Jurisdiction: India

2019 IMN Survey of National/Regional Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations

National authorities from FSB member jurisdictions should complete the survey and submit it to the FSB Secretariat (imn@fsb.org) by **Friday, 12 July** *(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 not required to include information about progress to date, main developments since last year's survey or future plans. Revisions to previously included text or descriptions of relevant developments and new reforms to enhance the existing framework in that area can be made as needed, but this is optional and should not lead to a downgrade from implementation completed to ongoing, unless these reverse previously implemented reforms. 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. Such publication is planned at around the time of the October 2019 G20 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors meeting. The FSB Secretariat will contact member jurisdictions in advance to check for any updates or amendments to submitted responses before they are published.

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 not be collected in the 2019 survey.

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

- ○ **Not applicable**
- ○ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment**
- ○ **Implementation ongoing**
- ◉ **Implementation completed as of** July 28, 2014

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

2. Establishment of international information sharing framework

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

Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) and securities market regulators of 27 member States of the European Union ("EU") / European Economic Authority ("EEA") signed bilateral Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) concerning consultation, cooperation and the exchange of information related to the supervision of the Alternative Investment Fund Managers (AIFMs). The bilateral MoUs were signed on July 28, 2014. The MoUs were signed in pursuance of the EU Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive (AIFMD) that was adopted by the European Council and Parliament in July 2011 which requires that adequate supervisory cooperation arrangements are put in place between EU and non-EU supervisory authorities including SEBI." SEBI is also a signatory to the Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding (MMoU) of International Organisation of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) and as a signatory to bi-lateral MoU with foreign regulatory bodies of various jurisdictions, is required to share information, related to its registered intermediaries (including hedge funds), if the same is sought by the foreign regulator in concerned jurisdiction.

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

2. Establishment of international information sharing framework

Update and next steps	
Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date

Relevant web-links	
Web-links to relevant documents	http://www.sebi.gov.in/sebiweb/home/detail/28853/yes/PR-SEBI-signs-MoU-with-27-European-regulators http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/internationalAffr/IA_MMOU.html

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)

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.

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 not be collected in the 2019 survey.

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** September 28, 2011

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

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

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

SEBI has issued a circular specifying the guidelines for issue/sale of structured products to retail investors i.e. "Guidelines for Issue and listing of Structured Products Market Linked Debentures" dated September 28, 2011. The Circular, inter alia, provides for eligibility criteria for issuer, minimum ticket size, disclosure requirements, appointment of third party valuation agency etc. For issuing these instruments, the issuer shall have minimum net worth of Rs 1 billion. While the issuers are free to determine the face value for such securities, no invitations for subscription or allotments shall be made for an amount less than Rs.1million in any issue. It is mandatory for the issuer to appoint a third party valuation agency which shall be credit rating agency registered with SEBI. A risk factor shall be prominently displayed that such securities are subject to model risk and the principal amount is subject to the credit risk of the issuer whereby the investor may or may not recover all or part of the funds in case of default by the issuer. The issuer is required to make "a detailed scenario analysis/valuation matrix showing value of the security under different market conditions such as rising, stable and falling market conditions shall be disclosed in a table along with a suitable graphic representation". It is mandatory for the issuer to appoint a third party valuation agency which shall be credit rating agency registered with SEBI. Structured Finance Instrument: In terms of regulation 43(1) of SEBI (Mutual Fund) Regulations, mutual funds are allowed to invest in securitised debt instruments, which are either asset backed or mortgage backed securities. Further, mutual fund scheme are not allowed to invest more than 10% of its (Net Asset Value) NAV in mortgaged backed securitised debt issued by a single issuer which are rated not below investment grade by a credit rating agency registered with SEBI. This limit may be extended to 12% of the NAV of the scheme with the prior approval of the Board of Trustees and the Board of asset management company (In terms of Seventh Schedule of SEBI (Mutual Fund) Regulations, 1996). Further, specifically for Infrastructure Debt Fund Schemes, schemes may invest up to 30% of its NAV in securitised debt securities of any single infrastructure company. This limit may be extended to 50% of the NAV of the scheme with the prior approval of the Board of Trustees and the Board of asset management company. Extensive due diligence is carried out at all the levels i.e. Trustees carries out on the Board of Directors of Asset Management Companies, Board of Director carries out on the investment Managers' and Investment Managers' before taking investment decision. Specifically, for investment in securitised debt instrument the following parameters are looked into and the same is also disclosed in the Scheme Information Document (SID): i) Risk profile of securitized debt vis-à-vis risk appetite of the scheme ii) Policy relating to originators based on nature of originator, track record, NPAs, losses in earlier securitized debt, etc. iii) Risk mitigation strategies for investments with each kind of originator: a) Assessment by a Rating Agency; b) Acceptance evaluation parameters (for pool loan and single loan securitization transactions); c) Critical Evaluation Parameters (for pool loan and single loan securitization transactions); d) Illustration of the framework that will be applied while evaluating investment decision relating to a pool securitization transaction. iv) The level of diversification with respect to the underlying assets, and risk mitigation measures for less diversified investments. v) Minimum retention period of the debt by originator prior to securitization and minimum retention percentage by originator of debts to be securitized. vi) The mechanism to tackle conflict of interest when the mutual fund invests in securitized debt of an originator and the originator in turn makes investments in that particular scheme of the fund. vii) In

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

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**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
PFRDA Investment Guidelines 2017: The Pension Funds under National Pension System (NPS) are allowed to make investments in rated Asset Based Securities, Commercial mortgage based Securities or Residential mortgage based securities, units issued by Real Estate Investment Trusts (REIT), unites issued by Infrastructure Investment Trusts, provided that investment under this category shall only be in listed instruments or fresh issues that are proposed to be listed. Provided further that investment under this category shall be made only in such securities which have minimum AA or equivalent rating in the applicable rating scale from at least two credit rating agencies registered by the SEBI under SEBI (Credit Rating Agency) Regulations, 1999 and subject to due diligence by the PFM. Investment in SEBI Regulated AIF (Category I and Category II only) as defined under the SEBI (Alternative Investment Fund) regulations 2012 are permitted for the New Pension System (NPS) Schemes.	

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents	https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/circulars/sep-2011/guidelines-for-issue-and-listing-of-structured-products-market-linked-debentures_20742.html http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/attachdocs/1317205112545.pdf SEBI (Mutual Fund) regulations, 1996: http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/commondocs/mutualfundupdated06may2014.pdf SEBI circular No. Cir/IMD/DF/13/2011, dated August 22, 2011: http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/attachdocs/1314009686727.pdf SEBI circular No. CIR/IMD/DF/5/2013, dated March 18, 2013: http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/attachdocs/1363665768253.pdf SEBI circular No. CIR/IMD/DF/4/2015, dated April 30, 2015: http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/attachdocs/1430388883147.pdf http://www.irda.gov.in/ADMINCMS/cms/frmGeneral_Layout.aspx?page=PageNo63&flag=1

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

- ○ **Not applicable**
- ○ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment**
- ○ **Implementation ongoing**
- ● **Implementation completed as of** September 28, 2011

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

6. Enhanced disclosure of securitised products

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

SEBI has laid down the framework for public offer and listing of securitized debt instruments through SEBI (Public Offer and Listing of Securitized Debt Instruments) Regulations, 2008. As per the said Regulation, no special purpose distinct entity or trustee thereof shall make an offer of securitised debt instruments to the public unless it files a draft offer document with SEBI at least 15 working days before the proposed opening of the issue. If SEBI specifies any changes to be made in the offer document, the special purpose distinct entity and trustee thereof shall carry out such changes in the draft offer document prior to filing it with the stock exchange. An offer document issued by a special purpose distinct entity or trustee thereof should contain all material information which is true, fair and adequate for an investor to make informed investment decision and should also disclose the matters specified in Schedule. Schedule to the said Regulations prescribes comprehensive disclosures pertaining to the issuer, originator, assets, pool details, credit enhancements etc. Further, SEBI has laid down model listing agreement for Securitized Debt Instruments on March 16, 2011, which specifies continuous listing requirements for Securitized debt securities. As per the Listing Agreement, special purpose distinct entity needs to furnish details, either by itself or through the servicer, on a monthly basis to the stock exchanges. Those details include details on pool snapshot, tranche snapshot, pool level details, yield, maturity & Loan -to-value (LTV) details on credit enhancement, waterfall mechanism till maturity, future cash flows schedule till maturity, collection efficiency, report asset class, details of overdue loans, credit rating, loan level details etc. These details have to be submitted within 7 days from the end of the month/ actual payment date. Where periodicity of the receivables is not monthly, reporting has to be made for such relevant periods. As a measure to develop the securitized debt market and improve transparency, the Over The Counter (OTC) transactions in Securitized Debt Instruments are required to be reported by banks and Primary Dealers (PDs) on the reporting platform of the stock exchanges and get settled through the clearing houses of the stock exchanges. Reserve Bank of India (RBI) disclosures requirements for securitisation transactions are quite comprehensive. RBI prescribed disclosures for the securitisation trustees under the Securitisation Guidelines 2006 which includes disclosures to the regulators as and when required by them, written disclosures to investors as well as continuing disclosures to each securities holder individually at periodic intervals (maximum 6 months or more frequent). Further, the Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV)/trustee should publish a periodical report on any reschedulement, restructuring or re-negotiation of the terms of the agreement, effected after the transfer of assets to the SPV, as a part of disclosures to all the participants at Quarterly/Half yearly intervals. Disclosures by the originators have been prescribed under the Securitisation Guidelines issued in February 2006 and May 2012 as per which the originating banks are required to make disclosures in the notes to accounts regarding exposures of the bank to securitization transactions with regards to minimum retention requirement (MRR) and other exposures. Further, the originator of the securitised instrument has to disclose certain information in the servicer/investor/trustee report. The disclosures includes information on the weighted average holding period of the assets securitised, the credit quality of the underlying loan/assets as well as detailed information on various aspects of securitisation transaction like distribution of overdue loans, amount of tangible security available, rating wise distribution, etc. Originators are also required to disclose details of their securitization exposures to Audit Sub-committee of their Board on quarterly basis. This will help in facilitating for better

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

6. Enhanced disclosure of securitised products

Update and next steps	
Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
These regulations have been substituted by SEBI (ISSUE AND LISTING OF SECURITISED DEBT INSTRUMENTS AND SECURITY RECEIPTS) REGULATIONS, 2008.Under these amended regulations, security receipts have been allowed to be issued on private placement basis in line with the guidelines issued by SEBI and RBI.	

Relevant web-links	
Web-links to relevant documents	https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/notification/PDFs/68628.pdf https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/notification/PDFs/FIGUSE070512.pdf https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/notification/PDFs/CIR24022014F.pdf http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/commondocs/sdireg_p.pdf http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/attachdocs/1300794690530.pdf http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/attachdocs/1428639949107.pdf http://www.sebi.gov.in/acts/sdireg.pdf https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/circulars/sep-2011/guidelines-for-issue-and-listing-of-structured-products-market-linked-debentures_20742.html

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-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

- *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** November 10, 2014

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

7. Consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of SIFIs

Progress to date

Issue is being addressed through

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

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

In the 15th FSDC Meeting (July, 2016), it was decided that "FSDC-SC may come out with a framework which may include broad guidelines for declaring SIFIs. Such framework and guidelines may then be considered by FSDC for approval. Further in future, any regulator declaring any SIFI should bring out the proposal before the FSDC-SC for deliberation especially on the cross-sectoral issues relating to financial stability. FSDC-SC would keep FSDC apprised on a regular basis on these matters". RBI has issued its framework for dealing with Domestic-Systemic Important Banks (D-SIBs) which discusses the methodology to be followed for identification of D-SIBs and also additional regulatory/supervisory implications for D-SIBs. The D-SIB Framework requires RBI to perform the process of identification of D-SIBs on an annual basis and issue list of banks considered as D-SIBs every year in August starting from 2015. Designation of a bank as a D-SIB has regulatory and supervisory implications. D-SIBs are required to maintain higher Common Equity Tier 1 ratio (CET1) and also may be subjected to closer supervision. Based on the D-SIB Framework, RBI advised State Bank of India (SBI), Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation of India (ICICI) Bank and Housing Development Finance Corporation (HDFC) Bank of their D-SIB status and the required additional capital requirements. Under the prescribed D-SIB framework, higher capital requirements applicable to D-SIBs reduce the probability of failure of these banks. Apart from having higher CET1 requirement, D-SIBs would, in due course be required to establish a robust recovery and resolution plan to ensure that they are resolved without having any significant impact on the financial system. Supervision of Financial Conglomerates: i). Financial Conglomerate (FC) is generally defined as a Group which has significant presence in at least two financial market segments (Banking, Capital Market, Insurance, Pension or Non-banking Finance) regulated by more than one of the Authorities/Regulators or otherwise so identified due to its significance to the financial system and approved by the Inter Regulatory Forum(IRF) a technical group of the Financial Stability and Development Council(FSDC) Council. FC group may also have certain non-financial entities that are not subject to direct oversight or supervision from any of the financial sector regulators. The FCs include bank-led, insurance company-led and securities company-led groups. For each FC group, a principal regulator (PR) and a designated entity (DE) have been identified for effective coordination of the oversight. ii) Conglomerate supervision was initiated by RBI way back in 2005, based on the recommendations of the Working Group for Systemically Important Financial Intermediaries (Chairperson: then Deputy Governor RBI). Conglomerate banks were identified based on the suggested criteria and a monitoring system for capturing intra-group transactions and exposures was instituted. A mechanism for periodic exchange of information among domestic regulators was put in place under the aegis of the High Level Coordination Committee for Financial Markets (HLCCFM) and a nodal cell was set up in RBI for smooth implementation of the oversight framework. iii). The mechanism was further strengthened with the setting up of dedicated Financial Conglomerate Monitoring Divisions (FCMDs) in the Department of Banking Supervision (DBS) of RBI for oversight of banks that operated in other segments of the financial sector. FCMD banks were required to submit bank group returns to RBI, which included details of the group structure, financials of group entities, intra-group transactions and exposures, etc. iv). In 2010, the FSDC was set up by Government of India for focused attention to financial stability issues. Under the aegis of a sub-committee of the FSDC, an IRF was set up in 2012 to function as a college of domestic

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

7. Consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of SIFIs

Update and next steps	
Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
The mechanism is working well. Two rounds of IRF meetings have been completed with all the identified FCs by the respective Principal Regulators. Apart from the IRF meeting with the FCs, five meetings have been held till date, of the main IRF, for identification of FCs and other policy related deliberations/decisions related to supervision of the FCs. In the meeting of IRF held on January 2018, the list of FCs was reviewed based on financials as on March 31, 2017. The IRF approved the same list of 11 FCs, as identified in the previous meeting. The IRF also decided that a FC group may be removed from the list of FCs if it does not qualify on the basis of prescribed criteria for two consecutive years and symmetrically, any new group may be included as FC if it meets the prescribed criteria for two consecutive years. RBI's revised regulatory framework applicable to Non-Banking Financial Companies (NBFCs): Non-deposit accepting NBFCs with assets of Rs. 5 billion and above have been defined as systemically important (NBFC-NDSI). All deposit taking NBFCs and NBFCs-NDSI are subject to prudential regulation which includes CRAR stipulations and application of credit/investment concentration norms; corporate governance guidelines and enhanced disclosures in their balance sheet. Further, the revised regulatory framework provides for consolidation of assets of all NBFCs in a group for application of prudential regulation, i.e. if the aggregate assets of all NBFCs in the group exceed the Rs. 5 billion marks then each of them, irrespective of their size, will be subject to prudential regulation. All deposit taking NBFCs and NBFC-NDSI are subject to supervision on an annual basis. D-SIBs: None of the Indian Banks are Global SIBs. However, RBI has finalised its Framework for dealing with Domestic -SIBs in July 2014. RBI has disclosed the name of banks designated as D-SIBs from the first time in August 2015. Assessment of systemic importance of banks on the basis of D-SIB Framework is done on an annual basis.	

Relevant web-links	
Web-links to relevant documents	https://www.rbi.org.in/Scripts/BS_CircularIndexDisplay.aspx?Id=9327 https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/PressRelease/PDFs/IPR545973FD04DDB0D4CBBAA84B3C45E1081DE.PDF https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/PressRelease/PDFs/PR624C6908E283D7A4DB7A7166BB28756E46F.PDF https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/PressRelease/PDFs/PR4950B6FF1B522ED4349A25671A5EBAFEE85.PDF

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.

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** 22.04.2003

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

9. Supervisory exchange of information and coordination

Progress to date

Issue is being addressed through

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

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

(a) Home-Host Supervisory cooperation -

As on May 4, 2018, formal arrangements such as MoUs/Statement of Co-operation (SoC(/Letter for Co-operation (LoC)) for supervisory co-operation and exchange of supervisory information have been established with 44 (forty four) overseas supervisory authorities. Besides ad-hoc agreements for supervisory co-operation and exchange of information were established with 3 (three) other overseas supervisory authorities pending establishment of a formal MoU at a later date/ based on the preference of the overseas counterpart for the ad-hoc agreement. The overseas supervisory authorities with whom formal/informal arrangements are in place include both host authorities (of Indian banks having overseas presence) as well as home authorities (of foreign banks operating in India). Supervisory Colleges were established during 2012-14 for all six major Indian banks having significant overseas operations. Periodical (once in two years) meetings of the Colleges are organized by RBI. The proceedings of the Colleges are in line with the best practices recommended by BCBS. Need based interactions with College members through secured electronic mail, teleconferences/videoconferences or physical letters are also resorted to with reference to supervisory issues warranting co-ordinated attention/action. On-site inspection of overseas offices of Indian banks in major jurisdictions were undertaken on an annual basis during 2012-2015 based on significant exposures, problem credits and other supervisory concerns that came to the notice of RBI. The insights gained through the onsite inspection process are captured appropriately in the risk assessment of the concerned banks. It has been India's experience that the existence of MoUs has helped in strengthening ties and enhancing communication with our overseas counterparts in a more meaningful manner. The MoUs provides for a formal, yet legally non-binding, channel for exchange of supervisory information between supervisors. Co-operation with overseas supervisors during the on-site inspections of cross-border banking organisations (by RBI/overseas supervisors) which results in exchange of supervisory information has been the most perceptible area which received a boost following the conclusion of the MoUs. Discussions and exchange of supervisory information between RBI and overseas supervisors prior to and following on-site inspections have been beneficial for the supervision of cross border banking organisations. Such discussions and exchange of information takes place both when the overseas supervisors inspect foreign banks in India as well as when we undertake inspections of Indian banks in overseas jurisdictions.

(b) Supervisory cooperation among domestic regulators:

A MOU was signed between the domestic regulators, viz RBI, SEBI, IRDAI and PFRDA in March 2013 to express their willingness to co-operate on the basis of the reciprocity as well as mutual trust and agree to base their co-operation in the field of Consolidated Supervision and monitoring of financial groups identified as Financial Conglomerates (FCs). The MOU is a statement of intent by the domestic regulators to collaborate, co-operate, share information, coordinate on-site

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

9. Supervisory exchange of information and coordination

Update and next steps

Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
1. In addition to the existing MOUs, fresh MOUs have been signed with regulators/supervisors from Nigeria, Zambia, Guyana, Thailand, Bhutan, Czech Republic and Singapore. Also, negotiations with other overseas regulators/ supervisors are in different stages for establishment of MoUs. 2. The amendment of Section 29 of the Banking Regulation Act (BR Act), 1949 in January 2013 has conferred upon RBI the powers to call for information from/and cause an inspection of any associate enterprise of a banking company and its books of accounts, jointly by one or more of its officers or employees or other persons along with the Board or authority regulating such associate enterprise. The said amendment in the BR Act, 1949 was deliberated in the Inter-Regulatory Technical Group (IRTG) of the FSDC-SC held on December 20, 2012. It was agreed that the modalities of such joint inspections would be chalked out in conjunction with SEBI/IRDA/PFRDA. 3. The joint inspection of FC group entities may generally be need based where concerns have been identified either by the sectoral regulator or other domestic sector regulator through their on-site/ off-site inspection of the FC or major violation of regulatory norms or occurrence of any event that causes distress to the FCs. 4. SEBI signed a bilateral MoU with Securities & Exchange Organization, Iran on August 10, 2017 and Gibraltar Financial Services Commission on February 2, 2018 for enhancing cooperation and exchange of information for regulatory and enforcement purposes between the jurisdictions. SEBI also entered into a MoU with the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) under the European Markets Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR) on June 21, 2017. The MoU establishes cooperation arrangements, including the exchange of information regarding Central Counterparties (CCPs) which are	

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents	http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/internationalAffr/IA_BilMoU.html

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** HR: Resource needs

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

10. Strengthening resources and effective supervision

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

(i) The High Level Steering Committee (HSLC) set up to review the Supervisory processes of commercial banks had recommended Risk-Based Supervision (RBS) of banks in its 2012 Report. (ii) The Committee has recommended that for undertaking key supervisory roles in specialized areas of risk management and modelling, treasury, credit, operational risk, and assuming the role of lead /principal inspecting officer, the supervisory staff should have an acceptable base level of knowledge /skill and experience especially those who are involved in supervision of banks having large and complex operations. Additionally, for undertaking general supervisory activities, accreditation with specific programs and training designed for AML /KYC, off-site supervision, customer service, accounting etc. is desirable. It has also recommended external agencies may be appointed, as required to train and equip staff. (para 6.8 - Supervisory Skills (HLSC Report dated June 2012); web link provided below) (iii) Based on the Committee's recommendations, RBI has initiated the following steps: - The Supervisory teams are adequately staffed and officers are encouraged to build skills in different areas of supervision. - Officers are regularly sent for various trainings/workshops on supervisory issues, both in India and abroad. - Sensitization workshops on Risk Based Supervision are also regularly held for banks. Apart from the regular external training opportunities at domestic and foreign institutions, a minimum training coverage of the staff is ensured through the annual internal trainings on Risk Based Supervision. In 2017, around 200 officers were covered in two senior supervisor level and three junior supervisor level trainings on RBS. Further, around 30 officers were covered as part of a separate workshop for Quality Assurance teams for RBS reports. In 2018, two RBS workshops for senior supervisors and two RBS workshops for junior supervisors covering around 120 officers have already been completed between February 2018 and April 2018. Two RBS workshops have been specifically designed and planned to cater to the training requirements of the newly joined officers in the supervision department. The same are scheduled to be conducted in the end of May 2018 and June 2018, covering around 60 officers at senior and junior levels. Further, the need based sensitization sessions for Bank's Board, top management, middle management and operational staff are being conducted and expected to be completed by September 2018. (iv) In addition to the above, as part of the World Bank Knowledge Partnership project, trainings on RBS and other supervisory areas are proposed to be conducted. (v) In view of the growing significance of Fin Tech innovations and their interactions with the financial sector as well as the financial sector entities, the Financial Stability and Development Council - Sub Committee (FSDC-SC) in its meeting held on April 2016 decided to setup a Working Group to look into and report on the granular aspects of Fin Tech and its implications so as to review and reorient appropriately the regulatory framework and respond to the dynamics of the rapidly evolving Fin Tech scenario. Accordingly RBI had setup an inter-regulatory Working Group on Fin Tech and Digital Banking during July 2016 to look into and report on the granular aspects of Fin Tech and its implications so as to review and reorient appropriately the regulatory framework and respond to the dynamics of the rapidly evolving Fin Tech scenario. RReport of the WG on "FinTech and Digital Banking in India" was published on February 8, 2018 and presented in FSDC forum. Reserve Bank has issued guidelines to register and regulate peer to peer lending platforms as NBFC R Peer to Peer Lending Platforms (NBFC R P2P) to ensure customer protection, data security and orderly growth. The Bank issued directions to NBFCs on managing risks and following code of conduct in outsourcing of

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

10. Strengthening resources and effective supervision

Update and next steps	
Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
A. i. Regular trainings/workshops on Risk Based Supervision have been conducted for Supervisory staff/bank officials. ii. The RBS process has been streamlined and all the banks have been brought under the RBS process. iii. The data reporting and consolidation process has been brought on the XBRL reporting platform. iv. A guidance note was prepared for all stakeholders. B. In view of the growing significance of Fin Tech innovations and their interactions with the financial sector as well as the financial sector entities, the Financial Stability and Development Council - Sub Committee (FSDC-SC) in its meeting held on April 2016 decided to setup a Working Group to look into and report on the granular aspects of Fin Tech and its implications so as to review and reorient appropriately the regulatory framework and respond to the dynamics of the rapidly evolving Fin Tech scenario. Accordingly RBI had setup an inter-regulatory Working Group on Fin Tech and Digital Banking during July 2016 to look into and report on the granular aspects of Fin Tech and its implications so as to review and reorient appropriately the regulatory framework and respond to the dynamics of the rapidly evolving Fin Tech scenario. RReport of the WG on "FinTech and Digital Banking in India" was published on February 8, 2018 and presented in FSDC forum. Reserve Bank has issued guidelines to register and regulate peer to peer lending platforms as NBFC R Peer to Peer Lending Platforms (NBFC R P2P) to ensure customer protection, data security and orderly growth. The Bank issued directions to NBFCs on managing risks and following code of conduct in outsourcing of financial services. This would ensure that NBFCs have sound and responsive risk management practices for risk arising out of such outsourced activities. C. In the Budget Speech 2017-18, the Finance Minister, Government of India had stated that Cyber security is critical for safeguarding the integrity and stability of our financial sector and announced that a Computer Emergency Response Team for the Financial Sector (CERT Fin) will be established. Thereafter, a Working Group had been set up under the chairmanship of	

Relevant web-links	
Web-links to relevant documents	https://www.rbi.org.in/scripts/PublicationReportDetails.aspx?ID=663#C6 https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/Bulletin/PDFs/0FSRC9DF0597A123466D9BF148E49BE1E3C1.PDF The Regulations are available at http//www.irda.gov.in https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/Notification/PDFs/NT87_091117658624E4F2D041A699F73068D55BF6C5.PDF https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/notification/PDFs/MDP2PB9A1F7F3BDAC463EAF1EEE48A43F2F6C.PDF

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** August 2012 and Ma

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

11. Establishing regulatory framework for macro-prudential oversight

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

A Monetary Policy Framework Agreement between the Government and the Reserve Bank of India was signed on 20.2.2015, providing for flexible inflation targeting. With a view to maintaining price stability, while keeping in mind the objective of growth, the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (RBI Act) has been amended by the Finance Act, 2016, to provide for a statutory and institutionalised framework for a Monetary Policy Committee (MPC). The provisions of the RBI Act relating to the chapter on Monetary Policy have been brought into force through a Notification in the Gazette of India Extraordinary on 27.6.2016. The Rules governing the Procedure for Selection of Members of Monetary Policy Committee and Terms and Conditions of their Appointment and factors constituting failure to meet inflation target under the MPC Framework have also been notified in the Gazette on 27.6.2016. The Government, in consultation with the RBI, has notified the inflation target in the Gazette of India Extraordinary dated 5th August 2016, for the five year period beginning from the date of publication of this notification and ending on the March 31, 2021, as under:- Inflation Target: Four per cent. Upper tolerance level: Six per cent. Lower tolerance level: Two per cent. The Monetary Policy Committee has been constituted and its constitution notified in the Official Gazette on 29.9.2016 and is functional.

India, with a view to strengthen and institutionalize the mechanism for maintaining financial stability, enhancing inter-regulatory coordination and promoting financial sector development, the Financial Stability and Development Council (FSDC) was set up by the Government as the apex level forum in December 2010. The Chairman of the Council is the Finance Minister and its members include Minister of State, in-charge of Department of Economic Affairs", the heads of financial sector Regulators [Reserve Bank of India (RBI), Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), Pension Fund Regulatory and Development Authority (PFRDA) & Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India (IRDAI)], Chairman, Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (IBBI), Finance Secretary and/or Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Secretary, Department of Financial Services, Secretary, Department of Revenue, Secretary, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Secretary, Ministry of Corporate Affairs and the Chief Economic Adviser. Adviser (FS) is the Secretary to the Council. The responsibility of the FSDC includes, inter alia, financial stability, financial sector development, inter-regulatory coordination, financial literacy, financial inclusion, macro prudential supervision of the economy including the functioning of large financial conglomerates and coordinating India's international interface with financial sector bodies like Financial Stability Board (FSB), Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and any other matter relating to the financial sector stability and development referred to by a member/Chairperson and considered prudent by the Council/Chairperson. Regular meetings are held to deliberate on the issues as mandated. So far FSDC has held 18 meetings and, apart from assessment of macro-economic financial stability related issues, it has discussed issues such as external sector vulnerabilities and review of recent macroeconomic developments, development of corporate bond market, implementation of recommendations of the FSLRC, asset quality, capital adequacy of banks, management & governance issues of Public Sector Banks (PSBs), impact of the tapering off of the quantitative easing in the US, fraud in Banks, building effective deterrence through expeditious action, rising bank NPAs, developing a robust regulatory framework for various

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

11. Establishing regulatory framework for macro-prudential oversight

Update and next steps	
Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
The composition of FSDC was amended in September 2017 and May 2018 respectively through a Gazette notification and now its members include Minister of State, in-charge of Department of Economic Affairs", Secretary, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Secretary, Department of Revenue, Secretary, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Chairman, Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (IBBI) in addition to the heads of financial sector Regulators [Reserve Bank of India (RBI), Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), Pension Fund Regulatory and Development Authority (PFRDA) & Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India (IRDAI)], Finance Secretary and/or Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Secretary, Department of Financial Services, and the Chief Economic Adviser. Adviser (FSDC) is now the Secretary to the Council. The main objectives of the IBC are to provide insolvency resolution process, maximisation of value of assets of corporate persons, promotion of entrepreneurship and balancing the interests of all stakeholders. There has been significant progress in insolvency of corporate persons in the country since the Code has come into being. India did not have prior experience of an insolvency resolution law that was pro-active, incentive-compliant, market-led, and time-bound. Thus, the Code, is in many ways, a leap into the unknown. Yet, the progress has been amazing; the commercial world quickly accepted the law and its implementation. The entire regulatory framework relating to corporate insolvency resolution, fast track resolution, liquidation, voluntary liquidation, insolvency professional agencies (IPAs), insolvency professionals (IPs), information utilities (IUs) and the entire ecosystem comprising Adjudicating Authority, IBBI, IPs, IPAs, IUs) are already in place and working. Debtors and creditors alike are undertaking corporate insolvency processes. Over 800 corporate debtors, including 12 big accounts identified by the Reserve Bank of India, have been admitted into the resolution process till now. Of them, about 70 have been closed on appeal or review. About 130 have completed the first phase ending in either resolution or liquidation. Resolution of	

Relevant web-links	
Web-links to relevant documents	http:// http://pib.nic.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=175046 https://rbi.org.in/Scripts/BS_Press Release Display.aspx?prid=37905 https://rbi.org.in/Scripts/BS_Press ReleaseDisplay.aspx?prid=39074 http://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/PressRelease/PDFs/IEPR155FDS0714.pdf http://finmin.nic.in/fsdc/StrucFSDC.pdf http://pfrda.org.in//MyAuth/Admin/showimg.cshtml?ID=353

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** February 5, 2015

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

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

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

In First Bi-Monthly Monetary Policy Statements of the RBI for 2015-16, it was announced that after carrying out empirical study using the Countercyclical Capital Buffer (CCCB) indicators, imposition of CCCB for banks in India was not required. Similarly, in the First Bi-Monthly Monetary Policy Statements of the RBI for 2016-17 and 2017-18, it was communicated that review and empirical testing of CCCB indicators did not warrant activation of CCCB at this point of time. The same was reiterated during the First Bi-Monthly Policy Statement of the RBI for 2018-19. RBI has been traditionally using various kinds of macro prudential tools, more specifically the countercyclical tools without ever calling them so, to safeguard the banking sector from excessive credit exuberance in certain sensitive segments and reduce interconnectedness among banks. In this context, the monetary and countercyclical measures have always been complementary. During the period from 2004 to 2009, the monetary tightening and easing phase corresponds respectively to increase in sectoral capital and provisioning requirements and easing of these requirements. During 2004-08, the Indian economy exhibited high real GDP growth of around 9 % resulting in sharp increase in asset prices and fuelling inflationary expectations. Consequently, the repo rate was increased in phases from 6 % in September 2004 to 9 % in August 2008. This period also saw an increase of 450 basis points in the cash reserve ratio, from 4.5 % in 2004 to 9 % in 2008. During the same time, risk weight on banks' exposure to commercial real estate was increased by up to 150 % in May 2006. Risk weight on CRE was brought down to 100% in November 2008 In June 2013, a new sub-sector CRE-Residential Housing (RH) was carved out from CRE with a lower RW of 75%. LTV ratio for housing loans has also been used as a macro-prudential tool by RBI, with high LTV ratio for low cost houses and low LTV ratio for high cost houses in order to ensure adequate margins of home buyers. The recent such review took place in October 2015 and June 2017. Risk weight on exposure to other sensitive sectors, like capital market, retail housing loans also saw similar increases. The provisions for standard assets were also revised upwards progressively in November 2005, May 2006 and January 2007, in view of the continued high credit growth in the real estate sector, personal loans, credit cards receivables, loans and advances qualifying as capital market exposures and loans and advances to the NBFCs. As a countercyclical measure, the LTV ratios, risk weight and standard asset provisioning rate for individual housing loans was revised on June 07, 2017. The impact of macroeconomic indicators on insurance sector is examined on periodic basis by Financial Stability Report, published annually w.e.f June 2018, which was being published half yearly till December 2017.

In addition to the above, IRDAI is also a member of Early Warning Group formed under the aegis of FSDC in which likely impact of Macro Economic factors on the financial sector is discussed. In the 19th meeting of FSDC-SC held on April 17, 2017, it was decided that the macro prudential policies as well as tools framed / identified by each regulator may be brought to the FSDC-SC for finalization. FSDC-SC may act as the authority for finalizing the broad based macro prudential policies for the system as a whole. FSDC may be apprised periodically in the matter. Issues, if any, due to overlapping of regulatory domain might be dealt with by the Inter Regulatory Technical Group (IRTG) which was a sub-group of FSDC-SC with participation from all the regulators. Implementation of the

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

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

Update and next steps	
Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
The Government has recently drawn out a draft Bill (Financial Resolution and Deposit Insurance Bill) for the resolution of financial firms. As per the proposed legislation, the resolution of all entities in the financial sector shall be handled by a specialized institution, if there is no scope or possibility of their restructuring and revival. The entities are classified as low, moderate, material, imminent and critical risk to viability. Entities designated as "critical risk" shall go into liquidation and the Resolution Corporation will be appointed as the receiver. The Financial Resolution and Deposit Insurance Bill, 2016 (the Bill) has been introduced in the Lok Sabha on 10th August 2017 and referred to a Joint Committee of Parliament with instructions to make a report to the Parliament by the last day of the first week of the next Session. The time period for submission of the report has been extended and now the Committee has been asked to submit its report by the last day of the Monsoon Session. The enactment of the Bill will establish and empower the Resolution Corporation to contribute to the stability and resilience of the financial system by carrying out speedy and efficient resolution of financial firms in distress, providing deposit insurance to consumers of certain categories of financial services, monitoring the Systemically Important Financial Institutions and protecting the consumers of financial institutions and public funds to the extent possible. The Government would await the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Bill	

Relevant web-links	
Web-links to relevant documents	http://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/PressRelease/PDFs/IEPR155FDS0714.pdf http://www.rbi.org.in/scripts/BS_PressReleaseDisplay.aspx?prid=30097

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)

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.

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** 01.12.2012

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

14. Reducing the reliance on ratings

Progress to date

Issue is being addressed through

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

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

i) Reserve Bank of India's regulatory framework requires banks to have their own credit risk assessment framework for lending and investments decisions and not rely only on ratings assigned by Credit Rating Agencies. The adequacy and effectiveness of banks' credit risk management framework, including aspects relating to credit assessment process and rating/grading, is one of the focus areas of the Reserve Bank's Risk Based Supervision of banks. Further, adequate disclosure requirements are already in place.

(ii) The Indian banking system's mandated reliance on external credit ratings is limited to capital adequacy computation for credit risk and specific market risk under Standardised Approach of Basel III. At present, all banks in India are under Standardised Approach.

(iii) Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) is working on various measures which seek to reduce the reliance on external ratings. While releasing the second consultative paper on the Revisions to the Standardised Approach for credit risk, BCBS acknowledged that it considered various alternatives to replace external ratings. Nonetheless, these alternatives would result in significant complexity or lack of comparability across banks. Therefore, taking a balance of all relevant objectives, the Committee proposes to maintain references to external ratings, where available and/or possible, but complementing its use with banks' due diligence processes. The Committee also proposes to enhance the requirements surrounding the use of external ratings, to ensure that banks undertake their own due diligence and internal risk management and not rely mechanistically on external ratings for risk-weighting purposes. Hence, BCBS has decided to reintroduce the use of ratings, in a non-mechanistic manner, for exposures to banks and corporates. As and when the work is finalised, Reserve Bank of India would consider adopting the same for Indian banks.

(iv) Further, certain major banks have applied for migration to the advanced approaches namely, Internal Rating Based (IRB) approach, towards computation of capital charge for credit risk under Basel II. RBI is presently carrying out model validation/ parallel run exercise for some select banks, based on their preparedness. It is expected that banks which satisfy with all IRB requirements under Basel II will be accredited to migrate to IRB approach, which may help in further reducing the reliance on external CRA ratings. SEBI has been identified as the lead regulator for the Implementation Group on Credit Rating Agencies (CRAs) to assess the position of compliance of regulatory framework in the country vis-à-vis the FSB principles for reducing reliance on CRA ratings. The Group had representatives from regulatory bodies of securities markets (SEBI), banking (RBI), insurance (IRDAI) and pension funds (PFRDA).It was concluded that though there were references to the use of CRA ratings in the regulations, the financial institutions are required to do their own due diligence prior to investment as specified in the Regulations. The ratings serve as a supplementary input for risk assessment and hence there is no mechanistic reliance on ratings by the institutions

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

14. Reducing the reliance on ratings

Update and next steps	
Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date

Relevant web-links	
Web-links to relevant documents	https://rbi.org.in/Scripts/NotificationUser.aspx?Id=906&Mode=0 https://rbi.org.in/Scripts/BS_ViewMasCirculardetails.aspx?id=9904

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**

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 till the time the neces
- ○ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since

15. Consistent application of high-quality accounting standards

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

India has made a commitment to converge to IFRS. The Union Finance Minister highlighted the need to implement accounting standards based on IFRS in his Budget announcement for 2014-15, declaring that corporates (other than banks, insurance and non-banking finance companies) would mandatorily require to migrate to IFRS converged Indian Accounting Standards from April 1, 2016 onwards. The Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India, notified roadmap for implementation of IFRS converged Indian Accounting Standards (Ind AS) for certain class of companies in February 2015 for convergence form financial year 2016-17 onwards mandatorily. In respect of banks and non-banking finance companies (NBFCs), the convergence will be from the Financial Year 2018-19 onwards. At present the banks in our jurisdiction are required to follow Indian GAAP (Accounting Standards) supplemented by Reserve Bank guidelines issued from time to time. The Reserve Bank of India issued directions to scheduled commercial banks on February 11, 2016 advising Scheduled Commercial Bank to comply with the Ind AS for financial statements for accounting periods beginning from April 01, 2018 onwards with comparatives for the periods ending March 31, 2018 or thereafter. However, it was decided to defer implementation of Ind AS for banks till the time the necessary legislative changes are under consideration.

The RBI had set up a Working Group on implementation of Ind AS for banks in India to look into implementation issues for banks. The Report of the Working Group is available on website www.rbi.org.in. The Report, inter alia, contains recommendations on implementation of the expected credit loss model by banks. Consistent application of high-quality accounting standards While matters concerning audit and accounts are primarily contained in the Companies Act, 2013, SEBI has, to ensure that the shareholders in listed entities are regularly kept abreast of the financial information of companies in which they have invested, prescribed certain stipulations in the erstwhile Listing Agreement presently (Listing Regulations) supplied with. Accounting Standards: For financial statements to have a true and fair view, it is essential that the statements are prepared in accordance with India's accounting standards. A committee named as SEBI Committee on Disclosures and Accounting Standards (SCODA) has been constituted to ensure smooth implementation of accounting standards, statements, guidance notes and studies evolved by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India (ICAI) to the extent that it pertains to disclosures in the Capital Market documents and for disclosures related to Intermediaries. This committee further suggests how to coordinate between SEBI and ICAI, such as by constituting study teams for providing inputs to Accounting Standards Board (ASB) of ICAI and providing inputs to ICAI for evolving new accounting standards and reviewing the existing accounting standards. The following provisions of the SEBI (Listing and Disclosure Obligations Requirements) provide for compliance with accounting standards by listed entities: Regulations 4. (1) (a) and (b) of the SEBI (Listing and Disclosure Obligations Requirements) state: (a) "The listed entity which has listed securities shall make disclosures and abide by its obligations under these regulations, in accordance with the following principles: (a) Information shall be prepared and disclosed in accordance with applicable standards of accounting and financial disclosure." (b) The listed entity shall implement the prescribed accounting standards in letter and spirit in the preparation of financial statements taking into consideration the interest of all stakeholders and shall also ensure that the annual audit is conducted

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

15. Consistent application of high-quality accounting standards

Update and next steps

Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**

Scheduled Commercial Banks have internally set up a Steering Committee headed by an official of the rank of an Executive Director comprising members from cross-functional areas of the bank to immediately initiate the IFRS converged Indian Accounting Standards (Ind AS) implementation process. Banks were also advised that the Audit Committee of the Board shall oversee the progress and report to the Board at quarterly intervals. Banks have been advised to submit their Ind AS compliant data to assess their preparedness and impact, as part of preliminary impact assessment exercise. Detailed guidelines for preparation of the proforma statements under Ind AS were issued in June 2016. A majority of Scheduled Commercial Bank have submitted proforma Ind AS Financial Statements for the half year ended September 30, 2016. The Reserve Bank of India issued directions to scheduled commercial banks on February 11, 2016 advising Scheduled Commercial Bank to comply with the Ind AS for financial statements for accounting periods beginning from April 01, 2018 onwards with comparatives for the periods ending March 31, 2018 or thereafter. However, it has now been decided to defer implementation of Ind AS by one year as the necessary legislative amendments are under consideration. The Reserve Bank of India is regularly engaging with the banks and other related organisations like Institute of Chartered Accountants of India, Indian Banks Association etc by way of meetings, seminars, conference, official communication and informal interaction, for the purpose of effective implementation of Ind AS. The Reserve Bank of India has initiated capacity building measures by way of training and faculty supports to other organisations. An Internal Working Group on Expected Credit Losses has been constituted by the Reserve Bank of India to specifically address the ECL framework of Ind AS 109 to enable issue of regulatory guidance on ECL. This Group has representatives from banks and officials from the Reserve Bank of India. As IFRS is accepted worldwide, a need was felt to converge the Indian standards with the same which would also serve many purposes - like, for example, making comparisons between Indian companies and their foreign counterparts. The new Indian Accounting Standards (Ind AS) have been prescribed which are converged with IFRS. These standards have been made applicable to Indian companies in a phased manner from

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

Insurance sector is given a road map to implement Indian Accounting Standards (Ind AS) (equivalent of IFRS) effective from Financial year 2018-19 with one year comparatives. IRDAI had constituted an Implementation Group to examine the implications of implementing Ind AS, address the implementation issues and facilitate formulation of operational guidelines to converge with Ind AS in the Indian Insurance sector. The Group has submitted the report along with formats for preparation of Ind AS compliant financial statements. The Insurance Sector was scheduled to move towards Ind AS (equivalent of IFRS) from the financial year 2018-19. However, the Insurance Regulator and Development Authority of India (IRDAI) has deferred the implementation of Ind AS by insurance companies till FY 2020-21. It may be noted that IASB has deferred the implementation of IFRS 17 for one more year and an exposure draft for carrying out amendment in IFRS 17 has been issued. This development has compelled IRDAI to re-consider the date of implementation from FY 2020-21.

The Reserve Bank of India issued directions to scheduled

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/PressRelease/PDFs/PR264270719E5CB28249D7BCE07C5B3196C904.PDF
http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/attachdocs/1441284401427.pdf
http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/attachdocs/1459418165606.pdf
http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/attachdocs/1467712561526.pdf
http://pfrda.org.in//MyAuth/Admin/showimg.cshtml?ID=711
http://pfrda.org.in//MyAuth/Admin/showimg.cshtml?ID=841

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.

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 April 1, 2020
- ○ Final rule (for part of the reform) in force since January 1, 2015 (in res

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

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

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

During the year 2018-19 significant progress has been made towards implementation of the two Basel III Liquidity Ratios, viz., LCR(Liquidity Coverage Ratio) & NSFR(Net Stable Funding Ratio), in India. The LCR was made applicable to Indian banks in a phased-in manner and the banks are now required to maintain LCR of 100% from January 1, 2019. The final NSFR guidelines were issued on May 17, 2018 and will be applicable to all banks from April 1, 2020.

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

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**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
The LCR was introduced in phased manner for Indian banks and they are now required to maintain LCR of 100% from January 1, 2019. RBI allowed banks to reckon government securities within the mandatory SLR requirement as Level 1 HQLAs up to limit specified by the RBI from time to time, under a facility called 'Facility to Avail Liquidity for Liquidity Coverage Ratio' (FALLCR). For the purpose of computing the LCR, such reckoned government securities within the mandatory SLR requirement should be valued at an amount no greater than their current market value (irrespective of the category of holding the security, i.e., Held to Maturity (HTM), Available for Sale (AFS), or Held for Trading (HFT)). The RBI currently allows government securities equivalent to 2% of the bank's net demand and time liabilities (NDTL) under MSF and 13.5% under FALLCR, or 15.5% of NDTL in the aggregate. This will increase to 17% in phased manner by April 2020. The final NSFR guidelines were issued on May 17, 2018 and the banks have to implement this guidelines from April 1, 2020.	

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents	https://rbi.org.in/scripts/NotificationUser.aspx?Id=7680&Mode=0 https://rbi.org.in/scripts/NotificationUser.aspx?Id=8934&Mode=0 https://www.rbi.org.in/Scripts/NotificationUser.aspx?Id=9631&Mode=0 https://www.rbi.org.in/Scripts/NotificationUser.aspx?Id=10309&Mode=0 https://rbi.org.in/SCRIPTS/bs_viewcontent.aspx?Id=3013 https://rbi.org.in/Scripts/NotificationUser.aspx?Id=11278&Mode=0

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** Basel III implemented

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

Issue is being addressed through

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

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

Scheduled commercial banks in India are subject to Pillar III disclosure requirements in line with the standards issued by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision as part of Basel II, Basel 2.5 and Basel III framework. These disclosures are an effective means of informing the market about a bank's exposure to risks and provide a consistent and comprehensive disclosure framework that enhances comparability. In terms of SEBI (Mutual Fund) Regulations, 1996, and SEBI master circular no. SEBI /HO/IMD/DF3/CIR/P/2016/84, dated September 14, 2016, disclosures are made in the Scheme Information Document (SID) relating to the financial instruments in which schemes invests. Risk associated with such instruments and risk mitigation measures are also disclosed in SID. (IFRS 7) In terms of Eighth Schedule of SEBI (Mutual Fund) Regulations, 1996, the valuation of investments of the schemes is done by applying fair value principles. (IFRS 13) Enhanced risk disclosures by financial institutions.

There are certain requirements for disclosures on risk by listed entities as mentioned in the SEBI Listing and Disclosure Obligations (LODR Regulations, 2015). The LODR would apply to all listed entities, including financial institutions. The major provisions are as follows: Presently, as per Schedule V of the SEBI Listing and Disclosure Obligations, the following information should be disclosed in the Annual Report as part of corporate governance: Management Discussion and Analysis: 1. This section shall include discussion on the following matters within the limits set by the listed entity's competitive position: (a) Industry structure and developments. (b) Opportunities and Threats. (c) Segment-wise or product-wise performance. (d) Outlook (e) Risks and concerns. (f) Internal control systems and their adequacy. (g) Discussion on financial performance with respect. Further, Regulation 21 of the SEBI Listing and Disclosure Obligations requires that a risk management committee be formed by the company. Risk Management Committee: (1)The board of directors shall constitute a Risk Management Committee. (2) The majority of members of Risk Management Committee shall consist of members of the board of directors. (3) The Chairperson of the Risk management committee shall be a member of the board of directors and senior executives of the listed entity may be members of the committee. (4) The board of directors shall define the role and responsibility of the Risk Management Committee and may delegate monitoring and reviewing of the risk management plan to the committee and such other functions as it may deem fit. (5) The provisions of this regulation shall be applicable to top 100 listed entities, determined on the basis of market capitalization. One of the key functions of the Board of directors of a listed entity, as per Regulation 4 (2) (f) (ii) (1) of the SEBI Listing and Disclosure Obligations is "reviewing and guiding corporate strategy, major plans of action, risk policy...". Regulation 17 (9) (a) states that the listed entity shall lay down procedures to inform members of board of directors about risk assessment and minimization procedures. Part A of Schedule II read with regulation 17 (7) of the LODR requires that the minimum information that is required to be placed before the board of directors of a listed company includes Quarterly details of foreign exchange exposures and the steps taken by management to limit the risks of adverse exchange rate movement, if material. The LODR also mandates that where in the preparation of financial statements, a treatment different from that prescribed in an Accounting Standard has been followed, the fact shall be disclosed in the

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

17. Enhanced risk disclosures by financial institutions

Update and next steps	
Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
Implementation of IndAS will also enhance the discosures by banks.	

Relevant web-links	
Web-links to relevant documents	http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/commondocs/mutualfundupdated06may2014.pdf SEBI master circular no. SEBI /HO/IMD/DF3/CIR/P/2016/84, dated September 14, 2016, http://www.sebi.gov.in/cms/sebi_data/attachdocs/1473853843227.pdf

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**

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

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

In India, there exists a sound deposit arrangement already in place. In India, Deposit Insurance Corporation (DIC) was established through the Deposit Insurance Act, 1961 which came into force on January 1, 1962. With a view to integrating the functions of deposit insurance and credit guarantee, the Deposit Insurance and Credit Guarantee Corporation (DICGC) came into existence on July 15, 1978. (Source: https://www.dicgc.org.in).

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

18. Strengthening of national deposit insurance arrangements

Update and next steps	
Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
The status of implementation should have been "REF" also in last year's survey.	The draft Financial Resolution and Deposit Insurance Bill 2017 envisaged the risk categorisation of banks. The risk based premium will be considered after the formation of Resolution Corporation (RC).

Relevant web-links	
Web-links to relevant documents	

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

- ○ **Not applicable**
- ○ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment**
- ○ **Implementation ongoing**
- ◉ **Implementation completed as of** 03.03.2012

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

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

Market participants in Indian securities market are permitted to use Algorithmic Trading (and High Frequency Trading) to trade. Dark pools do not exist in Indian securities market. The details of the regulatory framework is placed below: The provisions on Algoritmic Trading inter alia include norms pertaining to broker level risk controls, colocation, pre-trade risk controls, price bands, circuit breaker and risk management measures. The prudential investment guidelines prescribed by PFRDA have been framed with the objective of efficient allocation of contribution of the subscribers for garnering optimum returns for them and also channelizing the funds into desired sectors like infrastructure.

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

Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**

1. Comprehensive Review of Margin Trading Facility
SEBI vide circular SEBI/MRD/SE/SU/Cir-15/04 dated March 19, 2004 had prescribed framework for permitting stock brokers to provide margin trading facility to their clients. The framework for Margin Trading Facility was revised with effect from June 13, 2017 to encourage trading in cash segment. Some of the key changes in the framework are stated below:
a. Rationalization of initial margin requirement from 50% of transaction value to Value at Risk (VaR) + Extreme Loss Margin (ELM) framework which is based on the liquidity of the stock;
b. Permitting stocks to be allowed as collateral for availing funding from stock brokers;
c. Facilitating onboarding of clients for the purpose of margin trading through standardized "Right & Obligation document"

2. Review of Offer for Sale (OFS) of Shares through Stock Exchange Mechanism
Comprehensive guidelines on Offer for Sale of Shares through stock exchange mechanism were issued vide circular No CIR/MRD/DP/18/2012 dated July 18, 2012. In order to further streamline the process of OFS, these guidelines have been reviewed with an objective to encourage greater participation by employees. Promoters of eligible companies shall be permitted to sell shares within a period of 2 (two) weeks from the OFS transaction to the employees of such companies. The offer to employee shall be considered as a part of the said OFS transaction. The promoters may at their discretion offer these shares to employees at the price discovered in the said OFS transaction or at a discount to the price discovered in the said OFS transaction. Promoters shall make necessary disclosures in the OFS notice to the exchange including number of shares offered to employees and discount offered, if any.

3. Outsourcing of activities by Stock Exchanges and Clearing Corporations

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents

https://www.sebi.gov.in/web/?file=https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebi_data/attachdocs/jun-2017/1497409353676.pdf#page=1&zoom=auto,-29,792
https://www.sebi.gov.in/web/?file=https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebi_data/attachdocs/oct-2017/1509447152627.pdf#page=1&zoom=auto,-28,842
https://www.sebi.gov.in/web/?file=https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebi_data/attachdocs/oct-2017/1509266724602.pdf#page=1&zoom=auto,-29,639
https://www.sebi.gov.in/web/?file=https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebi_data/attachdocs/oct-2017/1509031551900.pdf#page=1&zoom=auto,-29,792
https://www.sebi.gov.in/web/?file=https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebi_data/attachdocs/nov-2017/1510912009985.pdf#page=1&zoom=auto,-29,792

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

- ○ **Not applicable**
- ○ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment**
- ○ **Implementation ongoing**
- ◉ **Implementation completed as of** 28.09.2015

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

20. Regulation and supervision of commodity markets

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

In India, Commodity Derivatives are traded on recognised Exchanges. Earlier these Exchanges were regulated by Forward Market Commission (FMC). Post-merger, effective from September 28, 2015, commodity derivatives and commodity derivatives Exchanges have come under the purview of Securities Contracts Regulation Act (SCRA), 1956. Registration of members:Any entity desirous of becoming a member of any commodity derivatives exchange(s), on or after September 28, 2015, shall have to meet the eligibility criteria to become a member of an exchange and conditions of registration, as specified in Securities Contracts (Regulation) Rules (SCRR) and SEBI (Stock Brokers and Sub-Brokers) Regulations, 1992 respectively, at the time of making the application of registration. Rule 8 of SCRR provides for the constitution types who are eligible to be registered as members, minimum of directors who must satisfy the requirements for experience, etc. Inspection of the books of accounts of the Members of the National Exchanges SEBI conducts inspection of members of Commodity Exchanges to examine whether the member has complied with the Rules, Regulations, Business Rules, Bye-laws, and directions of SEBI and Exchanges. Selection of the members are done on the basis of various of criteria like turnover, no. of complaints, no. of active clients, no. of margin defaults, etc.

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

20. Regulation and supervision of commodity markets

Update and next steps

Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
The steps taken by SEBI for the regulation and development of the commodity derivatives market since last year's survey are as under: A. New initiatives i. Options in Commodity Derivatives Market On the basis of approval accorded by SEBI Board, necessary amendments were made to the Securities Contracts (Regulation) (Stock Exchanges and Clearing Corporations) Regulations, 2012 ("SECC Regulations") and were published in Gazette on May 29, 2017. Pursuant to the amendments, necessary guidelines were issued on product design and risk management framework for options in commodity derivatives market vide circular dated June 13, 2017. ii. Permitting Category III Alternative Investment Funds (AIFs) in the commodity derivatives market SEBI has taken the initiative and based on the recommendations of Commodity Derivatives Advisory Committee (CDAC) and feedback received from various stakeholders, a consultation paper was released on April 28, 2017 therein soliciting comments from public regarding permitting participation of Category III AIFs in Commodity Derivatives Market. After considering the comments/observations of the public / stakeholders, vide circular dated June 21, 2017, SEBI allowed participation of Category III AIFs in the commodity derivatives market, which marks the beginning of institutional participation in the commodity derivatives market. iii. Integration of commodity derivatives and securities markets by integrating the participants, brokers, and operational frameworks	

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents	https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/regulations/jun-2017/securities-contracts-regulation-stock-exchanges-and-clearing-corporations-regulations-2012-last-amended-on-april-02-2018-_35129.html https://www.sebi.gov.in/media/press-releases/dec-2017/sebi-board-meeting_37183.html https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/circulars/jun-2017/participation-of-category-iii-alternative-investment-funds-aifs-in-the-commodity-derivatives-market_35146.html https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/circulars/jun-2017/options-on-commodity-futures-product-design-and-risk-management-framework_35096.html https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/circulars/jul-2017/position-limits-for-agricultural-commodity-derivatives_35422.html

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 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.

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 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

- ○ **Not applicable**
- ○ **Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment**
- ○ **Implementation ongoing**
- ◉ **Implementation completed as of** March 31, 2014 (Bank

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

Issue is being addressed through

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

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

RBI introduced Banking Ombudsman Scheme under the Banking Regulation Act 1949 as an Alternate Dispute Redress Mechanism which is a cost free mechanism and envisages minimal formalities for filing complaints by customers regarding deficiencies in banking services. It has established 21 offices of Banking Ombudsmen covering all States and Union Territories. Customers can lodge their complaints by post, e-mail or by accessing the RBI website. In February 2018, the RBI has implemented Ombudsman Scheme for Non-Banking Financial Companies as a cost free Alternate Disputes Redressal Mechanism for customers of Non-Banking Financial Companies. It has set up four offices of NBFC Ombudsman at four metro centres to handle complaints from NBFC customers. The RBI has set up Banking Codes and Standards Board of India (BCSBI) as an autonomous body which sets out minimum standards for banking services in India for individual customers and Micro and Small Enterprises. The BCSBI also undertakes annual rating of banks in terms of the measures taken by them for consumer protection and places the ratings in public domain. RBI has set up Consumer Education and Protection Department to monitor customer service in banking industry. The department is also tasked with imparting consumer education especially oriented at creating awareness about Banking Ombudsman Scheme and fictitious offers of money through emails/SMSs and other modes of communications. For handling of complaints against other RBI regulated entities and those complaints which are not covered under Banking Ombudsman Scheme, RBI has opened Consumer Education and Protection Cells at its 31 Regional Offices. RBI has formulated and released the Charter of Customer Rights in December 2014 which enshrines broad, overarching principles for protection of bank customers and enunciates the ˆfive' basic rights of bank customers. These are: (i) Right to Fair Treatment; (ii) Right to Transparency; Fair and Honest Dealing; (iii) Right to Suitability; (iv) Right to Privacy; and (v) Right to Grievance Redress and Compensation. To strengthen the grievance redressal mechanism of banks RBI had directed all Public Sector banks and major Private Sector and Foreign banks to appoint Internal Ombudsman. The concerned banks have appointed Internal Ombudsmen. RBI has issued an updated Master Circular on Customer Service and placed on its website. This is a compendium of all instructions/guidelines issued to banks on various customer service issues. RBI has also placed on its website, FAQs on various important subjects of customer interests. RBI conducted an advertisement campaign in print media, TV and on radio, and also released pan India SMS campaign, cautioning public about fictitious offers of money, precautions to be taken in electronic banking transactions etc.

As per the SEBI Act, 1992, the prime mandate of SEBI is "to protect the interests of investors in securities and to promote the development of, and to regulate, the securities market and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto investor protection". Under the said Act, chapter IV which lists the powers and functions of the Board includes Investor education and awareness as one of the measure to achieve its mandate. Section 11 (1) & Section 11 (2) (f) of the SEBI Act, 1992 states that it is the duty of the Board to protect the interests of investors in securities and to promote the development of, and to regulate the securities market, by measures as it thinks fit and measures for doing the same may include conducting activities for promoting investors' education and training of intermediaries of

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

22. Enhancing financial consumer protection

Update and next steps

Highlight **main developments since last year's survey**	**Planned actions** (if any) and expected commencement date
The banks had been advised to formulate their own Board approved Customer Rights Policy based on the Charter of Customer Rights (issued by the Reserve Bank) by July 2015 and all the banks have formulated the same. An ombudsman scheme, 2018 was introduced for NBFCs with objectives of enabling resolution of complaints free of cost relative to certain aspects of services rendered by certain categories of NBFCs registered with RBI. In the insurance sector, IRDAI (Protection of Policyholders Interests) Regulations, 2017 require insurance companies to have in place, effective and speedy grievance redress mechanisms. IRDAI (Insurance Brokers) Regulations, 2018 for insurance broking companies and IRDAI (Web Aggregators) Regulations, 2017 for web-aggregators	

Relevant web-links

Web-links to relevant documents	https://rbi.org.in/commonman/English/Scripts/AgainstBank.aspx http://www.bcsbi.org.in/codes.html https://www.rbi.org.in/scripts/BS_PressReleaseDisplay.aspx?prid=32667 http://www.scores.gov.in http://www.investor.sebi.gov.in/ https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/Content/PDFs/NBFC23022018.pdf

List of abbreviations used

AIF: Alternative Investment Funds
AIFMs: Alternative Investment Fund Managers
AIFMD: Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive
AMC: Asset Management Company
AUM: Asset under Management
BCBS: Basel Committee on Banking Supervision
BMC: Base Minimum Capital
CDS:Credit Default Swaps
CRA: Credit Rating Agency
DEA:Designated Entity
ESMA:European Securities and Markets Authority
EMIR: European Markets Infrastructure Regulation
FC: Financial Conglomerates
FCMD: Financial Conglomerate Monitoring Divisions
FMC: Forward Market Commission
FSAP: Financial Sector Assessment Programme
FSB: Financial Stability Board
FSDC: Financial Stability and Development Council
FSR: Financial Stability Report
HDFC:Housing Development Finance Corporation
ICICI:Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation of India
IFRS: International Financial Reporting Standards
IGMS: Integrated Grievance Management System
IOSCO: International Organization of Securities Commissions
IRB: Internal Rating Based
IRDAI: Insurance Regulatory and development Authority of India
IRF: Inter-Regulatory Forum
LCR: Liquidity Coverage Ratio
LTV:Loan -to-value
MMOU: Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding
MTM: Market to Market
NAV: Net Asset Value
NBFC: Non-Banking Financial Corporation
NPS: New Pension System
NSFR: Net Stable Funding Ratio

Sources of recommendations

- Buenos Aires: G20 Leaders' Communique (27 November 2018)
- 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)