

2000 M Street NW, Suite 720 Washington, DC 20036

Tel: 202-277-9390 Fax: 202-280-1141 www.new-rules.org

November 5, 2014

Financial Stability Board
Bank for International Settlements
Centralbahnplatz 2
Basel, Switzerland

RE: Comments on FSB Consultative Document: "Guidance on Cooperation and Information Sharing with Host Authorities of Jurisdictions Not Represented on CMGs where a G-SIFI has a Systemic Presence"

Dear FSB Secretariat Staff,

New Rules for Global Finance would like to thank the Financial Stability Board for their continued commitment to public consultation and for the opportunity to comment on the guidelines for this important and overlooked aspect of cross-border resolution. This effort to protect jurisdictions that host globally systemically important financial institutions (G-SIFIs) is crucial for small, open economies.

Where subsidiaries of a G-SIFI are not of "material" interest to the resolution process but are of systemic importance to the host country, that host jurisdiction is likely a developing economy. The guidance needs to clearly recognize this and acknowledge that developing countries have limited capacity and leverage in terms of cross-border resolution with G-SIFIs. These limitations have implications for the successful implementation of this *Guidance*.

We applaud the FSB for seeking to safeguard the interests of developing countries and to include them into resolution planning processes that impact their economies and citizens.

The obvious challenge is that the interests of G-SIFIs and host jurisdictions will not always align in the resolution planning process. G-SIFIs are concerned with the material interests of the resolution, not the impacts in jurisdictions where losses could be considered collateral damage. To safeguard smaller economies – and the unpredictable spillover effects that may or may not be significant for financial stability – the FSB needs to strongly encourage multilateral cooperation and transparent information sharing.

Specific comments on Guidance:

Process for Identifying Non-CMG Host Jurisdictions

- 2.1 The process for identifying non-CMG host jurisdictions where the G-SIFI has a systemic presence should begin as soon as practicable, *not only* after a Crisis Management Group (CMG) has been established. Identifying non-CMG host jurisdictions should be done in conjunction with establishing the CMG.
- 2.2 The criteria for what is considered "material" importance for the G-SIFI should be clear and shared with all jurisdictions where the G-SIFI operates well before any crisis emerges. This will enable host jurisdictions to plan for membership in any future CMG or to prepare an explanation of the G-SIFI's systemic presence to the host.
- 2.3 This paragraph states that home authorities should be able to obtain from the G-SIFI the relevant information that is necessary to support an analysis of those jurisdictions where a G-SIFI's operations are deemed locally systemic. Is there a way to ensure that this information will be available to the host jurisdiction? Or will this be contingent upon a bilateral information sharing agreement?
- 2.5 We applaud the principle that "The home authority should generally accept the host authorities' assessment provided it is supported by the criteria described in Section 3." We recommend that CMGs work with non-CMGs host authorities —or provide nonpartisan consultants—to provide technical assistance so that the host assessments meet the necessary criteria.

Cooperation and Information Sharing Arrangements

4.1 We recommend that the guidance encourage multilateral cooperation and information sharing (between non-CMG members and CMG members in addition to home authorities) without giving preference to bilateral arrangements.

Furthermore, we recommend that non-CMG host countries be formally incorporated into the CMG once it has been determined that the G-SIFI has a systemic presence in their county. This would increase transparency among all stakeholders in the resolution and streamline information sharing, as well as reduce asymmetric information and power relationships between the G-SIFI, home authorities and developing host countries.

Classes of Information to Be Shared

5.1 We recommend that this *Guidance* provide a plan for non-CMGs that do not meet the prerequisites for information sharing. Regardless if prerequisites are met, this does not change the potential systemic impact for the host jurisdiction. In an effort to protect its domestic economy, non-CMG host jurisdictions may be forced to act independently which could be counterproductive for the resolution as a whole.

5.5 We recommend that the FSB establish a permanent working group or taskforce for cross-border resolution and CMG issues. This working group would be responsible for setting the "minimum standards" for information sharing between CMG members, home and host jurisdictions. FSB members and non-FSB members from the Regional Consultative Groups (RCGs) should have equal representation in such a working group.

Sincerely,

Jo Marie Griesgraber Executive Director,

New Rules for Global Finance

Nathan Coplin

Deputy Director,

New Rules for Global Finance