

Jurisdiction: Canada

2018 IMN Survey of National/Regional Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations

Contact information

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

List of abbreviations used

Sources of recommendations

List of contact persons from the FSB and standard-setting bodies

National authorities from FSB member jurisdictions should complete the survey and submit it to the FSB Secretariat (imn@fsb.org) by **Friday, 8 June 2018** (*representing the most recent status at that time*). The Secretariat is available to answer any questions or clarifications that may be needed on the survey. Please also provide your contact details for the person(s) completing the survey and an index of abbreviations used in the response.

National authorities are expected to submit the information to the FSB Secretariat using the Adobe Acrobat version of the survey. The Microsoft Word version of the survey is also being circulated to facilitate the preparation/collection of survey responses by relevant authorities within each jurisdiction.

Jurisdictions that previously reported implementation as completed in a particular recommendation are only required to include information about main developments since last year's survey and future plans (if applicable) ("Update and next steps" table). New reforms to enhance the existing framework in that area should be described, but should not lead to a downgrade from implementation completed to ongoing. Jurisdictions that do not report implementation as completed are required to include full information both in the "Progress to date" and "Update and next steps" tables.

As with previous IMN surveys, the contents of this survey for each national jurisdiction will be published on the FSB's website at around the time of the 2018 G20 Summit in Buenos Aires. The FSB Secretariat will contact member jurisdictions ahead of the Summit to check for any updates or amendments to submitted responses before they are published.

I. Hedge funds

II III IV V VI VII VIII IX X

1. Registration, appropriate disclosures and oversight of hedge funds

G20/FSB Recommendations

We also firmly recommitted to work in an internationally consistent and non-discriminatory manner to strengthen regulation and supervision on hedge funds.
(Seoul)

Hedge funds or their managers will be registered and will be required to disclose appropriate information on an ongoing basis to supervisors or regulators, including on their leverage, necessary for assessment of the systemic risks they pose individually or collectively. Where appropriate registration should be subject to a minimum size. They will be subject to oversight to ensure that they have adequate risk management.
(London)

Implementation of this recommendation was reported to be completed by all FSB jurisdictions in the 2016 IMN survey. Given this, the reporting of progress with respect to this recommendation will take place every 2-3 years henceforth (i.e. in 2019 or 2020).

I. Hedge funds

- II
- III
- IV
- V
- VI
- VII
- VIII
- IX
- X

2. Establishment of international information sharing framework

G20/FSB Recommendations

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)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing recommendation 6 in IOSCO's [Report on Hedge Fund Oversight \(Jun 2009\)](#) on sharing information to facilitate the oversight of globally active fund managers.

In addition, jurisdictions should state whether they are:

- Signatory to the IOSCO MMoU in relation to cooperation in enforcement
- Signatory to bilateral agreements for supervisory cooperation that cover hedge funds and are aligned to the 2010 IOSCO [Principles Regarding Cross-border Supervisory Cooperation](#).

Jurisdictions can also refer to Principle 28 of the 2017 IOSCO Objectives and Principles of Securities Regulation, and take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those Principles.

Progress to date
<p> <input type="radio"/> Not applicable <input type="radio"/> Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment <input type="radio"/> Implementation ongoing <input checked="" type="radio"/> Implementation completed as of April 2014 </p> <p>If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification</p> <div style="background-color: #cccccc; height: 200px; width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"></div> <p>If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Draft in preparation, expected publication by <input type="radio"/> Draft published as of <input type="radio"/> Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on <input type="radio"/> Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since </p>

I. Hedge funds

II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
----	-----	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---

2. Establishment of international information sharing framework

Progress to date	
<p>Issue is being addressed through</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regulation / Guidelines</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions)</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>The AMF, OSC, Alberta Securities Commission (ASC) and British Columbia Securities Commission (BCSC) are all signatories to the IOSCO MMoU. Additional MoUs: In July 2013, the AMF, OSC, BCSC and ASC signed Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) with 29 European jurisdictions providing for the exchange of information and mutual assistance in the supervision of Alternative Investment Fund Managers. On March 23, 2012, the AMF, the OSC, the ASC and the BCSC entered into a similar MoU with the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC). This comprehensive arrangement will facilitate their supervision of regulated entities (including credit rating organizations) that operate on a cross-border basis in Australia and Canada. This MoU is similar to an MoU that was previously signed with the US Securities and Exchange Commission. On April 3, 2014, the AMF, OSC, ASC and BCSC entered into a MoU with the United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) concerning regulatory cooperation related to the supervision and oversight of regulated entities that operate in both the United States and Canada. On June 9, 2014, the AMF, OSC, BCSC and the Bank of Canada entered into a Memorandum of Understanding Respecting the Oversight of Certain Clearing and Settlement Systems, which provides a framework for cooperation with respect to domestic clearing agencies which have also been designated as systemically important to the Canadian financial system. The MoU establishes a common framework for information sharing, consultation and coordination among these authorities with respect to their collaborative oversight of Canadian-based CCP, SSS and CSD. On December 3, 2015, eight provincial securities regulators (ASC, AMF, BCSC, FCAA, FCNB, MSC, NSSC and OSC) signed a Memorandum of Understanding Respecting the Oversight of Clearing Agencies, Trade Repositories and Matching Service Utilities. The MoU formalizes the manner in which the jurisdictions cooperate and coordinate their efforts to oversee clearing agencies, trade repositories and matching service utilities (Covered Entities) in order to promote their safety and efficiency, as well as contribute to the management of systemic risk. On January 7, 2016, the AMF, the Manitoba Securities Commission (MSC) and the OSC entered into an MoU with the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) regarding arrangements for cooperation and the exchange of information relating to central counterparty activities carried on by entities recognized by each of these authorities. ESMA has also entered into a similar agreement with the ASC. Through this MoU, ESMA can rely on the supervision and enforcement capabilities of the AMF, the MSC, the OSC and the ASC in Canada regarding central counterparty activities carried on by entities established in one of those provinces that are recognized by ESMA.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

I. Hedge funds

II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
----	-----	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---

2. Establishment of international information sharing framework

Update and next steps	
<p>Highlight main developments since last year's survey</p> <p>In 2017 the following co-operation agreements were entered into:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The AMF, BCSC, ASC, MSC, the Financial and Consumer Affairs Authority of Saskatchewan, the Financial and Consumer Services Commission (New Brunswick) and the Nova Scotia Securities Commission entered into an Innovations Functions Co-Operation Agreement with the Australian Securities and Investments commission. 2) The OSC has entered into an Innovation Functions Co-Operation Agreements with the Australian Securities and Investments commission and the UK Financial Conduct Authority. 3) The AMF, OSC, BCSC, ASC, MSC, the Financial and Consumer Affairs Authority of Saskatchewan, the Financial and Consumer Services Commission (New Brunswick) and the Nova Scotia Securities Commission entered into a Co-operation Agreement regarding co-operation for innovation in the financial sector with the France Autorité des marchés financiers. 4) The AMF, OSC, BCSC, ASC, MSC, the Financial and Consumer Affairs Authority of Saskatchewan, the Financial and Consumer Services Commission (New Brunswick) and the Nova Scotia Securities Commission entered into an Innovation Functions Co-operation Agreement with Abu Dhabi Global Market Financial Services Regulatory Authority. <p>In 2016, the AMF and the Superintendencia del Mercado de Valores of the Republic of Panama entered into an MOU.</p> <p>In November 2016, the AMF became party to the Multilateral Arrangement for Regulatory, supervisory and Oversight Cooperation on LCH.Clearnet Ltc (LCH Global College). As a member of the LCH Global College arrangement, the AMF is able to raise issues or concerns and share its views in relation to LCH Limited"s risk controls with the BoE and other members of the LCH Global College.</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date</p>

Relevant web-links	
<p>Web-links to relevant documents</p>	<p>http://www.iosco.org/library/pubdocs/pdf/IOSCOPD322.pdf</p> <p>http://www.sec.gov/about/offices/oia/oia_bilateral/canada_regcoop.pdf</p> <p>http://lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/bourses-oar-chambres/protocole-entente-surveillance_systemecompensation_an.pdf</p> <p>http://lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/valeurs-mobilieres/0-ententes-vm/2015dec03-mou-acvm-chambre-compensation-en.pdf</p>

I. Hedge funds

- II
- III
- IV
- V
- VI
- VII
- VIII
- IX
- X

3. Enhancing counterparty risk management

G20/FSB Recommendations

Supervisors should require that institutions which have hedge funds as their counterparties have effective risk management, including mechanisms to monitor the funds' leverage and set limits for single counterparty exposures. (London)

Supervisors will strengthen their existing guidance on the management of exposures to leveraged counterparties. (Rec. II.17, FSF 2008)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate specific policy measures taken for enhancing counterparty risk management and strengthening their existing guidance on the management of exposure to leveraged counterparties.

In particular, jurisdictions should indicate whether they have implemented recommendation 3 of the IOSCO [Report on Hedge Fund Oversight \(Jun 2009\)](#).

In their responses, jurisdictions should not provide information on the portion of this recommendation that pertains to Basel III capital requirements for counterparty risk, since it is [monitored separately](#) by the BCBS.

Jurisdictions can also refer to Principle 28 of the 2017 IOSCO [Objectives and Principles of Securities Regulation](#), and take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those Principles.

Progress to date

- Not applicable
- Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
- Implementation ongoing
- Implementation completed as of

If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify

- 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

I. Hedge funds

II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
----	-----	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---

3. Enhancing counterparty risk management

Progress to date	
<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) <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>Following Basel III changes, OSFI has increased the risk-weighted asset charge for exposures to unregulated financial institutions (e.g., hedge funds) by increasing Asset Value Correlation (AVC) by 25% in the Internal Ratings-Based (IRB) formula. See link to the OSFI Capital Adequacy Requirements. Also, under the Internal Ratings-based Approach (IRB Approach), "Minimum Requirements for IRB Approach", the Probability of Default (PD) estimates for borrowers that are highly leveraged or for borrowers whose assets are predominantly traded assets must reflect the performance of the underlying assets based on periods of stressed volatilities. OSFI's supervision work includes assessment of appropriate controls and oversight of hedge funds by federally regulated financial institutions (FRFIs). These controls include single counterparty names and limits for each hedge fund. From the supervisory perspective, OSFI periodically obtains information on financial institutions' exposures to hedge funds. OSFI's large exposure rules cover entities such as hedge funds. Similar to OSFI, the AMF has also updated its requirement on unregulated institutions in its Capital Adequacy Guideline (CAG) following the enforcement of Basel III for financial institutions. This requirement impacted the risk weighted assets charge by increasing Asset Value Correlation (AVC) by 25% in the Internal Ratings-Based (IRB) formula. Also, according to the CAG, institutions not allowed to use IRB must follow the AMF's requirement when assessing the counterparty risk for capital purposes. These changes will impact the institutions exposure at default and therefore the capital required for such exposure. See Annex 3-II of the CAG.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 150px; width: 100%;"></div>

I. Hedge funds

- II
- III
- IV
- V
- VI
- VII
- VIII
- IX
- X

3. Enhancing counterparty risk management

Update and next steps

Highlight main developments since last year's survey

OSFI participated in the development of the Basel III Large Exposure framework and is reviewing its existing guidance in this domain. At the end of 2016, the AMF began working on concentration risk. The main objective is to reduce the exposure to a single counterparty. A new guideline will be published later this year.

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

(This area is currently blank for planned actions.)

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

- AVC Change: OSFI's Capital Adequacy Requirements Guideline: http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/eng/docs/car_chpt6.pdf
- Large Exposure Limit Guidance: http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/Eng/Docs/b2_Prd.pdf
- OSFI CAR: <http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/Eng/wn-qn/Pages/CARNFP-2014.aspx>
- The AMF's Ligne directrice sur les normes relatives à la suffisance du capital de base (in French only): http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/lignes-directrices-insti-depot/mod_ld_cap_coops_pf_2017-01.pdf

I	II. Securitisation	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
---	--------------------	-----	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---

4. Strengthening of regulatory and capital framework for monolines

G20/FSB Recommendations

Insurance supervisors should strengthen the regulatory and capital framework for monoline insurers in relation to structured credit. (Rec II.8, FSF 2008)

Implementation of this recommendation was reported to be completed by all FSB jurisdictions in the 2016 IMN survey. Given this, the reporting of progress with respect to this recommendation will take place every 2-3 years henceforth (i.e. in 2019 or 2020).

I II. Securitisation III IV V VI VII VIII IX X

5. Strengthening of supervisory requirements or best practices for investment in structured products

G20/FSB Recommendations

Regulators of institutional investors should strengthen the requirements or best practices for firms' processes for investment in structured products. (Rec II.18, FSF 2008)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate the due diligence policies, procedures and practices applicable for investment managers when investing in structured finance instruments and other policy measures taken for strengthening best practices for investment in structured finance products.

Jurisdictions may reference IOSCO's report on [Good Practices in Relation to Investment Managers' Due Diligence When Investing in Structured Finance Instruments \(Jul 2009\)](#).

Jurisdictions may also refer to the Joint Forum report on [Credit Risk Transfer-Developments from 2005-2007 \(Jul 2008\)](#).

Progress to date

Not applicable
 Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
 Implementation ongoing
 Implementation completed as of

If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged..." has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If "Implementation ongoing" has been selected, please specify

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

I	II. Securitisation	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
5. Strengthening of supervisory requirements or best practices for investment in structured products									

Progress to date	
<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) <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>Please also refer to our responses under Item 6. Background: On July 20, 2007, the CSA published CSA Staff Notice 44-304 - Linked Notes Distributed under the Shelf Prospectus System (CSA Staff Notice 44-304) which provides guidance to issuers that intend to qualify structured notes for distribution by way a shelf prospectus. In 2013, the AMF and the OSC participated in a survey that was conducted by IOSCO’s Task Force on Unregulated Markets and Products (TFUMP). In light of the TFUMP work and the evolving industry, AMF and OSC worked together to prepare the CSA Staff Notice 44-305 2015 Update - Structured Notes Distributed under the Shelf Prospectus System (the “CSA Staff Notice 44-305”) published in January 2015. In conducting the 2015 update, the AMF and OSC looked to investment fund regulatory requirements, developments, and the guidance provided in the TFUMP report. CSA Staff Notice 44-305 updates and supplements CSA Staff Notice 44-304 regarding: 1) disclosure issuers should consider when preparing prospectus supplements for their structured notes including fees, expenses, product pricing and estimates fair value, transparency of underlying interest; 2) disclosure issuers should consider providing regarding their structured notes on an ongoing basis including composition of the underlying portfolio to which the note is linked; initial price or level of the underlying interest; the current and historical daily bid prices for the note where the issuer or a related entity of the issuer intends to maintain a secondary market, annual compounded rates of return for notes that have reached maturity, etc.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

I	II. Securitisation	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
---	--------------------	-----	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---

5. Strengthening of supervisory requirements or best practices for investment in structured products

Update and next steps

Highlight main developments since last year's survey

In September 2016, the OSC published Frequently Asked Questions and other issues concerning structured notes on its website.

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

(This area is currently blank for planned actions.)

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

http://www.osc.gov.on.ca/documents/en/Securities-Category4/csa_20150122_44-305_structured-notes.pdf
https://www.osc.gov.on.ca/documents/en/Securities-Category4/csa_20070720_44-304_linked-notes.pdf

I	II. Securitisation	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
6. Enhanced disclosure of securitised products									

G20/FSB Recommendations

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)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures and other initiatives taken in relation to enhancing disclosure of securitised products, including working with industry and other authorities to continue to standardise disclosure templates and considering measures to improve the type of information that investors receive.

See, for reference, IOSCO’s [Report on Principles for Ongoing Disclosure for Asset-Backed Securities \(Nov 2012\)](#), [Disclosure Principles for Public Offerings and Listings of Asset-Backed Securities \(Apr 2010\)](#) and [report on Global Developments in Securitisation Regulations \(November 2012\)](#), in particular recommendations 4 and 5.

Progress to date
<p> <input type="radio"/> Not applicable <input type="radio"/> Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment <input type="radio"/> Implementation ongoing <input checked="" type="radio"/> Implementation completed as of May 2015 </p> <p>If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification</p> <div style="background-color: #cccccc; height: 200px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Draft in preparation, expected publication by <input type="radio"/> Draft published as of <input type="radio"/> Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on <input type="radio"/> Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since </p>

I	II. Securitisation	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
6. Enhanced disclosure of securitised products									

Progress to date	
<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) <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>Canadian securities authorities (AMF and OSC) participated in IOSCO’s Task Force on Unregulated Markets and Products (TFUMP). Since the end of TFUMP’s mandate, IOSCO and BCBS have undertaken additional work on securitization through a cross-sectoral BCBS-IOSCO Task Force on Securitization. In 2015, the AMF and the OSC also participated in a Thematic Review conducted by IOSCO’s Assessment Committee of the policy recommendations related to risk retention and enhanced transparency. Canadian Securities Administrators (CSA) securitization initiatives: In February 2015, the CSA published the amendments to the regulation. The amendments focus on the distribution of short-term securitized products in the exempt market, which are primarily asset-backed commercial paper (ABCP). The intent is to address investor protection and systemic risk concerns that were raised by certain types of complex ABCP that were issued in Canada pre-financial crisis. The amendments are also intended to allow the CSA to collect information on distributions of securitized products made under other prospectus exemptions. Issuers wishing to avail themselves of the exemption have to provide reasonable access to an “information memorandum” to investors and comply with continuous disclosure obligations. The exemption is only available for the distribution of short-term securitized products that meet a number of eligibility enhancements, including a requirement for the issuer to have a “global-style” liquidity agreement with an appropriate financial institution. The regulation also imposes disclosure of how the interests of investors are aligned with the interests of the issuer, the sponsor and the parties to asset transactions, including any risk retention measures the issuer or the sponsor takes. The amendments to the regulation came into force in May 2015. The CSA will continue to monitor international developments related to the disclosure requirements of issuers of ABS and other securitized products in the public markets. The CSA will also continue to evaluate the nature and quality of disclosure in prospectuses used to distribute securitized products in Canada, as well as the continuous disclosure reporting issuers file that have distributed securitized products.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

I	II. Securitisation	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
---	--------------------	-----	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---

6. Enhanced disclosure of securitised products

Update and next steps

Update and next steps				
<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;">Highlight main developments since last year's survey</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0; vertical-align: top;"> <p>None.</p> </td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;"></td> </tr> </table>	Highlight main developments since last year's survey	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date	<p>None.</p>	
Highlight main developments since last year's survey	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date			
<p>None.</p>				

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents	<p>http://www.iosco.org/library/pubdocs/pdf/IOSCOPD372.pdf CSA's securitization initiatives: Final amendments published in 2015: http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/valeurs-mobilières/45-106/2015-02-19/2015fev19-45-106-safi-avis-publication-en.pdf http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/valeurs-mobilières/45-106/2015-02-19/2015fev19-45-106-safi-final-acvm-en.pdf http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/valeurs-mobilières/45-106/2015-02-19/2015fev19-45-106-ig-safi-final-acvm-en.pdf http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/valeurs-mobilières/25-101/2015-02-19/2015fev19-25-101-safi-final-acvm-en.pdf</p>
--	---

I II III. Enhancing supervision IV V VI VII VIII IX X

7. Consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of SIFIs

G20/FSB Recommendations

All firms whose failure could pose a risk to financial stability must be subject to consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation with high standards. (Pittsburgh)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate: (1) whether they have identified domestic SIFIs and, if so, in which sectors (banks, insurers, other etc.); (2) whether the names of the identified SIFIs have been publicly disclosed; and (3) the types of policy measures taken for implementing consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of the identified SIFIs.

Jurisdictions should not provide details on policy measures that pertain to higher loss absorbency requirements for G/D-SIFIs, since these are monitored separately by the BCBS.

See, for reference, the following documents:

BCBS

- [Framework for G-SIFIs \(Jul 2013\)](#)
- [Framework for D-SIFIs \(Oct 2012\)](#)

IAIS

- [Global Systemically Important Insurers: Policy Measures \(Jul 2013\) and revised assessment methodology \(updated in June 2016\)](#)
- [IAIS SRMP guidance - FINAL \(Dec 2013\)](#)
- [Guidance on Liquidity management and planning \(Oct 2014\)](#)

FSB

- [Framework for addressing SIFIs \(Nov 2011\)](#)

Progress to date

Not applicable
 Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
 Implementation ongoing
 Implementation completed as of

If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify

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

I	II	III. Enhancing supervision	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
7. Consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of SIFIs									

Progress to date	
<p>Issue is being addressed through</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation / Guidelines</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions)</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>In March 2013, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions (OSFI) published an Advisory that identified domestic systemically important banks (D-SIBs) in Canada in the context of OSFI’s assessment of systemic risk, and establishes a common equity surcharge for designated banks. In November 2017, a Canadian institution was designated as a global systemically important bank (G-SIB). The Canadian banks designated as G/D-SIBs are subject to more intensive supervision. G/D-SIBs have also developed recovery and resolution plans, and regularly discuss recovery and resolution planning issues at crisis management groups. OSFI continues to participate in international and domestic work related to G/D-SIBs and global and domestic systematically important insurers (G-SII/D-SII) frameworks. Canadian G/D-SIBs are expected to have public information disclosure practices covering their financial condition and risk management activities that are among the best of their international peers. Canadian G/D-SIBs are expected to adopt the recommendations of the FSB’s Enhanced Disclosure Task Force, future disclosure recommendations in the banking arena that international standard setters and the FSB endorse, as well as evolving domestic and international bank risk disclosure best practices. In addition, as of July 2014, G/D-SIBs are required to make public disclosures in respect of the Liquidity Coverage Ratio.</p> <p>In June 2013, the AMF published a Notice confirming Desjardins Group as a domestic systemically important financial institution (D-SIFI). As such, Desjardins Group is subject to an additional Tier 1a capital requirement corresponding to 1% of its Risk-weighted assets requirement for starting from January 1, 2016, as well as enhanced disclosure practices and enhanced supervision by the AMF. The AMF has also required the development of recovery plans by Desjardins Group and the AMF is developing resolution plans for this D-SIFI.</p> <p>On February 27, 2014, the Financial Institutions Commission of British Columbia (FICOM) announced that it had designated Central 1 as a D-SIFI. Central 1 is the credit union central for credit unions in the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia. It provides liquidity management and clearing and payment services to its member institutions. FICOM will apply a number of regulatory and supervisory measures including increasing liquidity requirements, establishing leverage limits, enhanced supervision, and enhanced disclosure requirements. Canadian authorities will review the framework for assessing the systemic importance of non-bank non-insurance entities once finalized.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p> <div style="background-color: #D3D3D3; height: 150px; width: 100%;"></div>

I II III. Enhancing supervision IV V VI VII VIII IX X

7. Consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of SIFIs

Update and next steps

Highlight main developments since last year's survey

In November 2017, Royal Bank of Canada (RBC) was designated as a G-SIB by the FSB based on the assessment methodology published by the BCBS. RBC will be expected to meet the increased G-SIB requirements starting in January 2019.

Since last year's survey, as announced in the 2016-2017 Québec Budget, the Government of Québec has reviewed all the legislation governing the financial sector with a view to create an integrated, coherent framework dedicated to promoting the interests of Quebecers. The AMF is actively participating in the legislative reform process.

Bill n°141: An Act mainly to improve the regulation of the financial sector, the protection of deposits of money and the operation of financial institutions was introduced on October 5, 2017, in the National Assembly of Québec. This bill will give more powers to the AMF in terms of supervision, regulation and resolution of a D-SIFI. The bill will be adopted during the week of June 11, 2018.

Concerning the recovery and resolution framework, by the end of 2016, the AMF has received a third iteration of the recovery plan from the Desjardins Group and it has submitted its assessment report to the institution in July 2017. The fourth iteration of the Desjardins Group's recovery plan is expected in June 2018. The Desjardins Group's recovery plan is updated and submitted to the AMF on an annual basis (except for 2017) or after a major change to the organisational structure. Finally, the AMF has carried on with its work on resolution planning for the Desjardins Group. The writing of the second iteration of the resolution plan is underway. Both exercises are within the timeline the AMF has established when it designated the Desjardins Group as a D-SIFI. The AMF has also published its requirement on public reporting information about institutions under Pillar III. Full +

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

OSFI will continue to participate in international and domestic work related to G-SIB/G-SII and D-SIB/D-SII frameworks and will continue to oversee implementation of relevant policy measures.

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

- July 2014 OSFI Public Disclosure Requirements for Domestic Systemically Important Banks on Liquidity Coverage Ratio: <http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/eng/fi-if/rg-ro/gdn-ort/gl-ld/pages/lcr.aspx>
- June 2013 notice confirming designation of Desjardins Group as D-SIFI by the AMF: http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/assurances-inst-depot/avis-ifis-d-cq_desjardins_a.pdf
- <http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/fr/lignes-directrices-i-d-pro.html>
- Information on Central 1 designation: http://www.fic.gov.bc.ca/pdf/info_bulletins/CU-14-001.pdf

I	II	III. Enhancing supervision	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
---	----	----------------------------	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---

8. Establishing supervisory colleges and conducting risk assessments

G20/FSB Recommendations

To establish the remaining supervisory colleges for significant cross-border firms by June 2009. (London)

We agreed to conduct rigorous risk assessment on these firms [G-SIFIs] through international supervisory colleges. (Seoul)

Implementation of this recommendation was reported to be completed by all FSB jurisdictions in the 2017 IMN survey. The BCBS and IAIS will be monitoring implementation progress in this area with respect to banks and insurers respectively.

I II III. Enhancing supervision IV V VI VII VIII IX X

9. Supervisory exchange of information and coordination

G20/FSB Recommendations

To quicken supervisory responsiveness to developments that have a common effect across a number of institutions, supervisory exchange of information and coordination in the development of best practice benchmarks should be improved at both national and international levels. (Rec V.7 , FSF 2008)

Enhance the effectiveness of core supervisory colleges. (FSB 2012)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should include any feedback received from recent FSAPs/ROSC assessments on the [September 2012](#) BCP 3 (Cooperation and collaboration) and BCP 14 (Home-host relationships). Jurisdictions should also indicate any steps taken since the last assessment in this area, particularly in response to relevant FSAP/ROSC recommendations.

Jurisdictions should describe any recent or planned regulatory, supervisory or legislative changes that contribute to the sharing of supervisory information (e.g. within supervisory colleges or via bilateral or multilateral MoUs).

Progress to date

Not applicable
 Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
 Implementation ongoing
 Implementation completed as of

If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify

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

I II III. Enhancing supervision IV V VI VII VIII IX X

9. Supervisory exchange of information and coordination

Progress to date	
<p>Issue is being addressed through</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regulation / Guidelines</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions)</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>Canadian federal financial sector regulators monitor the activities of entities outside the federal regulatory perimeter on a regular basis for potential emerging risks to the Canadian financial system (e.g. mortgage finance companies, credit unions). This is part of the regular discussion of systemic vulnerabilities at the Senior Advisory Committee (SAC) Please see item 11 for further information. In addition, there are regular discussions of potential systemic risks among CSA members and between CSA members and federal regulators. CSA: The CSA has established several processes and mechanisms to address perimeter of regulation issues including: securitization, financial innovation, investment fund regulation, and unregulated market service providers regulation. CSA Systemic Risk Committee (SRC): The mandate of the CSA’s Systemic Risk Committee is: to develop and implement a process to follow up on and/or monitor identified systemic risks, or related knowledge gaps, in the Canadian capital markets from time to time, based on perceived need, to conduct comprehensive or targeted assessments of systemic risk in the Canadian capital markets; and to continue to build knowledge of systemic risks within the CSA, including how such risks may be transmitted as well as identified. The SRC also works with its domestic and foreign regulatory peers. The SRC has been coordinating quarterly inter-agency calls on systemic risk, including staff of the ASC, AMF, BCSC, OSC, the BoC, OSFI, the Federal Department of Finance, and Investment Industry Regulatory Organization of Canada (IIROC). The inter-agency calls have allowed staff to discuss matters with potential systemic risk implications including shadow banking, securitized investments, hedge funds, ETFs, money market funds, the potential shortage of safe assets for collateral, search for yields, benchmarks, cyber-security and global macroeconomic conditions Participation by the AMF, the OSC and ASC in the IOSCO Committee on Emerging Risks (CER) has brought an additional international perspective to the SRC and reaffirmed, at least to the SRC’s comfort, that the SRC’s methods and processes broadly follow Principles 6 and 7 of IOSCO’s Objectives and Principles of Securities Regulation.</p> <p>Other actions: OSFI maintains relationships with the major regulators of our FIs formally through MoUs, which set out the sharing of information. Information is also gathered through bilateral and quarterly monitoring discussions and Supervisory Colleges. Since FRFIs may have subsidiaries and affiliates that are supervised at the provincial level, and given the importance of some large provincial institutions, it is important that OSFI and the relevant provincial regulators enhance two-way communications and protocols to share supervisory information. Additionally, the AMF, BCSC, ASC and the OSC have entered into MoUs with various international bodies (see item 2). Further sharing of information takes place in the context of the development of recovery and resolution plans. The AMF became a signatory of the IAIS MMoU in March 2015. Also, along with seven other Canadian provinces, the AMF became a signatory of the Canadian Council of Insurance Regulators (CCIR) MoU in 2015. These two agreements aim to enhance the cooperation and the exchange of information between insurance regulators. (See also item 2, Establishment of international information sharing framework re: MoUs with ASIC, SEC, CFTC, ESMA). Since 2015, the Bank of Canada and provincial regulators, have been engaging to establish MoUs for increased information sharing in support of recent changes to the Bank of Canada’s Emergency</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

I	II	III. Enhancing supervision	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
---	----	----------------------------	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---

9. Supervisory exchange of information and coordination

Update and next steps

Highlight main developments since last year's survey

CSA Market Disruption & Cybersecurity Coordination Group is working on a formal coordination process to manage a market disruption, including a large-scale cybersecurity incident. The work will describe the role of the CSA and other regulatory organizations in a market disruption situation including a cybersecurity event and will also outline communication procedures.

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

I II III. Enhancing supervision IV V VI VII VIII IX X

10. Strengthening resources and effective supervision

G20/FSB Recommendations

We agreed that supervisors should have strong and unambiguous mandates, sufficient independence to act, appropriate resources, and a full suite of tools and powers to proactively identify and address risks, including regular stress testing and early intervention. (Seoul)

Supervisors should see that they have the requisite resources and expertise to oversee the risks associated with financial innovation and to ensure that firms they supervise have the capacity to understand and manage the risks. (FSF 2008)

Supervisory authorities should continually re-assess their resource needs; for example, interacting with and assessing Boards require particular skills, experience and adequate level of seniority. (Rec. 3, FSB 2012)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate any steps taken on recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 (i.e. supervisory strategy, engagement with banks, improvements in banks' IT and MIS, data requests, and talent management strategy respectively) in the FSB [thematic peer review report on supervisory frameworks and approaches to SIBs \(May 2015\)](#).

Progress to date

Not applicable
 Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
 Implementation ongoing
 Implementation completed as of Measures were in place

If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged..." has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If "Implementation ongoing" has been selected, please specify

Draft in preparation, expected publication by [redacted]
 Draft published as of [redacted]
 Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on [redacted]
 Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since [redacted]

I	II	III. Enhancing supervision	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
---	----	----------------------------	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---

10. Strengthening resources and effective supervision

Progress to date	
<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) <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>OSFI's mandate is defined in its governing statute. The OSFI Act, along with the legislation governing federally regulated financial institutions, provides OSFI with significant levels of independence to act, as well as a full range of tools and powers to conduct early intervention as needed.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

I	II	III. Enhancing supervision	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
---	----	----------------------------	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---

10. Strengthening resources and effective supervision

Update and next steps

Update and next steps				
<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;">Highlight main developments since last year's survey</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #f2f2f2; vertical-align: top;"> <p>N/A</p> </td> <td style="background-color: #f2f2f2;"></td> </tr> </table>	Highlight main developments since last year's survey	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date	<p>N/A</p>	
Highlight main developments since last year's survey	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date			
<p>N/A</p>				

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents	<p>OSFI Act: http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/O-2.7.pdf Guide to Intervention: http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/app/DocRepository/1/eng/practices/supervisory/Guide_Int_e.pdf OSFI Plans and Priorities 2016-2019: http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/eng/docs/rpp1617.pdf</p>
--	--

11. Establishing regulatory framework for macro-prudential oversight

G20/FSB Recommendations

Amend our regulatory systems to ensure authorities are able to identify and take account of macro-prudential risks across the financial system including in the case of regulated banks, shadow banks and private pools of capital to limit the build up of systemic risk. (London)

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)

Remarks

Please describe major changes in the institutional arrangements for macroprudential policy (structures, mandates, powers, reporting etc.) that have taken place in your jurisdiction since the global financial crisis.

Please indicate whether an assessment has been conducted with respect to the adequacy of powers to collect and share relevant information among national authorities on financial institutions, markets and instruments to assess the potential for systemic risk. If so, please describe identified gaps in the powers to collect information, and whether any follow-up actions have been taken.

Progress to date

Not applicable
 Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
 Implementation ongoing
 Implementation completed as of [redacted]

If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify

Draft in preparation, expected publication by [redacted]
 Draft published as of [redacted]
 Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on [redacted]
 Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since [redacted]

I	II	III	IV. Building and implementing macroprudential frameworks and tools	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
---	----	-----	--	---	----	-----	------	----	---

11. Establishing regulatory framework for macro-prudential oversight

Progress to date	
<p>Issue is being addressed through</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation / Guidelines</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions)</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>Canada has a comprehensive regulatory and supervisory framework that effectively addresses macro prudential concerns and systemic risk oversight including (when necessary) by adopting regulatory policies that go beyond international minimum standards. This framework, which is underpinned by legislation, allows for coordinated sharing of information and discussions related to oversight of regulated financial institutions, and the assessment and mitigation of systemic risks. Financial Institutions Supervisory Committee (FISC): FISC, established in 1987, is mandated in the OSFI Act to facilitate consultation and the exchange of information on matters relating to the supervision of financial institutions between OSFI, the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation (CDIC), the Bank of Canada (BoC), Financial Consumer Agency of Canada (FCAC), and the Department of Finance (Canada). The FISC meets regularly and has the obligation to share information regarding the condition of financial institutions under the umbrella of legislated protection of confidentiality. FISC provides the Superintendent of Financial Institutions with the benefit of the views of the other federal agencies when making supervisory decisions or dealing with problem institutions. Financial sector trends and risks are a standing item for discussion at FISC. Senior Advisory Committee (SAC): SAC is a policy committee chaired by Finance Canada with participation from the same regulatory agencies. SAC acts as a discussion forum for financial sector policy issues, including financial stability. The Committee allows for an exchange of views among financial sector agencies on specific issues and risks in order to inform the advice provided to the Minister of Finance on legislative, regulatory, and policy issues affecting the financial sector. SAC regularly discusses systemic vulnerabilities as well as measures and contingency plans to respond to potential vulnerabilities. These discussions promote a high level of inter-agency cooperation in the area of macro-prudential supervision and related actions. This framework also facilitates the participation of other agencies that are critical to monitoring systemic risk, such as the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC). Heads of Agencies (HoA): The HoA committee is chaired by the Governor of the BoC and includes four provincial Securities Regulators (i.e. the OSC, AMF, ASC, and BCSC), the Department of Finance, and OSFI. This forum, which meets twice per year, allows federal authorities and provincial securities market regulators to exchange information and views and to coordinate actions on issues of mutual concern that are affecting the Canadian financial sector. Currently, the HoA’s main focus includes ensuring a sound regulatory framework, driven by Canada’s efforts to implement its G20 commitments, which are intended to address, among other issues, systemic risk issues, such as OTC derivatives and shadow banking. Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation (CDIC): The Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Board of Directors has eleven members including senior officials from the BoC, Finance Canada, OSFI, and FCAC as ex-officio members, and five others drawn from the Canadian private sector, including the Chair. The CDIC Board discusses issues related to the management of the Corporation which includes issues related to financial stability such as the resolution of troubled CDIC member institutions. Government of Canada 2018 Budget: Based on collaborative work with FMIs and provincial regulators, Budget 2018 proposes to introduce legislative amendments that would implement a resolution framework for Canada’s systemically important FMIs. The objectives of the FMI resolution regime are to maintain the critical services of the FMI, promote financial stability, and reduce potential public exposure to loss.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

11. Establishing regulatory framework for macro-prudential oversight

Update and next steps

<p>Highlight main developments since last year's survey</p> <div style="background-color: #d3d3d3; height: 400px;"></div>	<p>Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date</p> <div style="background-color: #d3d3d3; height: 400px;"></div>
--	---

Relevant web-links

<p>Web-links to relevant documents</p>	<p>OSFI Act: http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/o-2.7/index.html Bank Act: http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/b-1.01/</p>
---	---

I	II	III	IV. Building and implementing macroprudential frameworks and tools	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
---	----	-----	--	---	----	-----	------	----	---

12. Enhancing system-wide monitoring and the use of macro-prudential instruments

G20/FSB Recommendations

Authorities should use quantitative indicators and/or constraints on leverage and margins as macro-prudential tools for supervisory purposes. Authorities should use quantitative indicators of leverage as guides for policy, both at the institution-specific and at the macro-prudential (system-wide) level. (Rec. 3.1, FSF 2009)

We are developing macro-prudential policy frameworks and tools to limit the build-up of risks in the financial sector, building on the ongoing work of the FSB-BIS-IMF on this subject. (Cannes)

Authorities should monitor substantial changes in asset prices and their implications for the macro economy and the financial system. (Washington)

Remarks

Please describe at a high level (including by making reference to financial stability or other reports, where available) the types of methodologies, indicators and tools used to assess systemic risks.

Please indicate the use of tools for macroprudential purposes over the past year, including: the objective for their use; the process to select, calibrate and apply them; and the approaches used to assess their effectiveness.

See, for reference, the following documents:

- FSB-IMF-BIS progress report to the G20 on [Macroprudential policy tools and frameworks \(Oct 2011\)](#)
- CGFS report on [Operationalising the selection and application of macroprudential instruments \(Dec 2012\)](#)
- IMF staff papers on [Macroprudential policy, an organizing framework \(Mar 2011\)](#), [Key Aspects of Macroprudential policy \(Jun 2013\)](#), and [Staff Guidance on Macroprudential Policy \(Dec 2014\)](#)
- IMF-FSB-BIS paper on [Elements of Effective Macroprudential Policies: Lessons from International Experience \(Aug 2016\)](#)
- CGFS report on [Experiences with the ex ante appraisal of macroprudential instruments \(Jul 2016\)](#)
- CGFS report on [Objective-setting and communication of macroprudential policies \(Nov 2016\)](#)

Progress to date

- Not applicable
- Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
- Implementation ongoing
- Implementation completed as of (a) Mortgage Underwrit

If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify

- Draft in preparation, expected publication by [redacted]
- Draft published as of [redacted]
- Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on [redacted]
- Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since [redacted]

I	II	III	IV. Building and implementing macroprudential frameworks and tools	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
---	----	-----	--	---	----	-----	------	----	---

12. Enhancing system-wide monitoring and the use of macro-prudential instruments

Progress to date	
<p>Issue is being addressed through</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation / Guidelines</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions)</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>The Bank of Canada and OSFI have developed a wide variety of quantitative indicators as guides for policy, both at the institution-specific and at the macro-prudential (system-wide) level. The Bank of Canada regularly undertakes an assessment of system-wide risks and vulnerabilities, which can use the credit-to-GDP gap as a measure of economy-wide leverage. The BOC has constructed a Canadian “macroprudential indicator” (MPI) based on the aggregation of credit gap, housing price gap and equity price gap. The MPI is a binary variable where a value of one signals a potential banking crisis beginning within the next 1 to 3 years. In addition, OSFI and the Bank of Canada conduct regular Macro Stress Test (MST) exercises to assess potential vulnerabilities and implications of severe adverse scenarios on D-SIBs. The MST results inform judgments by OSFI on banks’ risk management, the supervision of regulated lenders and capital planning. The Bank of Canada’s macro-financial risk assessment framework (MFRAF) complements the OSFI-BOC MST by including the impact of liquidity risk and network effects on banks’ capital position under stress in addition to the effects of solvency risk. MFRAF was further enhanced in 2015 to capture the balance sheet contagion effects associated with fire sales and mark-to-market of securities portfolios, thus better capturing the sources of systemic risk for banks. The Bank of Canada also developed a financial stress indicator (FSI), which uses a weighted average of a number of domestic variables covering banking, foreign exchange, debt and equity markets to measure the degree of financial stress in the economy. Additionally, the Bank of Canada’s overall assessments of the key vulnerabilities and risks for the Canadian financial system are communicated twice a year in the Financial System Review (FSR). The Bank provides a rating to each risk based on the probability that the risk will materialize and on the impact on Canada’s financial system and economy if it does materialize. In June 2012 OSFI published guidelines (B-20) for residential mortgage underwriting practices and procedures. These guidelines are applicable to all federally-regulated financial institutions engaged in residential mortgage underwriting and/or the acquisition of residential mortgage loan assets in Canada. In November 2014, OSFI finalized Guideline B-21, Residential Mortgage Insurance Underwriting Practices and Procedures, which sets out OSFI’s expectations with respect to prudent residential mortgage insurance underwriting and related activities. In December 2016, OSFI announced updated capital requirements for mortgage insurers effective January 1, 2017 following public consultation earlier in the year. These measures were in addition to the release of OSFI’s final guidance on revised capital requirements for exposures secured by residential real estates, which apply to banks that have been approved to use an internal ratings based approach to determine capital requirements for credit risk. The updates will ensure that capital requirements continue to reflect underlying risks and were effective as of November 1, 2016. On December 11, 2015, the Government announced changes to the rules for government-backed mortgage insurance; effective February 15, 2016, the minimum down payment for new insured mortgages increased from 5 per cent to 10 per cent for the portion of the house price above \$500,000. This measure applies to new taxpayer-backed insured mortgages. The 5 per cent minimum down payment for properties up to \$500,000 remains unchanged. In order to avoid regulatory arbitrage on the Canadian housing market and ensure a level-playing field relative to federal institutions (subject to OSFI’s updated B-20 Guideline effective in January 2018) the AMF published in March 2018 an updated version of its Residential Hypothecary Lending Guideline. This updated version includes new</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

I II III IV. Building and implementing macroprudential frameworks and tools V VI VII VIII IX X

12. Enhancing system-wide monitoring and the use of macro-prudential instruments

Update and next steps

Update and next steps	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
<p>Highlight main developments since last year's survey</p> <p>On October 17, 2017, the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions (OSFI) published the final version of its revised Guideline B-20: Residential Mortgage Underwriting Practices and Procedures. Effective January 1, 2018; 1) all uninsured mortgages originated by federally regulated lenders must face a stricter mortgage rate stress test, the minimum qualifying rate for uninsured mortgages will now be the greater of the five-year benchmark rate published by the Bank of Canada or the contractual mortgage rate +2%; 2) lenders must adjust their loan-to-value (LTV) limits for non-conforming loans in markets with rapidly rising home prices; and 3) restrictions on co-lending arrangements that could be designed to circumvent LTV limits. The changes to the guideline reinforce OSFI's expectation that federally regulated mortgage lenders remain vigilant in their mortgage underwriting practices.</p>	<p>.</p>

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents	
	<p>http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/Eng/fi-if/rg-ro/gdn-ort/gl-ld/Pages/CAR17_chpt6.aspx http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/eng/fi-if/rg-ro/gdn-ort/gl-ld/Pages/b21_let.aspx An Index of Financial Stress for Canada, Mark Illing and Ying Liu, Bank of Canada Working Paper 2003-14, June 2003: http://www.bankofcanada.ca/2003/06/working-paper-2003-14/ Assessing Financial System Vulnerabilities: An Early Warning Approach by Gurnain Pasricha, Tom Roberts, Ian Christensen and Brad Howell, Bank of Canada Review, Autumn 2013: http://www.bankofcanada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/boc-review-autumn13-pasricha.pdf</p>

I II III IV V. Improving oversight of credit rating agencies (CRAs) VI VII VIII IX X

13. Enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs

G20/FSB Recommendations

All CRAs whose ratings are used for regulatory purposes should be subject to a regulatory oversight regime that includes registration. The regulatory oversight regime should be established by end 2009 and should be consistent with the IOSCO Code of Conduct Fundamentals. (London)

National authorities will enforce compliance and require changes to a rating agency's practices and procedures for managing conflicts of interest and assuring the transparency and quality of the rating process.

CRAs should differentiate ratings for structured products and provide full disclosure of their ratings track record and the information and assumptions that underpin the ratings process.

The oversight framework should be consistent across jurisdictions with appropriate sharing of information between national authorities, including through IOSCO. (London)

Regulators should work together towards appropriate, globally compatible solutions (to conflicting compliance obligations for CRAs) as early as possible in 2010. (FSB 2009)

We encourage further steps to enhance transparency and competition among credit rating agencies. (St Petersburg)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures undertaken for enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs including registration, oversight and sharing of information between national authorities. They should also indicate their consistency with the following IOSCO document:

- [Code of Conduct Fundamentals for Credit Rating Agencies \(Mar 2015\)](#) (including on governance, training and risk management)

Jurisdictions may also refer to the following IOSCO documents:

- Principle 22 of [Principles and Objectives of Securities Regulation \(Jun 2010\)](#) which calls for registration and oversight programs for CRAs
- [Statement of Principles Regarding the Activities of Credit Rating Agencies \(Sep 2003\)](#)
- [Final Report on Supervisory Colleges for Credit Rating Agencies \(Jul 2013\)](#)

Jurisdictions should take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those principles.

Progress to date

Not applicable
 Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
 Implementation ongoing
 Implementation completed as of January 27, 2012 (with [redacted])

If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged..." has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If "Implementation ongoing" has been selected, please specify

Draft in preparation, expected publication by [redacted]
 Draft published as of [redacted]
 Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on [redacted]
 Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since [redacted]

I II III IV V. Improving oversight of credit rating agencies (CRAs) VI VII VIII IX X

13. Enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs

Progress to date	
<p>Issue is being addressed through</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation / Guidelines</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions)</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>National Instrument 25-101 Designated Rating Organizations (NI 25-101) came into force on April 20, 2012. NI 25-101 was subsequently amended and the amendment came into force on May 5, 2015. NI 25-101 addresses concerns regarding the quality and integrity in the rating process; the independence and management of conflicts of interest; the transparency and timeliness of ratings disclosure; and the treatment of confidential information. NI 25-101 is based on provisions in the IOSCO Code of Conduct for CRAs.</p> <p>After NI 25-101 came into force on April 20, 2012, four CRAs were subsequently designated as “designated rating organizations” (DROs) in Canada under applicable securities legislation. The CRAs were required to apply for designation and provide information for regulatory review as part of the designation process. DROs are subject to an annual filing requirement.</p> <p>Staff of the OSC, the principal regulator for the DROs, developed a risk based DRO compliance review program in Spring 2013. OSC staff completed their first annual oversight reviews of the DROs during the 2013-2014 fiscal year of the OSC, and have conducted subsequent reviews annually.</p> <p>As the principal regulator of DROs, the OSC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • joined, as a participating member, the supervisory colleges that were established in 2013 for S&P, Moody’s and Fitch, • continues to be a participating member of IOSCO Committee 6 on credit rating agencies, and • continues to have regular conference calls on CRA oversight issues with staff of each of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and European Securities and Markets Authority, pursuant to bilateral memoranda of understanding. 	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

I II III IV **V. Improving oversight of credit rating agencies (CRAs)** VI VII VIII IX X

13. Enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs

Update and next steps

Highlight main developments since last year's survey

The Canadian Securities Administrators (CSA) has been pursuing the following rule and policy amendments relating to DROs:

- rule and policy amendments relating to the application by Kroll Bond Rating Agency, Inc. (Kroll) for designation as a DRO (the Kroll-related amendments), and
- amendments to NI 25-101 relating to European Union (EU) equivalency and the March 2015 revision of the IOSCO Code of Conduct for CRAs (the NI 25-101 amendments).

On July 6, 2017, the CSA published for comment proposed Kroll-related amendments and proposed NI 25-101 amendments. The comment period closed on October 4, 2017.

Kroll-related amendments

On March 29, 2018, the CSA published final Kroll-related amendments which amend National Instrument 44-101 Short Form Prospectus Distributions and National Instrument 44-102 Shelf Distributions to recognize the credit ratings of Kroll, but only for the purposes of the alternative eligibility criteria for issuers of asset-backed securities to file a short-form prospectus or shelf prospectus, respectively.

- Subject to Ministerial approval, the final Kroll-related amendments will be in effect on June 12, 2018.
- Subject to confirmation and completion of certain matters, staff expect that Kroll will be designated as a DRO for purposes of the alternative eligibility criteria when the final Kroll-related amendments come into effect.

NI 25-101 amendments

The CSA plans to publish final NI 25-101 amendments later in 2018.

- The proposed NI 25-101 amendments were meant to reflect new EU requirements for CRAs, to ensure the EU continued to recognize the Canadian regime for DROs as “equivalent” for regulatory purposes after these new requirements go into effect 

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

As noted at left, the CSA plans to publish final amendments to NI 25-101 later in 2018 that will reflect the March 2015 revision of the IOSCO Code of Conduct for CRAs.

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

Consolidated version of existing NI 25-101:
http://www.osc.gov.on.ca/documents/en/Securities-Category2/SecuritiesLaw_ni_20160928_25-101_designated-rating-organizations.pdf

Proposed amendments to NI 25-101 published for comment on July 6, 2017:
http://www.osc.gov.on.ca/documents/en/Securities-Category2/cp_20170706_25-101_designated-rating-organizations.pdf

I II III IV V. Improving oversight of credit rating agencies (CRAs) VI VII VIII IX X

14. Reducing the reliance on ratings

G20/FSB Recommendations

We also endorsed the FSB’s principles on reducing reliance on external credit ratings. Standard setters, market participants, supervisors and central banks should not rely mechanistically on external credit ratings. (Seoul)

Authorities should check that the roles that they have assigned to ratings in regulations and supervisory rules are consistent with the objectives of having investors make independent judgment of risks and perform their own due diligence, and that they do not induce uncritical reliance on credit ratings as a substitute for that independent evaluation. (Rec IV. 8, FSF 2008)

We reaffirm our commitment to reduce authorities’ and financial institutions’ reliance on external credit ratings, and call on standard setters, market participants, supervisors and central banks to implement the agreed FSB principles and end practices that rely mechanistically on these ratings. (Cannes)

We call for accelerated progress by national authorities and standard setting bodies in ending the mechanistic reliance on credit ratings and encourage steps that 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)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate the steps they are taking to address the recommendations of the [May 2014 FSB thematic peer review report on the implementation of the FSB Principles for Reducing Reliance on Credit Ratings](#), including by implementing their [agreed action plans](#). Any revised action plans should be sent to the FSB Secretariat so that it can be posted on the FSB website.

Jurisdictions may refer to the following documents:

- FSB [Principles for Reducing Reliance on CRA Ratings \(Oct 2010\)](#)
- FSB [Roadmap for Reducing Reliance on CRA Ratings \(Nov 2012\)](#)
- BCBS [Basel III: Finalising post-crisis reforms \(Dec 2017\)](#)
- IAIS [ICP guidance](#) 16.9 and 17.8.25
- IOSCO [Good Practices on Reducing Reliance on CRAs in Asset Management \(Jun 2015\)](#)
- IOSCO [Sound Practices at Large Intermediaries Relating to the Assessment of Creditworthiness and the Use of External Credit Ratings \(Dec 2015\)](#).

Progress to date

Not applicable
 Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
 Implementation ongoing
 Implementation completed as of

If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify

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

I II III IV V. Improving oversight of credit rating agencies (CRAs) VI VII VIII IX X

14. Reducing the reliance on ratings

Progress to date	
<p>Issue is being addressed through</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regulation / Guidelines</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions)</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>The Bank of Canada and the Government of Canada have completed the transition to the use of internal credit ratings in the investment of Canada’s foreign exchange reserves; mechanistic reliance on CRA ratings has been eliminated and investment policies updated accordingly. The Bank’s policy work was completed in 2016 to address mechanistic reliance on CRA ratings for its domestic collateral policy for the Standing Liquidity Facility, for which mechanistic reliance on CRA ratings has been eliminated. A revised collateral policy is planned to be published in July 2018. Provincial and territorial securities legislation: With regards to provincial and territorial supervisory actions, Canada’s action plan that was published with the May 2014 FSB thematic peer review report on the implementation of the FSB Principles on Credit Ratings noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certain references to credit ratings remain in Canada’s provincial and territorial securities legislation, as those references are viewed as serving an appropriate policy purpose. • We understand the policy rationale for eliminating mechanistic reliance on credit ratings and are monitoring approaches taken by other international securities regulators in this area. • We understand removing ratings references is one approach which may achieve this policy objective, however, the Canadian Securities Administrators (CSA) do not propose to remove all references at this time. • The credit rating references in Canada’s provincial and territorial securities legislation serve an appropriate policy purpose and do not necessarily create mechanistic reliance (or, in the alternative, do not create undue or problematic reliance). • The policy purposes of the credit rating references include providing disclosure to investors, creating eligibility criteria for market participants to engage in certain activities, such as a corporate issuer offering certain debt securities without a prospectus, and creating thresholds for defining permitted investments for market participants, such as mutual funds. • In some instances, removing these references would require an alternative proxy. The CSA notes the need for international consistency in developing alternative risk assessment capabilities and processes before proposing legislative amendments. • We are monitoring approaches taken by other international securities regulators and will consider whether those approaches could inform future proposals to maintain, modify or delete references to credit ratings in Canada’s provincial and territorial securities legislation. • Other actions: In addition to the elimination of mechanistic reliance on CRA ratings in Canada’s foreign exchange reserves, the focus is now on the Treasury Management Activities of the Government. 	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 150px; width: 100%;"></div>

14. Reducing the reliance on ratings

Update and next steps

Highlight main developments since last year's survey

Work is nearing completion (expected during the summer of 2018) to review the use of CRA ratings in the management of the Government's exposures arising from: i) the investment of cash balances, and ii) the conduct of cross-currency swaps used to fund its foreign exchange reserves. As regards to supervisory actions, the CSA continues to monitor approaches taken by other international securities regulators.

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

The CSA will continue to monitor approaches taken by other international securities regulators.

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

- <http://www.fin.gc.ca/activty/oirrep/oir-rol-14-index-eng.asp>
- <http://www.bankofcanada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Annual-Report-2013.pdf>
- <http://www.bankofcanada.ca/2013/06/fsr-june-2013/>
- Canada's action plan that was published with the May 2014 FSB thematic peer review report on the implementation of the FSB Principles on Credit Ratings:
- http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/c_140429d.pdf

I II III IV V VI. Enhancing and aligning accounting standards VII VIII IX X

15. Consistent application of high-quality accounting standards

G20/FSB Recommendations

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)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate the accounting standards that they follow and whether (and on what basis) they are of a high and internationally acceptable quality (e.g. equivalent to IFRSs as published by the IASB), and provide accurate and relevant information on financial position and performance. They should also explain the system they have for enforcement of consistent application of those standards.

Jurisdictions may want to refer to their jurisdictional profile prepared by the IFRS Foundation, which can be accessed at: <http://www.ifrs.org/Use-around-the-world/Pages/Analysis-of-the-G20-IFRS-profiles.aspx>.

As part of their response on this recommendation, jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken for appropriate application of fair value recognition, measurement and disclosure.

In addition, jurisdictions should set out any steps they intend to take (if appropriate) to foster transparent and consistent implementation of the new accounting requirements for the measurement of expected credit losses on financial assets that are being introduced by the IASB and FASB.

See, for reference, the following BCBS documents:

- [Supervisory guidance for assessing banks' financial instrument fair value practices \(Apr 2009\)](#)
- [Guidance on credit risk and accounting for expected credit losses \(Dec 2015\)](#)
- [Regulatory treatment of accounting provisions - interim approach and transitional arrangements \(March 2017\)](#)

Progress to date

Not applicable
 Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
 Implementation ongoing
 Implementation completed as of International Financial

If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify

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

I II III IV V VI. Enhancing and aligning accounting standards VII VIII IX X

15. Consistent application of high-quality accounting standards

Progress to date	
<p>Issue is being addressed through</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation / Guidelines</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions)</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>The Canadian Accounting Standards Board (AcSB) endorsed and incorporated IFRS Standards as issued by IASB into the CPA Canada Handbook — Accounting as Canadian GAAP. Publicly accountable enterprises, including financial institutions but excluding investment funds and entities with rate-regulated activities, adopted IFRS Standards for fiscal years beginning on or after January 1, 2011. Investment funds in Canada adopted IFRS Standards for fiscal years beginning on or after January 1, 2014. Entities that have activities subject to rate regulation adopted IFRS Standards for fiscal years beginning starting on or after January 1, 2015. In 2014, the CSA extended previously granted exemptive relief (originally granted in 2011) to all issuers with rate regulatory operations which permitted these issuers to use US GAAP rather than adopt IFRS. This relief was slated to expire at the end of calendar 2018. CSA have extended this relief further until 2024 such that those issuers who apply for this relief will be able to continue to use US GAAP given that an international solution to this issue is still outstanding.</p> <p>In Canada, all reporting issuers are required to comply with securities legislation. Securities legislation generally requires that domestic reporting issuers prepare financial statements in accordance with Canadian GAAP applicable to publicly accountable enterprises. SEC issuer’s financial statements may be prepared in US GAAP.</p> <p>The Canadian Accounting Standards Board (AcSB), an independent accounting standard setter, has the authority to set the standards.</p> <p>The AcSB activities include influencing the development of IFRS Standards by engaging Canadians and sharing views with the IASB on proposed changes to IFRS Standards, and as a member of the Accounting Standards Advisory Forum, a group of technical advisors to the IASB. The AcSB follows a rigorous Due Process Manual to influence and endorse new and amended IFRS Standards for application in Canada.</p> <p>The AMF and the OSC participate on IOSCO’s Committee 1 (C1), which deals with accounting, auditing and disclosure. Members of the CSA have established a national review program to review continuous disclosure (CD) filings. The program is designed to identify material disclosure deficiencies that affect the reliability and accuracy of a reporting issuer’s disclosure record (including a reporting issuer’s financial statement files, and has two fundamental objectives: education and compliance. Members of the CSA conduct coordinated reviews on both a regular and ad-hoc basis.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 150px; width: 100%;"></div>

I II III IV V VI. Enhancing and aligning accounting standards VII VIII IX X

15. Consistent application of high-quality accounting standards

Update and next steps

Highlight main developments since last year's survey

IFRS 9 Financial Instruments, as issued by the IASB in July 2014 and translated and endorsed by AcSB in February 2015, is required to be applied by publicly accountable enterprises for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2018, other than insurers that meet qualifying criteria and choose to apply a temporary exemption until fiscal 2021.

OSFI issued an Advisory in January 2015 that communicated OSFI's expectations for Domestic Systemically Important Banks (D-SIBs) to adopt IFRS 9 for their annual reporting period beginning on November 1, 2017. Therefore, some banks have adopted IFRS 9 as of that date. In addition, OSFI issued an IFRS 9 Financial Instruments and Disclosures Guideline in June 2016 that provided guidance to Federally Regulated Financial Institutions on the application of IFRS 9. To encourage a high quality, robust implementation of the expected credit loss component of the IFRS 9, OSFI's IFRS 9 Guideline incorporated BCBS' Guidance on credit risk and accounting for expected credit losses for systemically important banks in Canada. For other deposit-taking institutions, the expectations in the Guideline were tailored to the size, nature and complexity of those institutions.

IFRS 15 Revenue from Contracts with Customers, as issued by the IASB in May 2014 and translated and endorsed by AcSB in February 2015, is effective for publicly accountable enterprises for annual reporting periods beginning on or after 1 January 2018. The adoption of this standard is anticipated to have a material impact on reporting issuers in some industries (e.g., telecommunications).

IFRS 16 Leases, as issued by the IASB in January 2016 and translated and endorsed by AcSB in June 2016, is required to be applied by publicly accountable enterprises for annual reporting periods beginning on or after 1 January 2019. 

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

Canadian regulators will consider implementation of noted IFRS Standards as part of their review program.

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

- www.frascanada.ca/international-financial-reporting-standards/index.aspx
- <http://www.frascanada.ca/accounting-standards-board/what-we-do/due-process/index.aspx>
- <https://www.ifrs.org/use-around-the-world/use-of-ifrs-standards-by-jurisdiction/canada/>
- <http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/Eng/Docs/ifrs9.pdf>

16. Enhancing guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, including on liquidity and foreign currency funding risks

G20/FSB Recommendations

Regulators should develop enhanced guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, in line with international best practices, and should encourage financial firms to re-examine their internal controls and implement strengthened policies for sound risk management. (Washington)

National supervisors should closely check banks' implementation of the updated guidance on the management and supervision of liquidity as part of their regular supervision. If banks' implementation of the guidance is inadequate, supervisors will take more prescriptive action to improve practices. (Rec. II.10, FSF 2008)

Regulators and supervisors in emerging markets will enhance their supervision of banks' operation in foreign currency funding markets. (FSB 2009)

We commit to conduct robust, transparent stress tests as needed. (Pittsburgh)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate the measures taken in the following areas:

- guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, including BCBS good practice documents ([Corporate governance principles for banks](#), [External audit of banks](#), and the [Internal audit function in banks](#));
- measures to monitor and ensure banks' implementation of the BCBS [Principles for Sound Liquidity Risk Management and Supervision \(Sep 2008\)](#);
- measures to supervise banks' operations in foreign currency funding markets;¹ and
- extent to which they undertake stress tests and publish their results.

Jurisdictions should not provide any updates on the implementation of Basel III liquidity requirements (and other recent standards such as capital requirements for CCPs), since these are [monitored separately by the BCBS](#).

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

Progress to date

Not applicable
 Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
 Implementation ongoing
 Implementation completed as of January 1, 2015 (Liqui+

If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged..." has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If "Implementation ongoing" has been selected, please specify

Draft in preparation, expected publication by [redacted]
 Draft published as of [redacted]
 Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on [redacted]
 Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since [redacted]

I II III IV V VI VII. Enhancing risk management VIII IX X

16. Enhancing guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, including on liquidity and foreign currency funding risks

Progress to date	
<p>Issue is being addressed through</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation / Guidelines</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions)</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>OSFI issued the Liquidity Adequacy Requirements (LAR) Guideline in May 2014 which implements the Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR), Net Stable Funding Ratio (NSFR) and a series of liquidity risk monitoring tools (Basel suite of monitoring tools, OSFI-designed Net Cumulative Cash Flow metric, intraday liquidity monitoring tools). OSFI revised its own liquidity risk management guidance / principles (Guideline B-6) in 2012. The implementation date of the LCR in Canada was January 1, 2015. OSFI released final guidelines on stress testing for banks and insurance companies in December 2009. In June 2013, OSFI published an Advisory on Settlement Risk in Foreign Exchange Transactions, which establishes expectations with respect to the management of foreign exchange settlement risk by banks, bank holding companies and trust and loan companies. The AMF has issued two Liquidity Guidelines. The first Liquidity Risk Management Guideline was issued in April 2009. The AMF's expectations with regard to liquidity risk management are based on the core principles and guidance issued by the BCBS in September 2008. A revision is in progress with implementation expected in 2018. The second deals with liquidity standards. The AMF issued the Liquidity Adequacy Requirements Guideline in December 2014 which implements Coverage Ratio (LCR), Net Stable Funding Ratio (NSFR) and additional liquidity monitoring tools like intraday liquidity monitoring tools. This guideline also implements the OSFI-designed Net Cumulative Cash Flow metric. It was implemented January 1, 2015. Moreover, the AMF issued the Stress Testing Guideline to enhance the institutions' risk management practices. The implementation date was June 1, 2012.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

16. Enhancing guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices, including on liquidity and foreign currency funding risks

Update and next steps

Highlight main developments since last year's survey

OSFI receives a Supplemental Liquidity Monitoring return as well as other management reporting that provides data on bank funding sources, both foreign and domestic, with granularity around specific source and jurisdiction. This is supplemented through regular communication with the institutions on funding details. In October 2017, the Basel Committee completed its Regulatory Consistency Assessment Programme (RCAP) review of the implementation of the LCR standard in Canada and found the Canadian LCR rules to be fully compliant with the Basel LCR rules (see <https://www.bis.org/bcbs/publ/d421.htm>). In March 2018, OSFI announced that it will target an NSFR implementation date for Canadian deposit-taking institutions of January 2020. The AMF issued a new version of the Compliance Guideline which came into effect on April 15, 2017 to better reflect the evolution of principles of sound and prudent management and guidance emanating from international bodies in connection with compliance, as well as the evolution of practices adopted by financial institutions. The amendments also took account of the needs and findings of the AMF's supervisory teams and were consistent with the recent updates of the Governance and the Integrated Risk Management Guidelines. A one-year transition period has been set to enable financial institutions to adjust to the new expectations. The AMF therefore expects financial institutions to make the necessary adjustments by April 15, 2018.

On December 1, 2016, the AMF released its Operational Risk Management Guideline in response to growing concerns of international bodies and in the spirit of adhering to the principles guiding on the matter. The AMF expects financial institutions to adopt the expectations in this guideline and implement them by December 1, 2017.

The implementation of the Operational Risk Management Guideline aims to promote the strengthening of the culture of risk since the management of the operational risk requires primarily the commitment of the Board of Directors, the Senior +

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

OSFI expects to commence public consultation by end-2018 on a revised Chapter 3 (NSFR) of the LAR Guideline in advance of the January 2020 implementation date of the NSFR.

A revision of the AMF's Liquidity Risk Management Guideline is in progress. Implementation is expected for 2018.

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

- LAR Guideline: <http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/Eng/wn-qn/Pages/LAR.aspx>
 - Guideline B-6: Liquidity Principles: <http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/Eng/fi-if/rg-ro/gdn-ort/gl-ld/Pages/b6.aspx>
 - Guideline E-18: Stress Testing - <http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/Eng/fi-if/rg-ro/gdn-ort/gl-ld/Pages/e18.aspx>
 - Advisory - Settlement Risk in Foreign Exchange Transactions: http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/eng/fi-if/rg-ro/gdn-ort/adv-prv/Pages/FXSR_let.aspx
 - AMF Governance Guideline: http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/lignes-directrices-toutes-institutions/mod_ld_gouv_pf_2016-09_an.pdf
 - AMF Liquidity Risk Management Guideline: <http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/lignes-directrices-toutes-institutions/2009mai26-ld-liquidite-en.pdf>
- +

17. Enhanced risk disclosures by financial institutions

G20/FSB Recommendations

Financial institutions should provide enhanced risk disclosures in their reporting and disclose all losses on an ongoing basis, consistent with international best practice, as appropriate. (Washington)

We encourage further efforts by the public and private sector to enhance financial institutions' disclosures of the risks they face, including the ongoing work of the Enhanced Disclosure Task Force. (St. Petersburg)

Remarks

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.

In addition, in light of the new IASB and FASB accounting requirements for expected credit loss recognition, jurisdictions should set out any steps they intend to take (if appropriate) to foster disclosures needed to fairly depict a bank's exposure to credit risk, including its expected credit loss estimates, and to provide relevant information on a bank's underwriting practices. Jurisdictions may use as reference the recommendations in the report by the Enhanced Disclosure Task Force on the [Impact of Expected Credit Loss Approaches on Bank Risk Disclosures \(Nov 2015\)](#), as well as the recommendations in Principle 8 of the BCBS [Guidance on credit risk and accounting for expected credit losses \(Dec 2015\)](#).

In their responses, jurisdictions should not provide information on the implementation of Basel III Pillar 3 requirements, since this is [monitored separately](#) by the BCBS.

Progress to date

Not applicable
 Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
 Implementation ongoing
 Implementation completed as of

If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged..." has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If "Implementation ongoing" has been selected, please specify

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

17. Enhanced risk disclosures by financial institutions

Progress to date	
<p>Issue is being addressed through</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Primary / Secondary legislation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulation / Guidelines</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions)</p> <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>OSFI requires federally regulated financial institutions to use Canadian generally accepted accounting principles, which is the adoption of IFRS. OSFI sets expectations for Canadian banks on the implementation of the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision’s disclosure requirements, which supplement the financial instruments disclosures of IFRS 7 and IFRS 13. OSFI has also outlined, among other requirements, more stringent public disclosure obligations that explicitly referenced the recommendations of the EDTF. The D-SIB framework notes that Canadian D-SIBs are expected to have public information disclosure practices that are among the best of their international peers. In July 2013, OSFI issued a letter to the Canadian D-SIBs sharing the results of the July 2013 EDTF roundtable discussions and reminding the D-SIBs of OSFI’s expectation for their full compliance by year end 2014. To encourage a high quality, robust implementation of the expected credit loss component of the IFRS 9, OSFI’s IFRS 9 Guideline incorporated BCBS’ Guidance on credit risk and accounting for expected credit losses for systemically important banks in Canada, in which Principle 8 focuses on disclosures under the Expected Credit Loss (ECL) framework. Additionally, please refer to Item 7 for details on the designation of Desjardins and Central 1 as D-SIFIs. In the 2015 EDTF Progress Report, Canada was reported as having implemented all of the EDTF recommendations. The Supervisory Framework adopted by the AMF in 2009 and revised in November 2014 includes the interactivity principle which requires financial institutions to report, in a timely manner, all new initiatives or developments that could impact their Risk Profile. Likewise, the Integrated Risk Management Guideline (2015) pinpoints the necessity for financial institutions to implement standardized processes and reliable information systems that allow them to identify connections between risks and to obtain reports that contain relevant, clear and adapted information in a timely manner so that senior management and the board of directors can monitor the achievement of the institution’s strategic objectives. From this perspective, as outlined in the Integrated Risk Management Guideline, the Risk Data Aggregation and Risk Disclosure Guideline (2016) - applicable only to federations of credit unions - stresses the importance for the AMF and the various market participants to be able to access integrated reports on the major risks to which institutions are exposed, especially those for which any threat to their viability could provoke a systemic crisis. Similarly, in its Governance Guideline (2016), the AMF expects that the disclosure of official information such as the organization’s financial situation, performance and structure should be taken into account. In addition, any event or other material information which could affect one or more stakeholders should also be disclosed promptly within regulatory timeframes, as applicable. As a general rule, the disclosure of information should be sufficiently complete and detailed to enable stakeholders to form a clear opinion on the institution’s performance in terms of its ability to exercise good governance. The AMF also expects the Desjardins Group to implement the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision’s disclosure requirements adapted for the cooperative model of Desjardins as stated in the Chapter 11 of Capital Adequacy Guideline (2017). Finally, the AMF therefore considers it essential to establish guidance as to the governance and infrastructure required for the optimization of processes, as well as ad hoc guidance on risk data aggregation capabilities and practices for disclosing these risks.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

17. Enhanced risk disclosures by financial institutions

Update and next steps	
<p>Highlight main developments since last year's survey</p> <p>An expectation of transparency with all stakeholders was added to the new version of the AMF's Governance Guideline (2016). The same expectation about disclosure is also specified in the Operational Risk Management Guideline (2016). In June 2016, OSFI issued the IFRS 9 Financial Instruments and Disclosures Guideline, which includes a principle outlining OSFI's expectations on the public disclosures on the accounting for expected credit losses.</p>	<p>Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date</p>

Relevant web-links	
<p>Web-links to relevant documents</p>	<p>IFRS 9 Financial Instruments and Disclosures Guideline: http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/Eng/Docs/ifrs9.pdf AMF Integrated Risk Management Guideline: http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/lignes-directrices-toutes-institutions/g_risk_management_final.pdf AMF Risk Data Aggregation and Risk Disclosure Guideline: http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/lignes-directrices-assurance/LD_ADRDR_PF_02-2016_eng.pdf AMF Risk Operational Guideline: http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/lignes-directrices-assurance/ld_gro_pf_2016-12_an.pdf http://www.ifrs.org/Pages/default.aspx</p>

18. Strengthening of national deposit insurance arrangements

G20/FSB Recommendations

National deposit insurance arrangements should be reviewed against the agreed international principles, and authorities should strengthen arrangements where needed. (Rec. VI.9, FSF 2008)

Remarks

Jurisdictions that have not yet adopted an explicit national deposit insurance system should describe their plans to introduce such a system.

All other jurisdictions should describe any significant design changes in their national deposit insurance system since the issuance of the revised IADI [Core Principles for Effective Deposit Insurance Systems](#) (November 2014).

In addition, jurisdictions should indicate if they have carried out a self-assessment of compliance (based on IADI’s 2016 [Handbook](#)) with the revised Core Principles:

- If so, jurisdictions should highlight the main gaps identified and the steps proposed to address these gaps;
- If not, jurisdictions should indicate any plans to undertake a self-assessment exercise.

Progress to date

Not applicable
 Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
 Implementation ongoing
 Implementation completed as of 2016. Most measures

If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify

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

18. Strengthening of national deposit insurance arrangements

Progress to date	
<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) <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>Most measures were in place under the CDIC Act prior to the 2008 financial crisis, with additional measures implemented after the crisis to further strengthen the deposit insurance regime. The main legislation (the CDIC Act) and regulations/guidelines that provide CDIC with powers to comply with the revised IADI Core Principles for Effective Deposit Insurance Systems (November 2014) are found in the following link: http://www.cdic.ca/en/financial-community/legislation-bylaws/Pages/default.aspx. In order to hasten its pay-out process and to facilitate the establishment of resolution tools, AMF (Québec) implemented data requirements for registered deposit institutions under the Deposit Insurance Act. The amendments to the bylaws were completed on June 2015. As announced in the 2016-2017 Québec Budget, the Government of Québec has reviewed all the legislation governing the financial sector with a view to create an integrated, coherent framework dedicated to promoting the interests of Quebecers.</p> <p>Bill n°141: An Act mainly to improve the regulation of the financial sector, the protection of deposits of money and the operation of financial institutions was introduced on October 5, 2017, in the National Assembly of Québec. Its adoption is already under consideration during the parliamentary session which began during the week of January 16, 2018 and will continue until mid-June 2018.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 100%; width: 100%;"></div>

18. Strengthening of national deposit insurance arrangements

Update and next steps

Highlight main developments since last year's survey

In 2017, the CDIC Board amended the CDIC Deposit Insurance Information By-law to update the manner in which member institutions need to inform depositors about deposit insurance coverage. CDIC member institutions would have one year until September 30th 2018 to implement the new measures. These measures were taken in order to help ensure the provision of clear, simple and not misleading information to depositors, and help ensure all depositors receive useful information on deposit insurance at the appropriate time, and irrespective of the distribution channels. A detailed information bulletin complemented the amended by-law to provide CDIC members with practical guidance to help them comply with the amended by-law. Following the comprehensive review of the federal deposit insurance framework led by the Department of Finance, the federal Budget Implementation Act 2018 would introduce legislative amendments to the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act to modernize and enhance the Canadian deposit insurance framework to ensure it continues to meet its objectives. These changes would modernize the scope of deposit insurance coverage to better reflect products currently offered in the market, including the coverage of foreign currency deposits, and address the complexity of trust deposits. The current legal framework in Québec is presently an updating process in order to be tailor-made to take into account all resolution features aligned with the mandate of resolution authority. The AMF is actively participating in this legislative reform process. The AMF anticipates stronger resolution powers to be introduced in its legislation by the national assembly. Indeed, Bill n°141, if adopted, will give more powers to the AMF in terms of supervision, regulation and resolution of a D-SIFI, notably by integrating a bail-in framework. The AMF has formalized exchanges with some of its safety-net players, namely Bank of Canada and CDIC (as described under section III, Recommendation 9). In addition, on April 23, 2018, the AMF announced the signing of a MoU with the CDIC for co-operation and information exchange with respect to deposit insurance and resolution of certain D-SIFIs. The MoU formalizes the information exchange process between the AMF and CDIC and opens up new possibilities for both agencies with respect to business continuity and crisis management. It will enable them to strengthen their overall collaboration and the

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

Since April 2016, the AMF has been conducting a self-assessment against the revised 2014 IADI Core Principles. The self-assessment is currently being graded. Any gaps will be addressed with their respective action plans.

Since June 2017, the AMF has been working on resolution scenario involving bail-in for a cooperative group as Desjardins Group, the Québec's D-SIFI. The works surrounding the bail-in are ongoing.

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

Research paper entitled "Resolution Issues for Financial Cooperatives-Overview of Distinctive Features and Current Resolution Tools available at: <http://www.iadi.org/en/core-principles-and-research/papers/>

Bill n°141 : An Act mainly to improve the regulation of the financial sector, the protection of deposits of money and the operation of financial institutions available at: <http://www.assnat.qc.ca/en/travaux-parlementaires/projets-loi/projet-loi-141-41-1.html>

19. Enhancing market integrity and efficiency

G20/FSB Recommendations

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)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate whether high frequency trading and dark pools exist in their national markets.

Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing the recommendations:

- in relation to dark liquidity, as set out in the IOSCO [Report on Principles for Dark Liquidity \(May 2011\)](#).
- on the impact of technological change in the IOSCO [Report on Regulatory Issues Raised by the Impact of Technological Changes on Market Integrity and Efficiency \(Oct 2011\)](#).
- on market structure made in the IOSCO Report on [Regulatory issues raised by changes in market structure \(Dec 2013\)](#).

Progress to date
<p> <input type="radio"/> Not applicable <input type="radio"/> Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment <input type="radio"/> Implementation ongoing <input checked="" type="radio"/> Implementation completed as of <input type="text" value="2012"/> </p> <p>If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification</p> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 300px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Draft in preparation, expected publication by <input type="text"/> <input type="radio"/> Draft published as of <input type="text"/> <input type="radio"/> Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on <input type="text"/> <input type="radio"/> Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since <input type="text"/> </p>

19. Enhancing market integrity and efficiency

Progress to date

Issue is being addressed through

- Primary / Secondary legislation
- Regulation / Guidelines
- Other actions (such as supervisory actions)

Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions

The AMF and the OSC have representatives on IOSCO’s Committee 2, which prepared reports on regulatory issues raised by changes in market structure by the impact of information technology (IT) on market integrity and efficiency, and IT challenges to effective market surveillance issues. With the structure of the market surveillance activities, the functions performed by either the IIROC (equity), the Bourse de Montréal (Bourse) (financial derivatives) and ICE Futures Canada (ICE) -(commodity derivatives), and of the current initiatives, Canada complies with the majority of the recommendations and is well-positioned to comply with the remaining ones soon. The legislation and rules in place ensure the effectiveness of the market surveillance by market authorities. Customer identification is currently missing on the information provided electronically to the CSA but can be obtained on an upon request basis.

A project led by IIROC is underway to add an account identifier on all orders entered on a marketplace. The CSA , the Bourse and the broker community are consulted and involved in the project to ensure that the common objective can be achieved, with minimum impact on the broker community. There is no automated cross-asset surveillance but front-line surveillances activities are clearly defined between IIROC, the Bourse and ICE. IIROC and the Bourse share information under a MoU with respect to market surveillance. Data information is encrypted and access controls to the surveillance tools are in place.

Under National Instrument 21-101, synchronization of clocks is required by the marketplaces, by the dealers trading on marketplaces and by the information processor which receives data. The regulators are relying on the IOSCO multilateral MoU for cross-border enforcement activities. IIROC and the exchanges are relying on the Inter-market Surveillance Group agreement for cross-border enforcement. In addition, regulators have MoUs in place with the SEC, CFTC, UK FCA and ASIC and others are being developed.

Dark Liquidity: The framework with respect to dark liquidity for equity trading was revised in 2012 and has been implemented through amendments NI 21-101 and to the Universal Market Integrity Rules (UMIR) administered by IIROC. The framework continues to allow dark liquidity trading, but manages its impact on price discovery, fairness and market efficiency:

- Dark orders can execute at the national best bid or best offer in circumstances where the contra-side was entered at a size level that exceeds a threshold, and meaningful price improvement is required otherwise;
- On a marketplace, visible orders must be executed before dark orders at the same price;
- Meaningful price improvement is defined in UMIR (usually one trading increment or one cent).

If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide **reasons for delayed implementation**



19. Enhancing market integrity and efficiency

Update and next steps

Update and next steps	Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
<p>Highlight main developments since last year’s survey</p> <p>The CSA final amendments to the OPR, including the May 2014 and June 2015 proposals, was published on April 7, 2016 and went into effect on July 6, 2016 or October 1, 2016. The final version made minor adjustments to the original consultations. No pilot study prohibiting the payment of rebates by marketplaces under the maker-taker fee model will be made at this time. On April 7, 2016, the CSA also published a notice requesting comment on a revised active trading fee cap applicable only to securities priced at or above \$1.00 that are listed on a Canadian exchange, but not also listed on a U.S. exchange (Non-Inter-listed Securities). The proposed cap on Non-Inter-listed Securities priced at or above \$1.00 would be \$0.0017 per share. The CSA has approved these amendments in January 2017. These amendments came into force on April 10, 2017. On March 16, 2018, the CSA issued Staff Notice 23-322 stating that the CSA had been engaged in dialogue with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) on this issue and that we would continue to do so in the context of the publication of a Transaction Fee Pilot to study the impacts of transaction fees and rebates on order routing behaviour, execution quality and market quality. As such, we stated that we would continue our discussions with SEC staff about coordinating the potential pilot studies, where appropriate. Any proposal to introduce a pilot study for Canadian marketplaces would be published in a separate notice for comment. However, in the interim, we stated that we welcomed any input or comments on a potential Canadian pilot study.</p> <p>In February 2017, the CSA issued a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) to procure and implement a Canadian capital marketplace data repository and analytics system - referred to as the “Market Analysis Platform” or “MAP” - that will improve insight into Canadian capital markets and market structure. The purpose of the MAP will be to efficiently identify and analyse Canadian capital market misconduct. Generally, it is expected that the MAP will (a) have the capability to conduct broad market analysis through the use of several types of data from many different sources; (b) provide functionality to assess, investigate and explain</p>	<p>[Empty cell for planned actions and commencement date]</p>

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents	
	<p>http://www.iosco.org/library/pubdocs/pdf/IOSCOPD353.pdf http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/en/press-releases-2012-conso.html_2012_csa-and-iroc-announce-the-implementation-of-a-dark-liquidity-framework-in-canada13-04-2012-12-0.htm http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/valeurs-mobilieres/21-101/2012-12-31/2012dec31-21-101-vofficielle-en.pdf http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/valeurs-mobilieres/21-101/2014-04-24/2014avril24-21-101-avis-cons-en.pdf http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/valeurs-mobilieres/21-101/2014-04-24/2014avril24-21-101-cons-en.pdf http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/valeurs-mobilieres/21-101/2014-04-24/2014avril24-21-101-ig-cons-en.pdf http://docs.iroc.ca/DisplayDocument.aspx?</p>

20. Regulation and supervision of commodity markets

G20/FSB Recommendations

We need to ensure enhanced market transparency, both on cash and financial commodity markets, including OTC, and achieve appropriate regulation and supervision of participants in these markets. Market regulators and authorities should be granted effective intervention powers to address disorderly markets and prevent market abuses. In particular, market regulators should have, and use formal position management powers, including the power to set ex-ante position limits, particularly in the delivery month where appropriate, among other powers of intervention. We call on IOSCO to report on the implementation of its recommendations by the end of 2012. (Cannes)

We also call on Finance ministers to monitor on a regular basis the proper implementation of IOSCO's principles for the regulation and supervision on commodity derivatives markets and encourage broader publishing and unrestricted access to aggregated open interest data. (St. Petersburg)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should indicate whether commodity markets of any type exist in their national markets.

Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures taken to implement the principles found in IOSCO's report on [Principles for the Regulation and Supervision of Commodity Derivatives Markets \(Sep 2011\)](#).

Jurisdictions, in responding to this recommendation, may also make use of the responses contained in the [update to the survey](#) published by IOSCO in September 2014 on the principles for the regulation and supervision of commodity derivatives markets.

Progress to date
<p> <input type="radio"/> Not applicable <input type="radio"/> Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment <input type="radio"/> Implementation ongoing <input checked="" type="radio"/> Implementation completed as of April 4, 2017 </p> <p>If "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged..." has been selected, please provide a brief justification</p> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 200px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>If "Implementation ongoing" has been selected, please specify</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Draft in preparation, expected publication by [redacted] <input type="radio"/> Draft published as of [redacted] <input type="radio"/> Final rule or legislation approved and will come into force on [redacted] <input type="radio"/> Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since [redacted] </p>

20. Regulation and supervision of commodity markets

Progress to date	
<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) <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>Market oversight powers for listed derivatives markets are set out in derivatives legislation. These broad oversight powers include intervention powers and the power to compel rule adoption by regulated entities. In 2014, Ontario, Québec and Manitoba enacted rules to govern the reporting of derivatives transactions. In 2016, the securities regulators in Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia implemented a trade reporting regime that is substantively harmonized with regimes in effect in Manitoba, Ontario, Québec and internationally. It became effective on May 1, 2016. Alberta Securities Commission, Québec AMF, and Ontario Securities Commission participate in IOSCO’s C7. Canadian authorities are collaborating to ensure that the IOSCO report on the Principles for the Regulation and Supervision of Commodity Derivatives Markets (Sep 2011) is being respected. This is being done by the ongoing work on respecting Canada’s commitment to the G20 reforms. In addition, OSFI published its final version of Guideline B-7 Derivatives Best Practices in January 2015, which outlines expectations for federally-regulated financial institutions (FRFIs) with respect to derivatives activities. The Guideline reflects the OTC derivatives market reforms initiated by G-20 leaders and communicates OSFI’s expectations for central clearing of standardized OTC derivatives and reporting derivatives data to a trade repository. OSFI also published its final version of Guideline E-22 Margin requirements for non-centrally cleared derivatives that came into effect in September 2016, which advocates the exchange of margin to secure performance on non-centrally cleared derivatives transactions between covered entities. The provisions of the guideline are consistent with international requirements and apply to all FRFIs. The CSA published Regulation 94-101 respecting Mandatory Central Counterparty Clearing of Derivatives in its final version on January 19, 2017 and it came into force on April 4, 2017.</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

20. Regulation and supervision of commodity markets

Update and next steps

Highlight main developments since last year's survey

Rules for OTC derivatives are being developed and implemented. Regulation 94-101 respecting Mandatory Central Counterparty Clearing of Derivatives was published in its final version on January 19, 2017 and it came into force on April 4, 2017. Regulation 94-102 respecting Derivatives: on Customer Clearing and Protection of Customer Collateral and Positions was published in its final form on January 19, 2017 and it came into effect on July 3, 2017. The CSA published for comment Regulation 93-101 respecting Derivatives: Business Conduct on April 4, 2017. It is not yet in effect. The CSA published for comment Regulation 93-102 respecting Derivatives: Registration on April 19, 2018.

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

The AMF is planning to update its Derivatives Risk Management Guideline and to develop a new guideline on margin requirements for non-centrally cleared derivatives in order to implement the principles put forward by IOSCO.

The CSA is developing a regulation on margin requirements for non-centrally cleared derivatives to be published for comment in 2018.

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

Regulation 91-507 respecting Trade Repositories and Derivatives Data Reporting (chapter I-14.01, r. 1.1):
<http://legisQuebec.gouv.qc.ca/en/ShowDoc/cr/I-14.01,%20r.%201.1>
 Regulation 94-101 respecting Mandatory Central Counterparty Clearing of Derivatives:
<http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/instruments-derives/reglements/94-101/2017-01-19/2017janv19-94-101-final-acvm-en.pdf>
 Regulation 94-102 respecting Derivatives: Customer Clearing and Protection of Customer Collateral and Positions and concordant regulations:
<http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/instruments-derives/reglements/94-102/2017-01-19/2017janv19-94-102-final-acvm-en.pdf>



21. Reform of financial benchmarks

G20/FSB Recommendations

We support the establishment of the FSB's Official Sector Steering Group to coordinate work on the necessary reforms of financial benchmarks. We endorse IOSCO's Principles for Financial Benchmarks and look forward to reform as necessary of the benchmarks used internationally in the banking industry and financial markets, consistent with the IOSCO Principles. (St. Petersburg)

Collection of information on this recommendation will continue to be deferred given the forthcoming FSB progress report on implementation of FSB recommendations in this area, and ongoing IOSCO work to review the implementation of the IOSCO Principles for Financial Benchmarks.

22. Enhancing financial consumer protection

G20/FSB Recommendations

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)

Remarks

Jurisdictions should describe progress toward implementation of the OECD’s [G-20 high-level principles on financial consumer protection \(Oct 2011\)](#).

Jurisdictions may also refer to OECD’s [September 2013 and September 2014 reports](#) on effective approaches to support the implementation of the High-level Principles. 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.

Progress to date

- Not applicable
- Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment
- Implementation ongoing
- Implementation completed as of

If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification

If “Implementation ongoing” has been selected, please specify

- 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

22. Enhancing financial consumer protection

Progress to date	
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other actions (such as supervisory actions) <p>Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions</p> <p>The current federal financial consumer protection framework is set out in the Bank Act, regulations, voluntary codes, sector commitments, and Commissioner’s guidance by the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada (FCAC). This framework applies to financial products and services provided by banks, and extends to non-bank federally regulated financial institutions, such as insurance companies and trust and loan companies, where applicable. In addition, there are voluntary industry codes and sector commitments. The FCAC administers the consumer provisions according to the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada Act. The FCAC also provides guidance and monitors compliance with the codes and commitments.</p> <p>AMF (Québec): The AMF has jurisdiction over all financial institutions holding a licence issued by the AMF to operate in Québec as such the following activities pertain to those regulated financial institutions and other entities. The AMF must ensure that financial institutions and other regulated entities of the financial sector comply with the applicable solvency standards as well as the obligations imposed by law to protect the interests of consumers of financial products and services and take any measures provided by law for those purposes. The Act respecting insurance, financial services cooperatives and trust companies and savings companies establishes financial institutions obligations to adhere to sound commercial practices. These practices include providing equitable resolution of complaints, properly informing persons being offered a product or service and acting fairly in dealings with them. A director or officer of a financial institution shall exercise the care, prudence, diligence and skill that a reasonable person would exercise in similar circumstances. Additionally, the Distribution Act requires intermediaries to act with due skill, care and diligence when dealing with customers. The AMF issued the Commercial Practices Guideline on 13 June 2013 to set out its supervisory expectations regarding fair treatment of consumers. Financial institutions that fail to comply with this guideline are deemed to have failed to adhere to sound commercial practices. The guideline focuses on protecting consumers against risks throughout the product life cycle (outcomes based). This guideline is fully harmonised with the G-20 high-level principles on financial consumer protection and recognized as such by the IMF (FSAP 2013). The guideline promotes cross-sectorial consistency. Aligned with the AMF’s approach to reduce prudential risk, the AMF’s supervision programme has started to assess the extent to which financial institutions are achieving the expected results set forth in the guideline. The AMF plays also a major role in financial literacy in Québec and conducts surveys of industry players and consumers to better meet their needs. The AMF has developed an Index of Financial Awareness in Québec that measures the relevance and usefulness of knowledgeable behaviour as well as the adoption of such behaviour. The AMF also manages the Education and Good Governance Fund, which supports consumer education and protection, promotes good governance, and improving the knowledge level of intermediaries (e.g., scholarships and excellence awards). In order to provide better protection and provide the necessary assistance to seniors who are victims of abuse, the Government of Québec, in partnership with four government agencies, including AMF, announced on January 7, 2018 that it ratified the “National Master Agreement on elder abuse” (“Entente-cadre nationale pour lutter contre la maltraitance envers les personnes âgées”) and its implementation. The agreement aims to provide better</p>	<p>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation</p>

22. Enhancing financial consumer protection

Update and next steps

Highlight main developments since last year's survey

FCAC is in the process of implementing a new Supervision Framework (Framework) in 2018-2019. The new Framework clarifies FCAC's expectations of regulated entities and describes the principles and processes FCAC will apply to supervise regulated entities and ensure that financial consumers continue to benefit from the applicable protections. The Framework identifies the three key pillars of supervision: promoting, monitoring and enforcing compliance. Once implemented, it will serve as the Agency's blueprint for proactive, agile, predictable and risk-based supervision. To bolster the rigour and independence of the Agency's investigative function, an Enforcement Division was also added to the Supervision and Promotion branch. This additional team will increase FCAC's ability to quickly and effectively respond to breaches. The new team will be responsible for all investigations and enforcement actions under the new Framework.

In January 2017, the Minister of Finance tasked FCAC with engaging provincial and territorial regulators and other key stakeholders in identifying best practices that could strengthen the federal financial consumer protection framework. This work supported the government's commitment to modernize the federal financial consumer protection framework in the Bank Act and its objective that the federal framework provides the highest overall level of protection for Canadians across the country. FCAC tabled its findings to the Minister in May 2017.

FCAC regularly conducts industry reviews to assess current or emerging issues on a specific topic or theme and to verify levels of compliance with market conduct obligations. The Agency's recent review, which was its most comprehensive to date, focused on the sales practices of Canada's six largest banks. FCAC released its report – Domestic Bank Retail Sales Practices Review – in March 2018. FCAC's review found that the retail banking culture's sharp focus on sales can increase the risk of mis-selling and breaching market conduct obligations. While FCAC did not find widespread mis-selling during its review, the

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

Canada's financial consumer protection framework is aligned with the high-level principles on financial consumer protection as they apply to our specific domestic circumstances. Canada continues to be a key contributor to further work undertaken by the OECD Task Force on Financial Consumer Protection. In Budget 2018, the federal government proposed to introduce legislation that would strengthen the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada's tools and mandate and continue to advance consumers' rights and interests when dealing with their banks. The Government proposes to conduct targeted consultations with stakeholders, including provinces and territories.

AMF - Planned Actions: Considering that rising interest rates, declining economies, declining incomes or unforeseen financial needs may pose significant challenges for many consumers, the AMF is working to clarify its expectations regarding the fair treatment of consumers with respect to credit to individuals. The aim of the AMF is to ensure that informed and confident consumers are an intrinsic value of responsible lending practices and the fair treatment of consumers. Also, in regards to a

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

AMF Sound Commercial Practices Guideline: http://www.lautorite.qc.ca/files/pdf/reglementation/lignes-directrices-assurance/g_scp_2013.pdf
 CCIR Framework for Cooperative Market Conduct Supervision in Canada: <https://www.ccir-ccrra.org/en/about/Framework%20for%20Cooperative%20Market%20Conduct%20Supervision.pdf>
<https://lautorite.qc.ca/en/general-public/fraud-prevention/preventing-elder-financial-abuse/>

I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	List of abbreviations used
---	----	-----	----	---	----	-----	------	----	---	----------------------------

- AcSB: Canadian Accounting Standards Board
- AMF: Autorité des Marchés Financiers
- ASC: Alberta Securities Commission
- ASIC: Australian Securities and Investment Commission
- AVC: Asset Value Correlation
- BCSC: British Columbia Securities Commission
- BoC: Bank of Canada
- CASB: Canadian Accounting Standards Board
- CCIR: Canadian Council of Insurance Regulators
- CD: Continuous Disclosure
- CDCC: Canadian Derivatives Clearing Corporation
- CIDC: Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation
- CHMC: Canada House and Mortgage Corporation
- CSA: Canadian Securities Administrators
- D-SIB: Domestic Systematically Important Bank
- D-SIFI: Domestic Systematically Important Financial Institution
- DRO: Designated Rating Organization
- EDTF: Enhanced Disclosure Task Force
- ETF: Exchange Traded Funds
- FASB: Financial Accounting Standards Board
- FCAC: Financial Consumer Agency of Canada
- FI: Financial Institution
- FICOM: Financial Institutions Commission of British Columbia
- FINTRAC: Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada
- FIC: Financial Institution Committee
- FISC: Financial Institutions Supervisory Committee
- FRFI: Federally Regulated Financial Institution
- FSAP: Financial Sector Assessment Program
- FSI: Financial Stress Indicator
- FSR: Financial System Review
- G-SII: Global Systematically Important Insurer
- HoA: Heads of Agency
- IADI: International Association of Deposit Insurers
- IASB: International Accounting Standards Board
- ICAAP: Internal Capital Adequacy Process



Sources of recommendations

- [Hamburg: G20 Leaders' Communique \(7-8 July 2017\)](#)
- [Hangzhou: G20 Leaders' Communique \(4-5 September 2016\)](#)
- [Antalya: G20 Leaders' Communique \(15-16 November 2015\)](#)
- [Brisbane: G20 Leaders' Communique \(15-16 November 2014\)](#)
- [St Petersburg: The G20 Leaders' Declaration \(5-6 September 2013\)](#)
- [Los Cabos: The G20 Leaders' Declaration \(18-19 June 2012\)](#)
- [Cannes: The Cannes Summit Final Declaration \(3-4 November 2011\)](#)
- [Seoul: The Seoul Summit Document \(11-12 November 2010\)](#)
- [Toronto: The G-20 Toronto Summit Declaration \(26-27 June 2010\)](#)
- [Pittsburgh: Leaders' Statement at the Pittsburgh Summit \(25 September 2009\)](#)
- [London: The London Summit Declaration on Strengthening the Financial System \(2 April 2009\)](#)
- [Washington: The Washington Summit Action Plan to Implement Principles for Reform \(15 November 2008\)](#)
- [FSF 2008: The FSF Report on Enhancing Market and Institutional Resilience \(7 April 2008\)](#)
- [FSF 2009: The FSF Report on Addressing Procyclicality in the Financial System \(2 April 2009\)](#)
- [FSB 2009: The FSB Report on Improving Financial Regulation \(25 September 2009\)](#)
- [FSB 2012: The FSB Report on Increasing the Intensity and Effectiveness of SIFI Supervision \(1 November 2012\)](#)