

2021 IMN Survey of National/Regional Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations

Jurisdiction
France

I1: Hedge funds - 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 not be collected in the 2021 survey.

I2: Hedge funds - 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:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification
Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
22.07.2013
Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes
Regulation / Guidelines - No
Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - No
Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions
. cf European Commission's reply. The French Market Authority (AMF) took part in the 5th edition of the IOSCO's Hedge Funds survey (as well as in the four previous editions). This bi-annual survey provides an insight into the Hedge Funds industry in the jurisdiction participating, notably regarding the size of the asset under management or trends including with respect to investment strategies implemented or the use of leverage in the jurisdictions which take part in the survey. The AMF is signatory to the IOSCO MMoU in relation to cooperation in enforcement.
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation
Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
Cf European Commission's reply

Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents

<https://www.esma.europa.eu/convergence/international-cooperation>

I3: Hedge funds - 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)

Implementation of this recommendation was reported to be completed by all FSB jurisdictions in the 2018 IMN survey. Given this, the reporting of progress with respect to this recommendation will not be collected in the 2021 survey.

II4: Securitisation - 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 not be collected in the 2021 survey.

II5: Securitisation -Strengthening supervisory, 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:

Implementation completed

Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification

Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
1.2016
Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes Regulation / Guidelines - Yes Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - No
Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions
Cf European Commission's reply
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation
Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
For insurance sector: http://ec.europa.eu/finance/insurance/solvency/solvency2/index_en.htm AIFM Directive implementing regulation: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investment/docs/20121219-directive/delegated-act_en.pdf IOSCO Final report on the Regulation of Retail Structured Products: http://www.iosco.org/library/pubdocs/pdf ESMA's Opinion "Structured Retail Products - Good practices for product governance arrangements" (27/03/14): https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/files/library/2015/11/2014-332_esma_opinion_u_structured_retail_products_-_good_practices_for_product_governance_arrangements.pdf CRR: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1401901268658&uri=CELEX:32013R0575 AMF Position n° 2010-05 on the marketing of complex financial instruments: http://www.amf-france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doctrine-list/Doctrine.html?category=IV+-+Commercialisation+-+Relation+client&docId=workspace%3A%2F%2FSpacesStore%2F8f1c7f9a-90bc-4afa-94cf-4b5db749a747

II6: Securitisation - 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:
Implementation completed

Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification
Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
20.06.2013
Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes
Regulation / Guidelines - No
Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - No
Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions
cf European Commission's reply
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation
Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
cf European Commission's reply
Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/3 Securitisation Regulation proposal

III7: Enhancing supervision - 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-SIBs, since these are [monitored separately](#) by the BCBS.

See, for reference, the following documents:

BCBS

- [Framework for G-SIBs \(Jul 2018\)](#)
- [Framework for D-SIBs \(Oct 2012\)](#)

IAIS

- [Holistic Framework for the Assessment and Mitigation of Systemic Risk in the Insurance Sector \(Nov 2019\)](#)
- [Application Paper on Liquidity Risk Management \(Jun 2020\)](#)
- [Draft Application Paper on Macroprudential Supervision \(Mar 2021\)](#)

FSB

- [Evaluation of the effects of too-big-to-fail reforms \(Mar 2021\)](#)
- [Framework for addressing SIFIs \(Nov 2011\)](#)

Progress to date:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification
Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
01.01.2016
Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes
Regulation / Guidelines - Yes
Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - No

Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions
In the banking sector : all the international requirements applicable to G-SIBs and D-SIBs are part of the EU regulatory framework and have come into force 1st of January 2016. All the G-SIFIs and D-SIFIs are supervised on a consistent and consolidated basis. ACPR contributes actively to the Data Gaps Initiative, developed by FSB. French G-SIBs report data to the International Data Hub is managed by the BIS. Solvency II has entered in force and will improve the consolidated supervision of insurance groups on several aspects, and since 2013 the preparation of this new framework has been a priority for ACPR. In the insurance sector, AXA was publicly identified as a GSII. There is a Crisis Management Group, recovery plan, resolution plans, LRMP, SRMP that comply with international standards (FSB / IAIS), but nothing is yet provided in the "hard" French law. Consolidated supervision of AXA is performed by the College of Supervisors independently of the designation of AXA as GSII.
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation
Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
https://acpr.banque-france.fr/sites/default/files/liste_eism_2017_au_titre_de_2016_0.pdf https://acpr.banque-france.fr/sites/default/files/liste_eism_2017_au_titre_de_2016_0.pdf https://acpr.banque-france.fr/sites/default/files/20171201-g-sii_list_for_reference_date-2016.pdf https://acpr.banque-france.fr/sites/default/files/20171201_o-sii_list.pdf https://acpr.banque-france.fr/sites/default/files/20161213_o-sii_methodology.pdf Methodology for assessing D-SIBs http://acpr.banque-france.fr/fileadmin/user_upload/acp/publications/registre-officiel/20161213_methodologie_A-EIS.PDF

III8: Enhancing supervision - 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.

III9: Enhancing supervision - 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:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification
Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
01.01.2014 (Banking) 01.01.2016 (Insurance) and 01.01.2016 (insurance)
Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes
Regulation / Guidelines - Yes
Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - Yes

Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions
<p>Between EEA countries, EU directives have established a legal framework for the exchange of information which is mandatory (including colleges of supervisors). For cooperation with other countries, ACPR has also the power to conclude bilateral agreements with the authorities of these countries subject to the condition that these authorities are entrusted with duties similar to those entrusted in France to the ACPR and provided that such authorities are themselves bound by an obligation of professional secrecy.</p> <p>In the banking sector : the ACPR has concluded a number of bilateral agreements for banking supervision with non EEA countries, among which Canada, the US, Switzerland, Korea, Qatar, Dubaï, Monténégro, Mexico, Serbia, Comoros, Taïwan, Morocco, China, Guinea, West African Monetary Union, Central African Banking Commission, India, Vietnam, Hong Kong and Singapore.</p> <p>In the insurance sector, Solvency II has come into force as from 1st January 2016. It has contributed to improving the consolidated supervision of insurance groups on several aspects. Since 2013, the preparation of this new framework has been a priority for the ACPR and since 2016 monitoring the implementation and improving the quality of Solvency 2 data is high on the ACPR agenda. For each international insurance group subject to the Solvency II Directive, the ACPR, as group supervisor, has established a global Coordination Arrangement between all EEA and main non EEA supervisors involved in the supervision of each said international group; EIOPA is also signatory of most of these CoArs. ACPR is also member of Coordination Agreements for groups where it is not Lead Supervisor. ACPR has also signed bilateral MoUs with non EEA supervisory authorities, including the New York State Insurance Department (USA), APRA (Australia) and CIMA (regional supervisor for 14 countries of West & Central Africa). More globally ACPR has also signed the IAIS MMoU. ACPR is fully involved in national and international initiatives aimed at enhancing supervisory coordination. In the framework of the AIFM Directive, cooperation between EU and non-EU authorities in the supervision of alternative investment fund managers was fostered through ESMA's negotiation of cooperation arrangements with non-EU authorities (bilateral MoUs)</p>
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation
Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
https://acpr.banque-france.fr/international/la-cooperation-au-niveau-international/les-accords-de-cooperation.html

III10: Enhancing supervision - 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:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification
Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
01.01.2016 for the insurance sector and 01/01/2014 for the banking sector
Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes Regulation / Guidelines - Yes Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - Yes
Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions
Insurance Sector: Solvency 2 Directive and delegated regulation, which provide a comprehensive set of rules concerning effective insurance supervision, entered into force on 01.01.2016. This directive has been completed by a number of guidelines. Banking Sector: The EU has put in place a comprehensive set of rules concerning effective supervision. Directive 2013/36/EU provides for the general powers and measures that supervisors shall have (art. 102-104), the power to impose penalties (art. 18 and 64) and the procedure to follow to carry out banks supervision (art. 97-98). Among the powers entrusted to supervisors, there is the obligation to carry out stress testing at least annually (Art. 100). Primary legislation has been complemented principally by the EBA guidelines on supervisory review and evaluation process, applicable since January 2016 and revised in 2018, by EBA guidelines on institutions' stress testing and EBA guidelines on interest rate risk in the banking book,. ACPR complied to these 3 guidelines issued by EBA in July 2018.
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation
Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
https://eba.europa.eu/-/eba-publishes-final-guidance-to-strengthen-the-pillar-2-framework

IV11: Macroprudential frameworks and tools - Establishing oversight regulatory framework

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:
Implementation completed

Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification

Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status

Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
01.06.2014

Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes
Regulation / Guidelines - No
Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - No

Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions
Macroprudential authority mandate and powers have been set up through primary and secondary legislation, all binding powers are effectively applicable.
Following an assessment, information collection powers have been further specified and strengthened - binding powers have been extended to cover credit origination by non banks (funds) and to address potential sector wide/systemic developments in the insurance sector.

Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation

Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey

Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents

IV13: Macroprudential frameworks and tools - Enhancing monitoring and use of macroprudential 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 \(Nov 2016\)](#)
- IMF [Macroprudential Policy Survey database](#)

Progress to date:

Implementation completed

Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification

Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status

Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation

01.12.2014

Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - No Regulation / Guidelines - Yes Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - No
Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions
The Haut Conseil de stabilité financière (HCSF - High Council for Financial Stability) is tasked with supervising the financial system as a whole, with the aim of safeguarding its stability and ensuring a sustainable contribution of the financial sector to economic growth. Among other tools, the HCSF decides each quarter of the appropriate level of the countercyclical capital buffer (CCyB) for French exposures.
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation
Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
https://www.economie.gouv.fr/hcsf-en https://www.economie.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/hcsf-en/HCSF20190318_-_Press_release.pdf https://www.economie.gouv.fr/hcsf/rapports-annuels https://www.economie.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/hcsf/Rapport_annuel_HCSF_2019.pdf https://publications.banque-france.fr/evaluation-des-risques-du-systeme-financier-juin-2019

V13: Improving credit rating agencies (CRAs) oversight- 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)

Implementation of this recommendation was reported to be completed by all FSB jurisdictions in the 2018 IMN survey. Given this, the reporting of progress with respect to this recommendation will not be collected in the 2019 survey.

V14: Improving credit rating agencies (CRAs) oversight - 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:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification
Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
6.2012999999999998

Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes Regulation / Guidelines - Yes Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - No
Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions cf European Commission's reply
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation
Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date cf European Commission's reply
Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
<p>EU Regulation No 462/2013: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32013R0462&from=FR EU Directive 2013/14/UE http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32013L0014&from=FR Art L533-10-1 of the French Monetary and Financial Code: http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichCodeArticle.do?cidTexte=LEGITEXT000006072026&idArticle=LEGIARTI000027794628 AMF General Regulation: http://www.amf-france.org/Reglementation/Reglement-general-et-instructions/Reglement-general-en-vigilance/Reglement-general.html?category=Livre+III+-+Prestataires&currentLivreRG=3 AMF Instruction No 2011-19: http://www.amf-france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doctrine-list/Doctrine.html?category=II+-+Produits+de+placement&docId=workspace%3A%2F%2FSpacesStore%2F39201cb5-fd7b-4826-9b6c-0023dbac0540 AMF Instruction No 2011-20: http://www.amf-france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doctrine-list/Doctrine.html?category=II+-+Produits+de+placement&docId=workspace%3A%2F%2FSpacesStore%2F00607a73-d096-4172-9847-289099a61eb6 AMF Instruction No 2011-21: http://www.amf-france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doctrine-list/Doctrine.html?category=II+-+Produits+de+placement&docId=workspace%3A%2F%2FSpacesStore%2F3ba57388-e504-49a1-978e-189e3d6af277 AMF Instruction No 2011-22: http://www.amf-france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doctrine-list/Doctrine.html?category=II+-+Produits+de+placement&docId=workspace%3A%2F%2FSpacesStore%2F65c46ccb-9cfb-4543-8e17-d70ca47cfc13 AMF Instruction No 2011-23: http://www.amf-france.org/Reglementation/Doctrine/Doctrine-list/Doctrine.html?category=II+-+Produits+de+placement&docId=workspace%3A%2F%2FSpacesStore%2Fa031d387-ef15-4ada-a10e-769ccaaa0243 Final Report: Good Supervisory Practices for Reducing Mechanistic Reliance on Credit Rating https://esas-joint-committee.europa.eu/Publications/Reports/JC%202016%2071%20Final%20Report%20Good%20Supervisory%20Practices%20for%20Reducing%20Mechanistic%20Reliance%20on%20Credit%20Ratings.pdf</p>

VI15: Enhancing accounting standards - 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: <https://www.ifrs.org/use-around-the-world/use-of-ifrs-standards-by-jurisdiction/>.

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

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:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification
Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
01.01.2005
Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes
Regulation / Guidelines - Yes
Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - Yes
Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation

Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
http://www.anc.gouv.fr/cms/sites/anc/accueil/recherche/etats-generaux-de-la-recherche-c/6emes-etats-generaux--2016.html http://www.anc.gouv.fr/cms/sites/anc/accueil/normes-internationales/historique-des-positions.default.html?displayTab=2016&

VII16: Enhancing risk management - Enhancing guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practice

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:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification

Progress to date: please provide a date for your “implementation ongoing” status

Progress to date: If you have selected “Implementation completed” - please provide date of implementation
01.01.2014

Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes
Regulation / Guidelines - Yes
Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - No

Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions

The Basel III agreement 2008 are implemented into EU law by the CRD IV Package which is made up of a Directive (Directive 2013/36/EU and a Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 575/2013. These prudential rules introduced in the two legislative texts have been applied since 1 January 2014 and modified by the CRD V package (Directive (EU) 2019/878 and Regulation (EU) 2019/876) in force respectively since 28 June 2021 and 29 December 2020. In particular, both texts contain provisions strengthening the requirements regarding risk management practices, including the management of liquidity risks, of credit institutions and the most significant investment firms; less significant investment firms being now subject to prudential requirements of Regulation (EU) 2019/2033 “IFR” and Directive (EU) 2019/2034 “IFD”. Pursuant to Directive 2013/36/EU supervisory authorities are required to review the arrangements, strategies, processes and mechanisms implemented by institutions and ensure that their risk management frameworks provide for sound management and coverage of their risks under the Pillar 2 approach. If not, supervisory authorities are allowed to apply supervisory measures to non-compliant institutions and take actions to address any situations of non-compliance. Other Regulations complementing the CRDIV package have been adopted, amongst which a Commission Implementing Regulation on additional liquidity monitoring metrics that entered into force in March 2016. In December 2013, EBA adopted guidelines on Pillar 2 capital measures for lending in foreign currencies. These guidelines, incorporated in those related to SREP, address the recommendation made by the ESRB (European Systemic Risk Board), following its 2011 Report on lending in foreign currencies. These guidelines specify the method to be used by supervisory authorities where FX lending risk is deemed to be material and where capital measures are deemed to be an appropriate method of treating this risk. In December 2014, EBA published Guidelines on common procedures and methodologies for the supervisory review and evaluation process (SREP) (EBA/GL/2014/13) that has been updated in July 2018. These Guidelines aim to provide supervisory authorities with a common European framework for SREP and risk assessment under Pillar 2. These guidelines explain how to assess the various risks to which banks are exposed, including FX lending and liquidity risks, as well as the governance and internal control framework of banks for identifying, managing, monitoring risks. The initial guidelines entered into force in January 2016 and revised guidelines were applied starting with the 2019 SREP examination process. The provisions of the Regulation on liquidity coming from the Regulation (EU) No 575/2013 have been complemented by the adoption of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 2015/61 of 10 October 2014 to supplement Regulation (EU) 575/2013 with regard to liquidity coverage requirement for credit institutions that specifies the method of calculation of the LCR and that entered into force in October 2015 and by the adoption of the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/313 of 1 March 2016 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 680/2014 with regard to additional monitoring metrics for liquidity reporting that entered into force in March 2016. The EBA published on 3 November 2016 Guidelines on ICAAP and ILAAP information. These Guidelines introduce a common approach and specify what information regarding ICAAP and ILAAP Competent Authorities should collect from institutions in order to perform their assessments of ICAAP and ILAAP frameworks as well as the reliability of ICAAP and ILAAP capital and liquidity estimates in a consistent manner following the criteria specified in the EBA SREP Guidelines. In 2016, EBA has issued Guidelines on communication between competent authorities and auditors (EBA/GL/2016/05) in order to facilitate an effective dialogue. ACPR has already started to implement these guidelines and has declared to be compliant in January 2017. In both sectors, stress tests are regularly carried out, through in particular coordinated exercises, at the EU level, by the 2 relevant authorities, the EIOPA and EBA and/or the SSM. This was the case in 2016. The European Banking Authority (EBA) published, on the 30 July 2021, the results of its 2021 EU-wide stress test which involved 50 banks from 15 EU and EEA countries, covering 70% of the EU banking sector assets.

Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation

Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey

Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
<p>http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32013L0036 Regulation (EU) No 575/2013</p> <p>http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32013R0575 Regulation (EU) 2019/2033 "IFR" : https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32019R2033 Directive (EU) 2019/2034 "IFD" : https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32019L2034&from=FR</p> <p>Commission Delegated Regulation on the LCR: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1458140192307&uri=CELEX:32015R0061</p> <p>Commission Implementing Regulation on Additional Liquidity Monitoring Metrics : http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32016R0313</p> <p>EBA Guidelines on SREP Guidelines on SREP methodologies and processes https://eba.europa.eu/-/eba-publishes-final-guidance-to-strengthen-the-pillar-2-framework</p> <p>EBA Guidelines on ICAAP and ILAAP: : https://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/10180/1645611/Final+report+on+Guidelines+on+ICAAP+ILAAP+%28EBA-GL-2016-10</p> <p>EBA stress tests : https://acpr.banque-france.fr/communique-de-presse/resultats-du-test-de-resistance-2018-de-lautorite-bancaire-europeenne-abe</p> <p>https://eba.europa.eu/risk-analysis-and-data/eu-wide-stress-testing/2018</p> <p>EIOPA stress tests : https://acpr.banque-france.fr/sites/default/files/medias/documents/2018-12-14_2018insurancestresstestresultspresrelease.pdf</p> <p>https://eiopa.europa.eu/pages/financial-stability-and-crisis-prevention/stress-test-2018.aspx</p>

VII17: Enhancing risk management - 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:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification

Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
01.01.2013 and 01.01.2016 for insurance sector
Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes Regulation / Guidelines - No Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - Yes
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation
Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions
<p>In the European Union largelisted banks are required to use IFRS for their consolidated accounts by virtue of the IAS Regulation and the subsequent adoption of individual IFRS standards. The most relevant standards for risk disclosure are IAS 32, IFRS 7 and IFRS 13 all adopted in the EU.</p> <p>IFRS 9 was endorsed by the EU through Commission Regulation (EU) 2016/2067 and has entered into force on January 1st 2018. The amendments to IFRS 4 permit entities that predominantly undertake insurance activities, (Commission Regulation (EU) 2017/1988) the option to defer the effective date of IFRS 9 until 1 January 2021.</p> <p>The objective of IFRS 9 is to improve the financial reporting of financial instruments by addressing concerns that arose in this area during the financial crisis. In particular, IFRS 9 responds to the G20s call to move to a more forward-looking model for the recognition of expected losses on financial assets. Adoption of IFRS 9 implied, by way of consequence, amendments to International Accounting Standard (IAS), notably IFRS 7 and IFRS 13. In particular, information in the notes is required on transition (IFRS 7.42I à 42S (i.e. information related to FTA) as well as information related to credit risk (IFRS 7.35A à 7.35N).</p>
Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
<p>https://acpr.banque-france.fr/sites/default/files/media/2017/11/17/avis-acpr-orientations-gl-eba-2017-06.pdf</p> <p>https://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/10180/1696202/Final+report+on+the+Guidelines+on+disclosure+requirements+under+Part+Eight+of+Regulation+575+2013+%28EBA-GL-2016-11%29.pdf</p> <p>https://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/10180/1532063/EBA-CP-2016-10+%28CP+on+Guidelines+on+Accounting+for+Expected+Credit%29.pdf/33a54bcc-f462-4749-a982-5a53bb3e8c03</p> <p>In their reviews, AMF closely reviews the disclosures provided by financial institutions on IFRS 13 and IFRS 7. AMF is currently participating to an ESMA review of the IFRS 13 application. Regarding IFRS 9, AMF issued in October a recommendation underlining the elements to be taken into account during the first application of the standard and encouraging issuers to provide detailed disclosures (quantitative and qualitative) on its impact. AMF will follow the application of its recommendation and the disclosures given.</p>

VIII18: Strengthening deposit insurance - 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:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification
Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
03.07.2015
Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes
Regulation / Guidelines - No
Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - No

Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions

The French Deposit Guarantee Scheme is already largely in line with the IADI Principles (latest change to regulations in September 2010). France has an explicit scheme managed by an autonomous structure (Fonds de Garantie des Dépôts et de Résolution - FGDR). Membership to this scheme is a compulsory condition for all banks to get licensed in France (Art. L. 312-14, Monetary and Financial Code). In addition to payout, the FGDR can take preventative action, including the granting of liquidity lines or guarantees and the purchase of shares in a credit institution. The FGDR is governed by a supervisory board made of elected representatives of the banking sector. The Chairperson of the Executive board has a specific agreement by the Ministry of Finance. Laws and regulations clearly define eligible deposits: up to a limit of EUR 100 000 per person and per institution, the FGDR guarantees both on demand and time deposits in the currencies of the European Economic Area for both residents and non-residents. Non-financial companies are covered, but not banks, other non-bank financial companies, government and central administrative authorities. It is funded by ex-ante risk-based premiums levied from banks and taking into account the level of eligible deposits. The FGDR can also borrow and raise additional premiums. Payout is triggered by the French supervisor (ACPR). The FGDR has access to deposit data upon a request to intervene. Communication to the public includes an FGDR website and mandatory information provided by banks to their clients. The FGDR is subrogated in the rights of the beneficiaries of its intervention (Article L312-6) and thus shares in the proceeds of recoveries from the estate of the failed bank. The FGDR may bring any action for damages against the de facto and de jure executives of the institutions it intervenes in to secure repayment of some or all of the sums it has paid (Article L.312-6). Finally, its mission had been reinforced since the Act n° 2013-672 of 26 July 2013 on banking separation and regulation gave it the capacity to intervene in resolution with new tools. Following the transposition of the new DGS Directive which was adopted in April 2014 and entered into force on 2 July 2014, modifications have been implemented regarding: - the funding of the FGDR; - the shortening to 7 days of legal proceedings for payout; - the extension of covered deposit to funds left in account in any currency; - the ability to conclude written cooperation agreements with other scheme given to FGDR.

Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation

Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey

Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents

Relevant provisions of the Monetary and Financial Code (in French): http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichCode.do;jsessionid=E7C20F10DC9F933ADD0870D1D66A42.tpdjo12v_1?idSectionTA=LEGISCTA000006170368&cidTexte=LEGITEXT000006072026&dateTexte=20130428
 DGS Directive published in the OJ on 12/6/2014 : <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014L0049&from=EN>

IX19: Safeguarding financial markets integrity and efficiency - Enhancing 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:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification
Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
03.01.2018 (MiFID 2 (Revised Markets in Financial Instruments Directive) was approved on 15 of April 2014 and will come into force on January 2017 - 1 year delay still under discussion - and 3 July 2016 for Market Abuse Regulation.)
Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes
Regulation / Guidelines - Yes
Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - No
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation
Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions
cf European Commission's reply
Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date
cf European Commission's reply

Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
MiFID II https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/markets-financial-instruments-mifid-ii-directive-2014-65-eu/amending-and-supplementary-acts/implementing-and-delegated-acts_en#relatedlinks
MiFIR https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/markets-financial-instruments-mifir-regulation-eu-no-600-2014/amending-and-supplementary-acts/implementing-and-delegated-acts_en#relatedlinks
MAR: https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/market-abuse-regulation-eu-no-596-2014/amending-and-supplementary-acts/implementing-and-delegated-acts_en#relatedlinks
MiFID 2 (level 1) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/FR/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2014.173.01.0349.01.FRA http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/FR/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.L_.2014.173.01.0084.01.FRA Delegated directive (level 2) http://ec.europa.eu/finance/securities/isd/mifid2/index_en.htm
MAR : http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R0596
Criminal Sanctions for Market Abuse Directive http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014L0057

IX20: Safeguarding financial markets integrity and efficiency - Regulation 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:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification
Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
03.01.2018

Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes Regulation / Guidelines - Yes Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - Yes
Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions cf European Commission's reply
Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation
Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey
Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date cf European Commission's reply
Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents
MiFID II https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/markets-financial-instruments-mifid-ii-directive-2014-65-eu/amending-and-supplementary-acts/implementing-and-delegated-acts_en#relatedlinks MiFIR https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/markets-financial-instruments-mifir-regulation-eu-no-600-2014/amending-and-supplementary-acts/implementing-and-delegated-acts_en#relatedlinks MAR: https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/market-abuse-regulation-eu-no-596-2014/amending-and-supplementary-acts/implementing-and-delegated-acts_en#relatedlinks
French banking law (July 2013): http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000027754539 http://ec.europa.eu/finance/securities/docs/isd/mifid/its-rts-overview-table_en.pdf (RTS 20 and 21)

IX21: Safeguarding financial markets integrity and efficiency - 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 ongoing reporting of progress in this area by the FSB Official Sector Steering Group, and ongoing IOSCO work to review the implementation of the IOSCO Principles for Financial Benchmarks.

X22: Enhancing financial consumer protection - 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 refer to OECD's [September 2013 and September 2014 reports](#) on effective approaches to support the implementation of the High-level Principles, as well as the [G20/OECD Policy Guidance on Financial Consumer Protection in the Digital Age](#), which provides additional effective approaches for operating in a digital environment. 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. In the case of private pensions, additional guidance can be found in the [Good Practices on the Role of Pension Supervisory Authorities in Consumer Protection Related to Private Pension Systems](#).

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:
Implementation completed
Progress to date: If you have selected "Not applicable" or "Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment" - please provide a brief justification
Progress to date: please provide a date for your "implementation ongoing" status
Progress to date: If you have selected "Implementation completed" - please provide date of implementation
2012
Progress to date: issue is being addressed through
Primary / Secondary legislation - Yes
Regulation / Guidelines - Yes
Other actions (such as supervisory actions) - Yes

Progress to date: short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline/other actions

Insurance Distribution Directive (ex. "Insurance Mediation Directive") The Insurance Distribution Directive (IDD) aims at deepening the internal market in insurance distribution and provides for a more effective protection of consumers when purchasing insurance products. Further rules are expected to specify the principles laid down in the Directive, and Technical Advice by EIOPA is expected on these points by February 2017.

Packaged Retail and Insurance-based Investment Products (PRIIPs) Regulation The Regulation on Packaged Retail and Insurance Based Investment Products (PRIIPs) aims to improve investor protection by introducing the obligation for PRIIPs manufacturers to provide a clear, short and standardised key information document (KID), and to publish it on its website. The KID is to offer a uniform presentation that clearly spells out main features, risks and opportunities as well as costs associated with a broad range of investment products available to retail investors, such as insurance-based investment products, structured investment products and collective investment schemes. This consumer friendly document is to facilitate the understanding of and comparison between different investment products.

France has transposed into French law legal provision of Directive 2014/17/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 February 2014 on credit agreements for consumers relating to residential immovable property and amending Directives 2008/48/EC and 2013/36/EU and Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010. All implemented provisions were published.

France has transposed into French law legal 2014/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July on the comparability of fees related to payment accounts, payment account switching and access to payment accounts with basic features -the Payment Accounts Directive (PAD or "the Directive"). All implemented provisions were published.

The transparency, anti-corruption and economic modernisation bill, published in december 2016, contains measures for modernising the economy while adequately protecting investors and consumers:

- i) enhances financial stability and the protection of citizens with savings by expanding the powers of the financial regulatory authorities;
- ii) establishes a prudential regime for retirement insurance policies while maintaining the current level of protection for the insured
- iii) prohibits advertising by online platforms that offer high-risk financial instruments
- iv) supports the expansion of new means of payment by creating a level competitive playing-field for all categories of payment service providers.

Progress to date: if this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation

Update and next steps: highlight main developments since 2019 survey

Update and next steps: planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

Relevant web-links: please provide web-links to relevant documents

List of abbreviations used

List of abbreviations used