unambiguous mandates, sufficient independence to act, appropriate resources, and a full suite of tools and powers to proactively identify and address risks, including regular stress testing and early intervention. (Seoul)	Jurisdictions should provide any feedback received from recent FSAPs/ROSC assessments on the October 2006 BCPs 1 and 23 or, if more recent, the September 2012 BCPs 1, 9 and 11. Jurisdictions should also indicate any steps taken since the last assessment in this area, particularly in response to relevant FSAP/ROSC recommendations.	Implementation ongoing or completed <i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i>	Planned actions (if any):
(17)		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)		Issue is being addressed through : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Status of progress : Reform effective (completed) as of : before 2011	Expected commencement date:
New		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)	Jurisdictions should describe the outcomes of the most recent assessment of resource needs (e.g. net increase in supervisors, skills acquired and sought). Please indicate when this assessment was most recently conducted and when the next assessment is expected to be conducted.	Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: In the recent FSAP (published June 2011) the Netherlands fully comply with BCP1. DNB has a clear mandate and sufficient independence to effectively perform its activities without undue political or market interference. In addition, the Netherlands largely comply with BCP23. Since this FSAP mission, important steps have been taken with the introduction of a new supervisory approach, which was the result of a larger organisational reorientation of supervision. Also, an important increase of almost 10% of resources was approved. Finally, a new Crisis Management Law has been	Web-links to relevant documents:

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>introduced for more effective and early intervention.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
V. Building and implementing macroprudential frameworks and tools					
13 (18)	Establishing regulatory framework for macro-prudential oversight	Amend our regulatory systems to ensure authorities are able to identify and take account of macro-prudential risks across the financial system including in the case of regulated banks, shadow banks ³ and private pools of capital to limit the build up of systemic risk. (London)	Please describe the systems, methodologies and processes that have been put in place to identify macroprudential risks, including the analysis of risk transmission channels.	Implementation ongoing or completed <i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i>	Planned actions (if any):
19)		Ensure that national regulators possess the powers for gathering relevant information on all material financial institutions, markets and instruments in order to assess the potential for failure or severe stress to contribute to systemic risk. This will be done in close coordination at international level in order to achieve as much consistency as possible across jurisdictions. (London)	Please indicate whether an assessment has been conducted with respect to the powers to collect and share relevant information among different authorities – where this applies – on financial institutions, markets and instruments to assess the potential for systemic risk. Please indicate whether the assessment has indicated any gaps in the powers to collect information, and whether any follow-up actions have been taken.	Issue is being addressed through : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Status of progress : Reform effective (completed) as of : 2012/2013 Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: A Financial Stability Committee has been established in 2012, chaired by the president of the Dutch central bank, in which the other supervisor on the financial markets (the Authority on financial markets) and the ministry of Finance participate. The Dutch central bank has also established a special department for the surveillance of macroprudential risks. Furthermore	Expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:

³ 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
				<p>legislation is in the process of being finalised to strengthen the macroprudential mandates of the financial superisors in the Netherlands. The Dutch central bank will also be given special additional powers in a new law to request more information regarding macroprudential risks. The Netherlands have established a body which monitors financial stability and can identify macrorprudential risks. This strengthens the structure of responsibility for macroprudential analysis significantly. Furthermore the mandate for both the prudential and the regulatory supervisors is being strengthened and states explicitly the macroprudential responsibilities. The broadening of the (legal) possibilities for the central bank to request information regarding financial stability is currently being executed. The Dutch central bank has published about its stronger emphasis on macroprudential analysis, and the set up of new divisions within DNB dedicated to this focus and analysis.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents: http://www.dnb.nl/publicatie/publicaties-dnb/incidentele-publicaties/ http://www.dnb.nl/publicatie/publicaties-dnb/incidentele-publicaties/</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
14 (20)	Enhancing system-wide monitoring and the use of macro-prudential instruments	<p>Authorities should use quantitative indicators and/or constraints on leverage and margins as macro-prudential tools for supervisory purposes. Authorities should use quantitative indicators of leverage as guides for policy, both at the institution-specific and at the macro-prudential (system-wide) level...(Rec. 3.1, FSF 2009)</p> <p>We are developing macro-prudential policy frameworks and tools to limit the build-up of risks in the financial sector, building on the ongoing work of the FSB-BIS-IMF on this subject. (Cannes)</p>	<p>Please describe major changes in the institutional arrangements for macroprudential policy that have taken place in the past two years, including changes in: i) mandates and objectives; ii) powers and instruments; iii) transparency and accountability arrangements; iv) composition and independence of the decision-making body; and v) mechanisms for domestic policy coordination and consistency.</p> <p>Please indicate the use of macroprudential tools in the past two years, including the objective for their use and the process used to select, calibrate, and apply them.</p> <p>See, for reference, the CGFS document on Operationalising the selection and application of macroprudential instruments (Dec 2012).</p>	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</p> <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : May 2013.</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>- Legal clarification of responsibilities of the financial supervisors re financial stability - Establishment of a macroprudential body (2-11-12) Major changes that have been implemented in the Netherlands consist of firstly amending the formal law regarding the task and mandate of both the Dutch central bank and the Authority on Financial Markets. The existing mandate formulated in the formal laws with regard to these bodies are being broadened and shall refer explicitly to the responsibility of both supervisors regarding financial stability. Secondly, the minister of</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Parliamentary proceedings to amend the Act on Financial Supervision and the Bank Act.</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>
(21)		<p>Authorities should monitor substantial changes in asset prices and their implications for the macro economy and the financial system. (Washington)</p>	<p>Jurisdictions can also refer to the FSB-IMF-BIS progress report to the G20 on Macroprudential policy tools and frameworks (Oct 2011), and the IMF paper on Macroprudential policy, an organizing framework (Mar 2011).</p>		

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>Finance has erected the so called financial stability committee. This body consists of the most important representatives of the Dutch central bank and the Authority on Financial Markets, as well als the Dutch Ministry of Finance. The committee monitors the financial stability in the Netherlands and may formulate recommendations, including with regard to further necessary instruments for the supervisors re their task for financial stability. (Both supervisors carry out their tasks and responsibilities independently from the Ministry.) Furthermore this body will facilitate policy coordination between the three relevant parties concerned, and transparency (reports and recommendations will be published).</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/nieuws/2012/11/02/financieel-stabiliteitscomite-opgericht.html</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
15 (22)	Improved cooperation between supervisors and central banks	Supervisors and central banks should improve cooperation and the exchange of information including in the assessment of financial stability risks. The exchange of information should be rapid during periods of market strain. (Rec. V.8 , FSF 2008)	<p>Jurisdictions can make reference to the following BCBS documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report and recommendations of the Cross-border Bank Resolution Group (Mar 2010) • Good Practice Principles on Supervisory Colleges (Oct 2010) (Principles 2, 3 and 4 in particular) 	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>Improved supervisory approach (see 'short description')</p> <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : 1st quarter of 2012</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>DNB is both a central bank and a supervisory authority, which places it in a good position to benefit from the synergies that derive from the cooperation between central bank and supervisor, and the cross-sectoral approach applied by the organisation. It facilitates information exchange, joint decision making and the use of multi-functional teams, especially in the case of vulnerable market conditions and crisis intervention. The integration of financial stability risks in the supervisory process is supported by i) a separate Financial</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>Stability Department, which is the linking pin between the central bank and supervision ii) the creation of a Financial Stability Committee since the end of 2012 and iii) the implementation in Q1 2012 of a new supervisory approach – FOCUS! - by DNB which contains an explicit link of macro-economic developments to microprudential risks (through a macro-register) as the result of which supervision will be more focussed on potential sources for later problems which enables more powerful and effective supervision.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents: http://www.toezicht.dnb.nl/4/2/14/50-225810.jsp</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VI. Improving oversight of credit rating agencies (CRAs)					
16 (23)	Enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs	All CRAs whose ratings are used for regulatory purposes should be subject to a regulatory oversight regime that includes registration. The regulatory oversight regime should be established by end 2009 and should be consistent with the IOSCO Code of Conduct Fundamentals. (London)	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures undertaken for enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs. They should also indicate its consistency with the following IOSCO document:	Implementation ongoing or completed <i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i>	Planned actions (if any): Question 24: Publication of the new text in the official Journal of the European Union by June 2013. Entry into force 20 days later Implementation of the new rules by ESMA, including development of four technical standards and four guidelines. Commission is required to report, after technical advice by ESMA, to the European Parliament and the Council on a wide range of topics: By end 2013 on feasibility of a network of small and medium-sized credit rating agencies By 31 December 2014 on feasibility of European credit rating agency By 1 July 2015 on market situation in view of provisions on structured finance instruments and rotation Question 25: Equivalence assessments on-going for multiple jurisdictions by ESMA. Expected commencement date: Question 24: New amendment as of mid 2013
(24)		National authorities will enforce compliance and require changes to a rating agency’s practices and procedures for managing conflicts of interest and assuring the transparency and quality of the rating process. CRAs should differentiate ratings for structured products and provide full disclosure of their ratings track record and the information and assumptions that underpin the ratings process. The oversight framework should be consistent across jurisdictions with appropriate sharing of information between national authorities, including through IOSCO. (London)	• Code of Conduct Fundamentals for Credit Rating Agencies (May 2008) Jurisdictions may also refer to the following IOSCO documents: • Principle 22 of Principles and Objectives of Securities Regulation (Jun 2010) which calls for registration and oversight programs for CRAs; • Statement of Principles Regarding the Activities of Credit Rating Agencies (Sep 2003) ; and • Credit Rating Agencies: Internal Controls Designed to Ensure the Integrity of the Credit Rating Process and Procedures to Manage Conflicts of Interest (Dec 2012) .	Issue is being addressed through : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Status of progress : Reform effective (completed) as of : Regulation 1060/2009 effective as of 1 January 2010, Regulation 513/2011 effective as from 1 July 2011, CRA III Regulation agreed, entry into publication and entry into force foreseen in June 2013. Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: Question 23: Regulation 1060/2009 is amended to attribute centralised supervision of rating agencies to the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) which has full regulatory oversight which is in force since 1st of July 2011(Regulation 513/2011). Question 24: Regulation 1060/2009 ensuring registration and authorisation of rating agencies and	
(25)		Regulators should work together towards appropriate, globally compatible solutions (to conflicting compliance obligations for CRAs) as early as possible in 2010. (FSB 2009)			Expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents: (24): http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/securi

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>addressing conflicts of interests, transparency of rating methodologies, publication of track record of ratings. A new amendment of the CRA regulation strengthening further the rules has been agreed by the co-legislators in November 2012 and will enter into force by mid 2013. Main improvements of the amendment relate to: - reducing reliance on external credit ratings (see next point) -strengthening transparency of sovereign ratings including: (1) indicative calendar for sovereign ratings, (2) disclosure of full research report of sovereign ratings - 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 enable to engage in civil claims in case of gross negligence and intentional violation of the CRA regulation by rating agencies -competition: European Rating Platform which will disclose centrally on a website by ESMA all available ratings by registered and certified CRAs, requirement on a comply or explain basis to use small CRA in case an issuer employs multiple rating agencies. - enhanced transparency on structured finance instruments and rotation for re-securitisations. Question 25: Third</p>	<p>ties/agencies/index_en.htm http://eurlex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:302:SOM:EN:HTML</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>Country regime foreseen in Regulation 1060/2009, allowing for endorsement of third country ratings and equivalence of third country regimes. Equivalence Decision on regulatory frameworks of US, Canada and Australia adopted in October 2012 and Japan in September 2013.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p> <p>http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/rating-agencies/index_en.htm</p> <p>http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:145:0030:0056:EN:PDF Question 24:</p> <p>http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/rating-agencies/index_en.htm</p> <p>http://eurlex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:302:SOM:EN:HTML Question 25:</p> <p>http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/rating-agencies/index_en.htm</p> <p>http://eurlex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:302:SOM:EN:HTML</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
17 (26)	Reducing the reliance on ratings	<p>We also endorsed the FSB’s principles on reducing reliance on external credit ratings. Standard setters, market participants, supervisors and central banks should not rely mechanistically on external credit ratings. (Seoul)</p> <p>Authorities should check that the roles that they have assigned to ratings in regulations and supervisory rules are consistent with the objectives of having investors make independent judgment of risks and perform their own due diligence, and that they do not induce uncritical reliance on credit ratings as a substitute for that independent evaluation. (Rec IV. 8, FSF 2008)</p> <p>We reaffirm our commitment to reduce authorities’ and financial institutions’ reliance on external credit ratings, and call on standard setters, market participants, supervisors and central banks to implement the agreed FSB principles and end practices that rely mechanistically on these ratings. (Cannes)</p>	No information on this recommendation will be collected in the current IMN survey since a thematic peer review is taking place in this area during 2013.		

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VII. Enhancing and aligning accounting standards					
18 (27)	Consistent application of high-quality accounting standards	Regulators, supervisors, and accounting standard setters, as appropriate, should work with each other and the private sector on an ongoing basis to ensure consistent application and enforcement of high-quality accounting standards. (Washington)	Jurisdictions should indicate the accounting standards that they follow and whether (and on what basis) they are deemed to be equivalent to IFRSs as published by the IASB. They should also explain the system they have for enforcement of consistent application of those standards.	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>See below</p> <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : 1-1-2005</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>The EU adopted in 2002 a regulation to adopt IFRS. Since January 2005, the IFRS are mandatory for the consolidated accounts of listed companies. Enforcement of IFRS is done by National Market Authority and coordinate by the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA). The Dutch Central Bank (DNB) and the Netherlands Authority for the Financial Markets (AFM) participate intensively in (inter)national committees with other supervisors, accounting setters and the private sector to ensure consistent</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>application and enforcement of high-quality accounting standards. Consistent application and enforcement of high-quality accounting standards has been identified as high priority topics for both supervisors. Prudential supervision will also focus on this issue.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
<p>19 (28)</p> <p>(29)</p>	<p>Appropriate application of Fair Value Accounting</p>	<p>Accounting standard setters and prudential supervisors should examine the use of valuation reserves or adjustments for fair valued financial instruments when data or modelling needed to support their valuation is weak. (Rec. 3.4, FSF 2009)</p> <p>Accounting standard setters and prudential supervisors should examine possible changes to relevant standards to dampen adverse dynamics potentially associated with fair value accounting. Possible ways to reduce this potential impact include the following: (1) Enhancing the accounting model so that the use of fair value accounting is carefully examined for financial instruments of credit intermediaries; (ii) Transfers between financial asset categories; (iii) Simplifying hedge accounting requirements. (Rec 3.5, FSF 2009)</p>	<p>Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for appropriate application of fair value accounting.</p> <p>See, for reference, the following BCBS documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basel 2.5 standards on prudent valuation (Jul 2009) • Supervisory guidance for assessing banks' financial instrument fair value practices (Apr 2009) 	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>Central bank participation in several relevant international fora and adoption of international standards (see 'short description').</p> <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Draft published as of : March 2013, Exposure draft of the IASB ED/2013/3 'Financial instruments: expected credit losses'.</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>DNB participates in the EBA task force for accounting and procyclicality and the EBA accounting subgroup both of which have the objective of devising standards and methods for dealing with s.c. “weak” valuations. Moreover, DNB participates the BCBS/Accounting Task Force which group is analysing the impact of changing accounting standards (such as IFRS 9) on capital treatment under Basel II and Basel</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>We closely follow the agenda of IASB (and FASB) in this respect</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>III. DNB is involved in the revision processes of IASB through international fora such as BCBS, IAIS, EBA and EIOPA.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
VIII. Enhancing risk management					
20 (31)	Enhancing guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, including on liquidity and foreign currency funding risks	Regulators should develop enhanced guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, in line with international best practices, and should encourage financial firms to re-examine their internal controls and implement strengthened policies for sound risk management. (Washington)	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken to enhance guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices. See, for reference, the Joint Forum's Principles for the supervision of financial conglomerates (Sep 2012) and the following BCBS documents:	Implementation ongoing or completed <i>If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged..." has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i>	Planned actions (if any): Expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:
(33)	National supervisors should closely check banks' implementation of the updated guidance on the management and supervision of liquidity as part of their regular supervision. If banks' implementation of the guidance is inadequate, supervisors will take more prescriptive action to improve practices. (Rec. II.10, FSF 2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles for effective risk data aggregation and risk reporting (Jan 2013) • The Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR) (Jan 2013) • Principles for the sound management of operational risk (Jun 2011) • Principles for sound stress testing practices and supervision (May 2009) 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Status of progress : Reform effective (completed) as of : 17-7-2013		
(34)	Regulators and supervisors in emerging markets ⁴ will enhance their supervision of banks' operation in foreign currency funding markets. (FSB 2009)	Jurisdictions may also refer to FSB's February 2013 thematic peer review report on risk governance .	Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: Capital Requirements Directive IV has introduced the liquidity rules of Basel III, incl. the LCR.		
(35)	We commit to conduct robust, transparent stress tests as needed. (Pittsburgh)		Web-links to relevant documents: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st07/st07746.en13.pdf (CRD4 : Directive) en http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st07/st07747.en13.pdf (CRD4: Regulation).		

⁴ Only the emerging market jurisdictions may respond to this recommendation.

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
21 (36)	Efforts to deal with impaired assets and raise additional capital	Our efforts to deal with impaired assets and to encourage the raising of additional capital must continue, where needed. (Pittsburgh)	Jurisdictions should indicate steps taken to reduce impaired assets and encourage additional capital raising. For example, jurisdictions could include here the amount of new equity raised by banks operating in their jurisdictions during 2012.	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>Progress concerns two elements: i) in view of the global agreement to raise capital requirements, Dutch banks are in the process of strengthening their capital positions ii) After a long process searching for a private or public/private solution, on 1 February 2013 the Dutch State was forced to nationalize bank/insurer SNS REAAL, mainly because of its poor real estate loan portfolio SNS Property Finance. In his letter to Parliament the Dutch Minister of Finance has announced to separate the real estate loan portfolio from SNS REAAL and to recapitalize the remaining group.</p> <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : 2012/2013</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>Netherlands In 2012, the Core Tier 1 ratio of the Dutch banking sector improved to 10,2 percent. The capital ratio (unadjusted for risks) increased to almost 4 percent. EU developments Following the EBA stress test exercise in the latter half of 2011, EU banks were required to raise their Core Tier 1 ratio (CT1) to 9%, after setting an additional buffer against sovereign risk holdings. The European banking authority (EBA) identified a shortfall for 27 banks of €76bn, to be addressed by mid-2012 via an increase of the capital elements of the highest quality and via a limited set of actions aimed at reducing risk weighted assets (RWAs). This capital exercise resulted in an aggregate €16 bn recapitalisation for these 27 banks. This recapitalisation has been achieved mainly via new capital measures (retained earnings, new equity, and liability management), and to a lesser extent, by releasing capital through measures impacting RWAs.. Since 2012, the EBA has been working to support the work of the EU national supervisory authorities for assessing asset quality in individual banks. In late 2012, the EBA provided supervisors with common definitions on forbearance and non-performing loans to monitor asset quality of banks' books on</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>a common basis.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents: http://www.government.nl/news/2013/02/01/state-of-the-netherlands-nationalises-sns-reaal.html</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
22 (37)	Enhanced risk disclosures by financial institutions	Financial institutions should provide enhanced risk disclosures in their reporting and disclose all losses on an ongoing basis, consistent with international best practice, as appropriate. (Washington)	Jurisdictions should indicate the status of implementation of the disclosures requirements of IFRSs (in particular IFRS7 and 13) or equivalent. Jurisdictions may also use as reference the recommendations of the October 2012 report by the Enhanced Disclosure Task Force on Enhancing the Risk Disclosures of Banks .	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : January 1st, 2013</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>IFRS 13 Fair Value Measurement applies to IFRSs that require or permit fair value measurements or disclosures and provides a single IFRS framework for measuring fair value and requires disclosures about fair value measurement. The Standard defines fair value on the basis of an 'exit price' notion and uses a 'fair value hierarchy', which results in a market-based, rather than entity-specific, measurement. IFRS 13 was originally issued in May 2011 and applies to annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2013. IFRS 7 Financial Instruments: Disclosures requires disclosure of information about the significance of financial instruments to an entity, and the</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>nature and extent of risks arising from those financial instruments, both in qualitative and quantitative terms. Specific disclosures are required in relation to transferred financial assets and a number of other matters. IFRS 7 was originally issued in August 2005 and applies to annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2007.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
IX. Strengthening deposit insurance					
23 (38)	Strengthening of national deposit insurance arrangements	National deposit insurance arrangements should be reviewed against the agreed international principles, and authorities should strengthen arrangements where needed. (Rec. VI.9, FSF 2008)	Jurisdictions should describe any revisions made to national deposit insurance system, including steps taken to address the recommendations of the FSB's February 2012 thematic peer review report on deposit insurance systems .	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</p> <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : 2012</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>The Netherlands has a well functioning deposit guarantee scheme (DGS) in place which complies with the IADI principles. The Netherlands has decided to further strengthen the DGS by transforming the current ex post financed DGS into an ex ante funded scheme. Legislation establishing the ex ante financed DGS will enter into force in July 2015. Furthermore, the Dutch intervention act, which came into force in 2012, has introduced the possibility of a transfer of deposits that can be financed through the DGS.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Legislation establishing the ex ante financed DGS will enter into force in July 2015.</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/regelingen/2012/03/30/amvb-ex-ante-dgs.html https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/S-TB-2012-241.html	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
X. Safeguarding the integrity and efficiency of financial markets					
24 (39)	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)	<p>Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the following IOSCO reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on Regulatory Issues Raised by the Impact of Technological Changes on Market Integrity and Efficiency (Oct 2011); and • Report on Principles for Dark Liquidity (May 2011). 	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</p> <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Draft published as of : 20.10.2011</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>The MiFID review contains further measures for strengthening market integrity and efficiency, including measures to mitigate potential threats arising from HFT and measures extending the current transparency regime.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p> <p>http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/securities/isd/mifid_en.htm</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>The proposals are now being negotiated in the European Council. After agreement on these proposals has been reached, implementation in national legislation will follow; in the meantime no additional measures will be implemented at the national level.</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
25 (40)	Enhanced market transparency in commodity markets	We need to ensure enhanced market transparency, both on cash and financial commodity markets, including OTC, and achieve appropriate regulation and supervision of participants in these markets. Market regulators and authorities should be granted effective intervention powers to address disorderly markets and prevent market abuses. In particular, market regulators should have, and use formal position management powers, including the power to set ex-ante position limits, particularly in the delivery month where appropriate, among other powers of intervention. We call on IOSCO to report on the implementation of its recommendations by the end of 2012. (Cannes)	Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken to enhance market transparency in commodity markets. See, for reference, IOSCO’s report on Principles for the Regulation and Supervision of Commodity Derivatives Markets (Sep 2011) . Jurisdictions, in responding to this recommendation, may also make use of the responses contained in the report published by the IOSCO’s Committee on Commodity Futures Markets based on a survey conducted amongst its members in April 2012 on regulation in commodity derivatives market.	Implementation ongoing or completed <i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i> Issue is being addressed through : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Status of progress : Draft published as of : 20.10.2011 Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The MiFID review and the new MAR contain measures that will strengthen transparency and help prevent market abuse. Ex-ante position limits are part of MiFID for example and MAR will address the interconnectedness between spot and derivative markets. Web-links to relevant documents: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/securities/isd/mifid_en.htm http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/securities/abuse/index_en.htm	Planned actions (if any): MiFID is being negotiated in the European Council; Council and EP are negotiating on MAR. After agreement has been reached, implementation (if necessary) in national legislation will follow; no additional measures will be implemented at the national level Expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
26 New	Legal Entity Identifier	<p>We support the creation of a global legal entity identified (LEI) which uniquely identifies parties to financial transactions. (Cannes)</p> <p>We encourage global adoption of the LEI to support authorities and market participants in identifying and managing financial risks. (Los Cabos)</p>	Jurisdictions should indicate whether they have joined Regulatory Oversight Committee (ROC) and whether they intend setting up Local Operating Unit (LOU) in their jurisdiction.	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: <p>The Dutch Central Bank (DNB) has joined the ROC. Moreover, the Dutch Chamber of Commerce has been formally invited by the two Dutch supervisors - the Dutch Central Bank and the Financial Market Authority (AFM) - to operate as a pre-LOU issuing a pre-LEI.</p> <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : The Dutch Central Bank has been a member of the ROC since its inception in January 2012. The Dutch Chamber of Commerce strives to become effective as a pre-LOU issuing a pre-LEI as of 1 July 2013.</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>As trade reporting for certain classes of derivatives will become obligatory under EMIR from 23 September 2013 onwards and a global LEI has not yet been</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>At the moment, the Dutch Chamber of Commerce is preparing itself to become the Dutch pre-LOU issuing a pre-LEI.</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p> <p>It is expected that the Dutch pre-LOU will start issuing pre-LEIs from 1 July 2013 onwards, allowing financial parties to register for a LEI in order to fulfill their reporting obligations under EMIR.</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				<p>established, the Netherlands consider it essential to establish a pre-LOU issuing a pre-LEI in the federal system as envisaged by the FSB. This is only a temporary solution; the Dutch Chamber of Commerce is supposed to issue the ultimate LEIs as well.</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>	

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
XI. Enhancing financial consumer protection					
27 (41)	Enhancing financial consumer protection	We agree that integration of financial consumer protection policies into regulatory and supervisory frameworks contributes to strengthening financial stability, endorse the FSB report on consumer finance protection and the high level principles on financial consumer protection prepared by the OECD together with the FSB. We will pursue the full application of these principles in our jurisdictions. (Cannes)	Jurisdictions should describe progress toward implementation of the OECD's G-20 high-level principles on financial consumer protection (Oct 2011) .	<p>Implementation ongoing or completed</p> <p><i>If “ Not applicable “ or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</i></p> <p>Issue is being addressed through :</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regulation /Guidelines</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</p> <p>Initiatives of the platform for financial education "Wijzer in Geldzaken"</p> <p>Status of progress :</p> <p>Reform effective (completed) as of : 2006</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</p> <p>Financial consumer protection is an integral part of the Financial Supervision Act (Wet op het financieel toezicht) and secondary legislation, with supervision by a dedicated market conduct agency: Autoriteit Financiële Markten ('financial markets authority').</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p> <p>www.wijzeringeldzaken.nl; http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0020368/geldigheidsdatum_23-04-2013; http://www.afm.nl/en/professionals/regel</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any):</p> <p>Expected commencement date:</p> <p>Web-links to relevant documents:</p>

No	Description	G20/FSB Recommendations	Remarks	Progress to date	Next steps
				geving/wetten.aspx ; http://www.afm.nl/en	

XII. Source of recommendations:

[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 \(1 November 2012\)](#)

XIII. List of Abbreviations used:

AFM: Autoriteit Financiële Markten, Financial Markets Authority

AIFM: Alternative investment fund managers directive

CRD: Capital requirements directive

DGS: Deposito garantie stelsel, Deposit guarantee scheme

DNB: De Nederlandsche Bank, the Netherlands Central Bank

ESAs: European Supervisory Authorities (i.e. EBA, EIOPA, ESMA)

SSM: Single Supervisory Mechanism

Wft: Wet op het financieel toezicht, Financial Supervision Act