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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Registration, appropriate disclosures and oversight of hedge funds</td>
<td>We also firmly recommitted to work in an internationally consistent and non-discriminatory manner to strengthen regulation and supervision on hedge funds. (Seoul)</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Implementation of this recommendation was reported to be completed by all FSB jurisdictions in the 2016 IMN survey. Given this, the reporting of progress with respect to this recommendation will take place every 2-3 years henceforth (i.e. in 2019 or 2020).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Establishment of international information sharing framework</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Jurisdictions should indicate the progress made in implementing recommendation 6 in IOSCO’s <em>Report on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009)</em> 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 <em>Principles Regarding Cross-border Supervisory Cooperation</em>. Jurisdictions can also refer to Principle 28 of the 2010 IOSCO <em>Objectives and Principles of Securities Regulation</em>, and take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those Principles.</td>
<td>☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</td>
<td>If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification: Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: ☐ 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: ☒ Implementation completed as of: 29.08.2013 Issue is being addressed through: ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☒ Regulation/Guidelines ☒ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: MOUs Short description of the content of the legislation/regulation/guideline: In Turkey, the fund itself and the manager have to be located in the same Jurisdiction. CMB is fully cooperating with other jurisdictions in case of any information requested by other Authorities or vice versa. Additionally, the fund managers have to provide relevant information about their activities, if any, in other jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The IOSCO MMoU concerning the cooperation and exchange of information among the member countries has been approved by all IOSCO members at the 2002 Annual Conference held in Istanbul. CMB is among the first institutions signing the IOSCO MMoU. CMB is fully cooperating with other jurisdictions in case of any information requested by other authorities or vice versa. CMB has signed MOUs with authorities of 15 European Union countries (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, Netherlands, United Kingdom) as well as Iceland, Norway and Liechtenstein with respect to cooperation and exchange of information for the supervision of Alternative Investment Fund Managers. In addition, The CMB has collaborative arrangements with foreign regulatory and supervisory authorities and still continues its efforts to sign MoUs concerning the cooperation and sharing of information with foreign counterparts. CMB signed MoUs with authorities from 35 countries in this regard.</td>
<td>Highlight main developments since last year’s survey: Developments mentioned above are still in effect. Web-links to relevant documents: <a href="http://cmb.gov.tr/indexpage.aspx?pageid=71&amp;submenuheader=4">http://cmb.gov.tr/indexpage.aspx?pageid=71&amp;submenuheader=4</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enhancing counterparty risk management</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Jurisdictions should indicate specific policy measures taken for enhancing counterparty risk management and strengthening their existing guidance on the management of exposure to leveraged counterparties. In particular, jurisdictions should indicate whether they have implemented recommendation 3 of the IOSCO Report on Hedge Fund Oversight (Jun 2009). In their responses, jurisdictions should not provide information on the portion of this recommendation that pertains to Basel III, since it is monitored separately by the BCBS. Jurisdictions can also refer to Principle 28 of the 2010 IOSCO Objectives and Principles of Securities Regulation, and take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those Principles.</td>
<td>☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification: ☒ Implementation completed as of: 01.07.2014</td>
<td>Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisors will strengthen their existing guidance on the management of exposures to leveraged counterparties. (Rec. II.17, FSF 2008) |
Furthermore, there are one limits put on place regarding total counterparty risk.

**Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:**
We are still monitoring the results of the new regulations.

**Web-links to relevant documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## II. Securitisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4) Strengthening of regulatory and capital framework for monolines</td>
<td>Insurance supervisors should strengthen the regulatory and capital framework for monoline insurers in relation to structured credit. (Rec II.8, FSF 2008)</td>
<td>Implementation of this recommendation was reported to be completed by all FSB jurisdictions in the 2016 IMN survey. Given this, the reporting of progress with respect to this recommendation will take place every 2-3 years henceforth (i.e. in 2019 or 2020).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 (5) | Strengthening of supervisory requirements or best practices for investment in structured products | Regulators of institutional investors should strengthen the requirements or best practices for firms’ processes for investment in structured products. (Rec II.18, FSF 2008) | 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). | ☒ Implementation completed as of: 01.07.2014 | - If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation:  
- Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:  
- Web-links to relevant documents: |

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

- Implementation ongoing:  
  Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:
  - 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:  
- Implementation completed as of:  
  01.07.2014  

Issue is being addressed through:

- Primary / Secondary legislation  
- Regulation /Guidelines  
- Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:  

Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:

According to “Communiqué on Principles of Investment Funds” and “Guideline on Investment Funds” that came into force on 01.07.2014, all the issuers of structured products that funds invest in have to be investment-grade rated. Also funds investing in structured products have to make daily VAR calculations, which are
<p>| | | | reported daily to supervisors of risk management unit and weekly to Board of Directors of the management firm. Highlight main developments since last year’s survey: Web-links to relevant documents: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Enhanced disclosure of securitised products</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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 forAsset-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.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation: As there has been no ABS public offering in Turkey up to now and also there isn’t any application and shared road map for ABS public offering, objective and qualitative information could not be obtained from the market participants in order to complete ABS prospectus standard. Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Detailed information about the parties involved in the ABS issuance or ABS itself for public offerings will be featured in the prospectus standard of ABS. CMB will continue to work on ABS prospectus standard compatible with international standards/guidelines. Indeed, the date of commencement depends critically on ABS public offering applications to CMB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2017 IMN Survey of National Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:

##III. Enhancing supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7  | Consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation of SIFIs | All firms whose failure could pose a risk to financial stability must be subject to consistent, consolidated supervision and regulation with high standards. (Pittsburgh) | 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 2013)  
• 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) | ☐ Not applicable  
☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment  
If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged …” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:  
☑ Implementation ongoing:  
Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:  
☐ 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: 23.02.2016 | Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:  
Web-links to relevant documents: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance on Liquidity management and planning (Oct 2014)</td>
<td>FSB:</td>
<td>hand, according to Regulation on Audits that will be conducted by the BRSA, D-SIBs are already subject to enhanced/intensified consolidated supervision. Also, while the frequency of on-site supervision for other banks depends on their size, complexity and supervision rating score, specifically D-SIBS are subject to comprehensive consolidated supervision process every year. Besides, different from other banks, D-SIBS are unconditionally obliged to fully comply with the best practices guidelines published by BRSA on various subjects while other banks are to comply with the guidelines on the basis of proportionality principle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Framework for addressing SIFIs (Nov 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TREASURY There is no GSII in Turkey. However, consolidated supervisions are conducted for some insurers in coordination with BRSA. CMB According to the Assessment Methodologies for Identifying NBNI GSIFIs, Turkish investment funds, asset management companies and investment firms are not considered as SIFIs. Regarding these, CMB has no action on regulation and supervision of NBNI GSIFT's.

**Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:**

BRSA On-site supervision guidelines have been revised and noted in guidelines that independent of any criterion, D-SIBS are subject to comprehensive consolidated supervision process every year.

**Web-links to relevant documents:**

http://www.bddk.org.tr/WebSitesi/turkce/Mevzuat/Bankacilik_Kanununa_Iliskin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duzenlemeler/14988sistemik_onemli_bankalar_hakkinda_yonetmelik.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Establishing supervisory colleges and conducting risk assessments</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Reporting in this area should be undertaken solely by home jurisdictions of global systemically important insurers (G-SIIs). The BCBS is separately monitoring implementation progress in this area with respect to banks. Please indicate the progress made in establishing and strengthening the functioning of supervisory colleges for G-SIIs, including the development of any joint supervisory plans within core colleges and leveraging on supervisory activities conducted by host authorities. See, for reference, the following IAIS documents: • ICPs 24 and 25, especially guidance 25.1.1 – 25.1.6, 25.6, 25.7 and 25.8 • Application paper on supervisory colleges (Oct 2014)</td>
<td>☒ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged …” has been selected, please provide a brief justification: BRSA: Turkey does not have any GSIIs. ☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: ☐ 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: ☐ Implementation completed as of: Issue is being addressed through: ☐ Primary / Secondary legislation ☐ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: BRSA: Turkey does not have any GSIIs. Highlight main developments since last year’s survey: Web-links to relevant documents:</td>
<td>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation: Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Supervisory exchange of information and coordination</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>☐ Not applicable</td>
<td>Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance the effectiveness of core supervisory colleges. (FSB 2012)</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment</td>
<td>Web-links to relevant documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:
☐ 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:
☒ Implementation completed as of: 25.02.2011 (BRSA); 30.12.2012 (CMB); 27.07.2013 (Treasury)

Issue is being addressed through:
☒ Primary / Secondary legislation
☐ Regulation /Guidelines
☒ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: MMoUs: In order to enhance supervisory exchange of information and coordination, the CMB has been signing MoUs with both international financial organizations and national authorities for the purposes of developing bilateral cooperation opportunities, carrying out cross border supervision and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enforcement activities effectively. The CMB is one of the first countries signing the IOSCO Multilateral MoU. Additionally, starting from the 1990s, CMB has signed bilateral MoUs with various regulatory and supervisory authorities from 35 jurisdictions.</td>
<td>BRSA An amendment in the Banking Law Nr. 5411 concerning the professional secrecy issue is enacted as of 25.02.2011. In this context, the conflict between Turkish legislation and EU Directives has been eliminated through this amendment. This change in the Law enabled BRSA to enter into Memorandum of Understanding with EU Supervisory Authorities which enhanced the cooperation. BRSA has signed bilateral MoUs with the 36 regulatory and supervisory authorities of other jurisdictions. (as of December 2016) Furthermore, the BRSA is legally authorized to cooperate with a foreign supervisory authority even in the absence of a specific agreement. Pursuant to Article 98/3 of the BL, if a MoU is not effective, the information requests of authorities of foreign countries within the context of Article can be fulfilled within the framework of the principle of reciprocity. CMB Capital Market Law promulgated in 2012, Article No: 128/d: “Cooperating in any manner in relation to capital markets and signing bilateral or multilateral memorandum of understanding in accordance with the principles of reciprocity and the protection of professional confidentiality, with corresponding foreign institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2017 IMN Survey of National Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

that are authorized to regulate and supervise capital markets, in order to exchange information, meet requests for document, inspecting the headquarters, branch offices or subsidiaries or affiliates located in Turkey of institutions performing activities in the capital markets of foreign countries as well as in the bodies from which they outsource within the framework of a written contract and to take the necessary administrative measures, share the expenditures related to the activities to be carried out in this context” is defined within the duties of the CMB. TREASURY Regulation about supervisory exchange of information and coordination akin to ICP 5 and ICP 17. Insurance Law Article No. 29 is pertinent to information sharing and cooperation among international institutions. Article 32 of Regulation on Monitoring and Supervision Insurance and Pension Sector (amendment date: R.G. 27.07.2013 – 28720) deals with information sharing and collaboration. It enables the Treasury to cooperate with national and international monitoring and supervising authorities, to be a party to agreements on information sharing and joint supervision, and to exchange information within the legal framework of the Insurance Regulations. The Treasury is a signatory of IAIS Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding (IAIS MMoU) as of 28.03.2013.

**Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:**
## Web-links to relevant documents:

For the CMB Law:

For The MOUs Signed by the CMB:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strengthening resources and effective supervision</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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). Jurisdictions should also indicate any steps taken or envisaged in terms of resources/expertise, supervisory measures and/or regulation to strengthen the oversight of risks associated with financial innovation (FinTech).</td>
<td>☐ Not applicable ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification: Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: ☐ 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: Implementation completed as of: 23.02.2016 (BRSA); 31.05.2014 (Treasury) Issue is being addressed through: ☑ Primary / Secondary legislation ☑ Regulation /Guidelines ☑ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: BRSA: A secondary regulation has been issued on 23/02/2016 regarding the identification and additional capital requirements for D-SIBs in line with BCBS Framework. The D-SIBs are identified for 2017, but the D-SIB list is</td>
<td>Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not disclosed to the public. Implementation of this recommendation do not require any change in regulations/guidelines. On the other hand, according to Regulation on Audits that will be conducted by the BRSA, DSIBs are already subject to enhanced/intensified consolidated supervision according to their size, complexity and risk profile. TREASURY Insurance Early Warning System (SEUS) has been established by the Treasury. In the context of SEUS, early warning indicators of potential financial distress have been defined out of number of indicators by taking into account of correlations and weights. In addition, insurance sector specific stress testing mechanism has been developing. In the context of stress testing, while a top down approach for the assessment of an earthquake scenario and contagion risk shocks has been used, a bottom up approach is partly considered in the solvency regime for the market risk (only interest rate shock is used) There is also a catastrophic risk monitoring mechanism in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    |             |                         |         | Highlight main developments since last year’s survey: | | Web-links to relevant documents:  
| No | Description                                                                 | G20/FSB Recommendations                                                                 | Remarks                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Progress to date                                                                 | Next steps                                                                                       | Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11 | Establishing regulatory framework for macro-prudential oversight            | Amend our regulatory systems to ensure authorities are able to identify and take account of macro-prudential risks across the financial system including in the case of regulated banks, shadow banks and private pools of capital to limit the build up of systemic risk. (London) | 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. | ☒ Implementation completed as of: 08.06.2011 |                                                                                                               |
|    | (11)  | Ensure that national regulators possess the powers for gathering relevant information on all material financial institutions, markets and instruments in order to assess the potential for failure or severe stress to contribute to systemic risk. This will be done in close coordination at international level in order to achieve as much consistency as possible across jurisdictions. (London) | Please indicate whether an assessment has been conducted with respect to the 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. | ☐ Not applicable  ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment  If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification: | ☐ Implementation ongoing:  Status of progress (for legislation and regulation/guidelines only): | In order to enhance the effectiveness of SRAG work, two subgroups are planned to be established under SRAG. Member agencies of SRAG are working on developing the protocols of these groups, one of which is planned to focus on monitoring systemic risk and other on crisis management and resolution.  Web-links to relevant documents: |

**Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:**

The Financial Stability Committee (FSC) was established in June 8, 2011. Financial Stability Committee is composed of the Undersecretary of Treasury and the heads of the Central Bank of Turkey, Banking Regulation and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision Agency, Capital Markets Board and Saving Deposit Insurance Fund under the chairmanship of Minister in charge of the Treasury (currently Deputy Prime Minister). The FSC monitors and identifies the systemic risks and determines possible necessary macroprudential measures to mitigate them. Building on the individual institutions’ powers pertaining to their specific areas, the law (Law on the Structures and Duties of the Undersecretariat of Treasury, No: 4059, Additional Article: 4) empowers the Financial Stability Committee with the mandate to gather the information from all relevant parties, and to coordinate and monitor the policy implementations of them. Also, members of the FSC have the power to reach all available data from their respective bodies. There are also MoUs and bilateral subprotocols between several authorities on information sharing. Current and emerging data needs are shared within the principles of these protocols. The peer review report of Turkey was published at 19.11.2015. One of the topics that had been examined is macroprudential policy framework and tools. The peer review team did not identified any gaps in the powers to collect information for the assessment of the systemic risk. The Systemic Risk Assessment Group (SRAG), established by the FSC members in 2012, aims to provide support to the FSC by identifying potential systemic risk in the financial system, informing the FSC about potential systemic risks, and developing policies to mitigate the system-wide risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highlight main developments since last year's survey:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>While Secretariat of FSC is hosted by Undersecretariat of Treasury, BRSA was acting as Secretariat of SRAG. To strengthen effective cooperation between FSC and SRAG, SRAG protocol was modified to change the Secretariat of SRAG as Undersecretariat of Treasury. Strengthening the analytical support available to the FSC and SRAG through an integrated and enhanced Secretariat is also a suggestion by the FSAP team. FSAP report of Turkey has been published on 03.02.2017. The FSAP team did not identify any gaps in the powers to collect information for the assessment of the systemic risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web-links to relevant documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Enhancing system-wide monitoring and the use of macro-prudential instruments</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>☐ Not applicable</td>
<td>Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: The subgroup of the SRAG that is responsible for monitoring systemic risks aims to strengthen the analytical framework of heat map that is planned to be developed into an early warning exercise. In 2017 the BRSA and CBRT stress-testing teams are planning to organize a second workshop in order to discuss their scenarios and newly incorporated techniques into their models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authorities should monitor substantial changes in asset prices and their implications for the macro economy and the financial system. (Washington)</td>
<td>☐Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</td>
<td>☐ 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: ☒ Implementation completed as of: Implementation of macro-prudential instruments is an ongoing process. Heat map has been presented to SRAG since July 2016.</td>
<td>Web-links to relevant documents:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies: Lessons from International Experience (Aug 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td>related authorities. Systemic risk is monitored and analysed by the authorities regularly in both aggregate and granular level within the scope of the duties and powers. The FSC’s role is to coordinate policy actions and to better integrate micro and macroprudential perspectives among institutions. The CBRT regularly monitors the developments in the global and Turkish economy. The CBRT follows a “guided discretionary approach” considering the systemic threats to financial stability in a proactive manner. CBRT’s Financial Stability Report and the BRSA’s Annual Report communicate macro prudential instruments. Related authorities have been using various macro prudential tools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGFS report on Experiences with the ex ante appraisal of macroprudential instruments (Jul 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loan-to-value (LTV) ceilings on residential mortgage loans, vehicle loans; • Use of risk weights for by loan type; • Debt to Income: i.e., credit card limit must be proportional to the income of the card holder • Use of provisions by loan type; • Limits to credit card payments and number of installments; • Upper limit to consumer loan maturity • Liquidity requirements ; • Measures on Extension of the Maturity of Deposits (Withdrawal before maturity, differentiation of withholding according to maturity of deposits, differentiation of Resource Utilization Support Fund (RUSF) based on Maturity); • Differentiation on Deposit Insurance System Premiums (risk based premium system); • Maturity cap for general purpose and vehicle loans; • Reserve requirements Although insurance companies in Turkey neither is described as systemically important nor pose systemic risk in the financial sector, as the UoT, we established an Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGFS report on Objective-setting and communication of macroprudential policies (Nov 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Warning System Model (SEUS) measuring the financial strength of companies and the sector. In addition, insurance sector specific stress testing mechanism has been developing. There is also a catastrophic risk monitoring mechanism in place. <strong>Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most of these policies came into force late 2013 and had been strictly applied for 16 quarters. However, in the year of 2016, an adjustment of BRSA’s macro prudential policies have been implemented with a view of addressing financial cycle without harming systemic risk concerns. In this context, LTV changed from 75% to 80% for housing loans, Provisions and risk weights are adjusted from high to standard levels, and maximum maturity of consumer loans is limited to 48 months. Risk weights for consumer loans have been lowered to be compatible with Basel standards. General provisions for consumer loans have been lowered to 1% for standard loans and to 2% for loans under close monitoring, which were 4 and 8% respectively for banks with retail loan share in total loans greater than 25% and/or with NPL ratio for retail loans excluding housing loans greater than 8%. General provisions are decreased for corporate loans which has been effective since January 2017. The BRSA has increased the installment period from 9 to 12 months for cash advances and purchases of goods and services made with credit cards. Relevant changes are closely monitored by onsite supervision department of BRSA on a weekly basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>has developed a heat map, which is a collaborative presentation of systemic risk in Turkey. The heat map is designed to show risk accumulation in the financial sector by three major segments, namely, financial institutions, financial markets and real economy. The heat map design captures risks arising from the above three channels that are monitored and assessed by the relevant institutions. The CBRT has developed the technical framework of stress test exercise. New satellite models have been formed to provide better insight for the stress testing module. The BRSA and the CBRT have organized a joint workshop in November 2016 in order to share their stress-testing experiences. CBRT: In 2016, it was mentioned that first phase of the CBRT “Data Project” has finished in October 2014. The second phase is under way and the arrangement for the new regulation continues. After completing the second phase it is expected that the data gap will tighten and it will be possible to reach more frequent reporting of the banking and financial institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>☒ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</td>
<td>If this recommendation has not yet been fully implemented, please provide reasons for delayed implementation: The EU Project to renew the regulations on CRAs functioning in capital markets has not been finalized due to several changes demanded in the original schedule by the EU counterpart. In this respect, the alignment of Turkish regulations with EU rules is planned to be completed in 2017. Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The oversight framework should be consistent across jurisdictions with appropriate sharing of information between national authorities, including through IOSCO. (London)</td>
<td>Regulators should work together towards appropriate, globally compatible solutions (to conflicting compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jurisdictions should indicate the policy measures undertaken for enhancing regulation and supervision of CRAs including registration, oversight and sharing of information between national authorities. They should also indicate their consistency with the following IOSCO document:</td>
<td></td>
<td>If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Code of Conduct Fundamentals for Credit Rating Agencies (Mar 2015)</strong> (including on governance, training and risk management)</td>
<td>Jurisdictions may also refer to the following IOSCO documents:</td>
<td>☒ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:</td>
<td>☒ Implementation completed as of: Issue is being addressed through:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Principle 22 of Principles and Objectives of Securities Regulation (Jun 2010)</strong> which calls for registration and oversight programs for CRAs</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Primary / Secondary legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Statement of Principles Regarding the Activities of Credit Rating Agencies (Sep 2003)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Regulation /Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Final Report on Supervisory Colleges for Credit Rating Agencies (Jul 2013)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jurisdictions should take into account the outcomes of any recent FSAP/ROSC assessment against those principles.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</strong> CMB: Pursuant to paragraph (n) of Article 22 and Article 39 of the former Capital Markets Law, the first regulation on credit rating activities in capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obligations for CRAs) as early as possible in 2010. (FSB 2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>markets, which required authorization and supervision of rating agencies, was promulgated in 1997. CMB is one of the first authorities that introduced regulatory oversight regime with registration. Since that first Communiqué, the provisions of the Communiqué have been updated several times (2004, 2007, 2010 and 2013) in order to make it in compliance with 2003 IOSCO principles and 2004 IOSCO Code of Conduct as well as to reflect the changes in the financial markets. Only rating agencies established in Turkey that are qualified by CMB and international rating agencies recognized by CMB are permitted to provide rating service in Turkey. There are 6 domestic CRAs, which are under oversight of Capital Markets Board of Turkey, and 3 international CRAs authorized to rate Turkish listed companies and capital market institutions. Rating activities within the context of the Communiqué are subject to the surveillance and inspection of CMB; CMB may request any kind of information and document from rating agencies. In addition to several administrative actions that may be taken by CMB, CMB has the authority to delist the rating agency should there be a substantial change in the degree that the agency satisfies the listing criteria or should CMB detect a violation of relevant provisions of rating regulations. The last amendment in CMB’s CRA communiqué was published in 2013 and aimed to adapt the EU-rules regarding sovereign ratings. Currently, the CMB is carrying out a project to have the CRA communiqué in line with EU 2009/1060 Regulation. Draft is not disclosed to public as of yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On the other hand, it is worth to note that BRSA has its own set of rules regarding CRAs. BRSA: “Regulation on the Principles Regarding the Authorization and Activities of Rating Agencies” which mainly incorporates international best practices entered into force on 17.04.2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Web-links to relevant documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.bddk.org.tr/WebSites/turkce/Mevzuat/Bankacilik_Kanununa_Iliskin_Duzenlemeler/10821derecelendirme_yonetmeligi.pdf">https://www.bddk.org.tr/WebSites/turkce/Mevzuat/Bankacilik_Kanununa_Iliskin_Duzenlemeler/10821derecelendirme_yonetmeligi.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14 | Reducing the reliance on ratings   | We also endorsed the FSB’s principles on reducing reliance on external credit ratings. | 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 Consultative Document Revisions to the Standardised Approach for credit risk (Dec 2015)  
  - 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 | ☐ Not applicable  
☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment  
*If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged ...” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:*  
  - Implementation ongoing: Status of progress (for legislation and regulation/guidelines only):  
☐ 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: 06.09.2014 (BRSA); 18.02.2017 (CMB)  
☐ Implementation completed as of:  
Issue is being addressed through:  
☐ Primary / Secondary legislation  
☒ Regulation /Guidelines  
☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:  
Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:  
BRSA: As stated in the Agreed Action Plan for Reducing Reliance on CRAs, due to the nature of the local market and the BRSA regulations, practically CRA ratings have no effect with regards to banking activities. BRSA follows Basel Committee to finalize its work on | Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:  
<p>| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>competition among credit rating agencies. (Los Cabos)</td>
<td></td>
<td>the Use of External Credit Ratings (Dec 2015).</td>
<td>alternative methods of risk weighting. BRSA will then develop regulations in line with new Basel standards. All banks are obliged to make their own credit assessments before extending credits and not to solely rely on any CRA rating. CRA ratings are not a replacement of internal risk assessment according to BRSA regulations. In order to incentivise market participants to develop internal risk management capabilities, BRSA published regulations on IRB and AMA on 06.09.2014. (Currently all banks are using Basel’s standard approaches) BRSA has also published a detailed credit risk management guideline on 17.07.2014 in order to improve banks’ internal risk assessment capabilities. CMB: Debt securities regulation TREASURY Reinsurance risk is one of the risk categories that is used to calculate the required capital of the insurance, reinsurance and pension companies. Before the amendment of the “Regulation on Measurement and Assessment of Capital Requirements of Insurance, Reinsurance and Pension Companies” on 23.08.2015, for the calculation of the reinsurance risk, the premiums ceded to the “reinsurers rated with the minimum rating by the rating agencies to be determined by the Undersecretariat” were multiplied with the risk factor of 0.03. In order to reduce the reliance on ratings, this provision was amended as follows: the premiums ceded to the “reinsurers included in the list to be published by the Undersecretariat based on the financial and technical competence criteria” shall be multiplied with the risk factor of 0.06.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:

BRSA: In line with the aim of being fully compliant with the Basel framework, during the RCAP process of Turkey, regulations on credit rating agencies, the IRB approach has been updated on 23/10/2015 and 20/01/2016. Credit Risk Management Guide has been revised on 31.03.2016.

CMB: In last year’s survey it is stated that; - The rating reference used in the existing debt securities regulation regarding the issuance limit of debt securities enabling banks and financial institutions to double their limit (if they have been granted one of the top-three ratings in the investment grade) is planned to be removed completely, - Investment grade note is planned to be required for public offerings with the amendment that will be made on debt securities regulation. By February/2017, the amendment of communiqué on debt securities is approved by the Board and delivered to promulgate. Taking into consideration the dynamics of firms in the country and discussions about rating agencies and debt securities markets; - The rating reference used in the existing debt securities regulation regarding the issuance limit of debt securities enabling banks and financial institutions to double their limit is removed just for financial institutions - Investment grade note is not required for debt securities issuance in the final rule of debt securities regulation.

Web-links to relevant documents:

IRB Regulation: http://www.bddk.org.tr/WebSitesi/turkce/Mevzuat/Bankacilik_Kanununa_Iliskin_Duzenlemeler/13491idd_teblig.pdf Risk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Guideline:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.bddk.org.tr/">http://www.bddk.org.tr/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WebSitesi/turkce/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mevzuat/Bankacilik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kanununa_Iliskin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duzenlemeler/14604bankalarin_kredi_y-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>onetime_milisi_rehber.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aspx?MevzuatKod=7.5.21069&amp;Mevzuat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iliskisi=0&amp;sourceXmlSearch=sermaye%2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0yeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VI. Enhancing and aligning accounting standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Consistent application of high-quality accounting standards</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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: <a href="http://www.ifrs.org/Use-around-the-world/Pages/Analysis-of-the-G20-IFRS-profiles.aspx">http://www.ifrs.org/Use-around-the-world/Pages/Analysis-of-the-G20-IFRS-profiles.aspx</a>. 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.</td>
<td>☐ Not applicable</td>
<td>☐ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: ☐ 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: ☒ Implementation completed as of: 01.11.2006 (BRSA) 03.06.2007 (Treasury); CMB: 21.12.2004 (for listed companies and capital market institutions other than investment funds and housing finance and asset finance funds) and 30.12.2013 (for investment funds and housing finance and asset finance funds)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2017 IMN Survey of National Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See, for reference, the following BCBS documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Supervisory guidance for assessing banks’ financial instrument fair value practices</strong> (Apr 2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Guidance on credit risk and accounting for expected credit losses</strong> (Dec 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>market institutions as defined in Capital market Law apply Turkish Accounting Standards and Turkish Financial Reporting Standards (TAS/TFRS) (which is compatible with IFRSs) as set and disclosed by the Public Oversight, Accounting and Auditing Standards Authority (POA). Application of those standards is required to be audited by independent audit firms according to the related CMB regulations. In addition, a team of experts has been assigned to do revision of financial reports on a risk basis and required precautions are taken for those entities which breach standards and related regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:**

BRSA: Institutions under the supervision of the BRSA have to comply with TFRSs which are in line with IFRSs since 01.11.2006. BRSA has the authority to supervise and regularly supervises the full implementation of TFRSs by the related companies. BRSA regulations regarding fair value considerations in the calculation of capital requirements are in line with Basel III and in force since July 2012. BRSA published a separate best practice guideline on fair value calculations at December 2015.

TREASURY: All norms regarding accounting, financial reporting and valuation of assets are compliant with IFRS since 2007. Insurance, reinsurance and pension companies under the supervision of Treasury have to comply with TFRSs which are in line with IFRSs. Treasury has the authority to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervise regularly the full implementation of TFRSs by the related companies. CMB Following articles 14 and 36 and subparagraph (ğ) of first paragraph of article 128 of the Capital Markets Law no. 6362 dated 6.12.2012, Communiqué on Principles of Financial Reporting In Capital Markets was promulgated on 13.06.2013 and Communiqué on Principles Regarding Financial Reporting of Investment Funds was promulgated on 30.12.2013. The purpose of these Communiqué is to set the principles and procedures regarding financial reports to be publicly announced by issuers and capital market institutions. These entities prepare their financial statements on the basis of TAS/TFRS issued and published by POA. Moreover, to ensure that the financial reporting principles and procedures are clear and understandable, or for the sake of unity in implementation thereof, if and when deemed necessary, the Capital Market Board reaches decisions pursuant to article 14 of the Law. Entities are under obligation to comply with these decisions POA. Turkey has already adopted IFRS Standards for the financial statements of all public interest entities. Listed companies, intermediary institutions and portfolio management companies were permitted to use IFRSs as of 2003 (voluntarily), and have been required to use IFRSs since 2005 (mandatory). All banks and financial institutions have been required to use IFRSs since 2006. IFRSs are incorporated into laws and regulations as Turkish Accounting Standards (TASs) and Turkish Financial Reporting Standards (TFRSs). TASs and TFRSs are fully compliant with the...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IFRSs issued by the IASB, and they are published in the Official Gazette as communiques. Turkey has a formal process for the endorsement/adoPTION of new and amended IFRS. New and amended standards are continuously updated by the POA and published in the Official Gazette.

**Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:**

BRSA published a new regulation on classification of assets and provisions set aside for financial assets in June 2016. The regulation requires banks to measure their expected credit losses based on the impairment rules of IFRS 9 starting from January 1, 2018. POA TFRS 9 Financial Instruments was issued by the POA and published in the Official Gazette. TFRS 9 will be mandatory effective for periods beginning on or after 1 January 2018 with early adoption permitted. With the publication of TFRS 9, which is fully compliant with IFRS 9, transparent and consistent implementation of the new accounting requirements for the measurement of expected credit losses on financial assets will be ensured.

**Web-links to relevant documents:**

BRSA Accounting Rules
Turkey’s jurisdictional profile prepared by the IFRS Foundation can be accessed at: http://www.ifrs.org/Use-around-the-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### VII. Enhancing risk management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Enhancing guidance to strengthen banks’ risk management practices, including on liquidity and foreign currency funding risks</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>☐ Not applicable</td>
<td>Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: ☒ Implementation completed as of: 31.03.2016 Issue is being addressed through: ☒ Primary / Secondary legislation ☒ Regulation /Guidelines ☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web-links to relevant documents:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We commit to conduct robust, transparent stress tests as needed. (Pittsburgh)</td>
<td>requirements for CCPs), since these are monitored separately by the BCBS.</td>
<td>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline: The BRSA published an updated regulation on internal systems and ICAAP for banks on 11.07.2014. Additionally, to address the main G20/FSB recommendations; detailed risk management guidelines on credit risk, market risk, operational risk, counterparty credit risk, liquidity risk (funding and market), interest rate risk in the banking book (yield curve risk, basis risk, optionality risk), concentration risk, country and transfer Risk (indirect country risk, sovereign risk, macroeconomic risk and contagion Risk) have been issued. Moreover, the stress testing framework is regulated more explicitly and the BRSA has also issued the supporting guidelines on stress testing and ICAAP Report preparation. Highlight main developments since last year's survey: Web-links to relevant documents: <a href="http://www.bddk.org.tr/WebSitesi/turkce/Mevzuat/Bankacilik_Kanununa_Iliskin_Duzenlemeler/Bankacilik_Kanununa_Iliskin_Duzenlemeler.aspx">http://www.bddk.org.tr/WebSitesi/turkce/Mevzuat/Bankacilik_Kanununa_Iliskin_Duzenlemeler/Bankacilik_Kanununa_Iliskin_Duzenlemeler.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2017 IMN Survey of National Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Enhanced risk disclosures by financial institutions</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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 <em>Enhancing the Risk Disclosures of Banks and Implementation Progress Report by the EDTF (Dec 2015)</em>, 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 <em>Impact of Expected Credit Loss Approaches on Bank Risk Disclosures (Nov 2015)</em>, as well as the recommendations in Principle 8 of the BCBS <em>Guidance on credit risk and</em></td>
<td>☐ Not applicable</td>
<td>Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accounting for expected credit losses (Dec 2015)</td>
<td>TREASURY The Undersecretariat monitors the information disclosed by insurers in a timely manner. Article 18 Paragraph 2 of Insurance Law No. 5684 stipulates that the Undersecretariat shall cause to be re-announced such financial statements corrected if any untrue information is discovered in the announced financial statements announced by insurance and reinsurance companies, taking into account generally accepted accounting rules and principles. PAO As Turkey had already adopted all IFRS Standards, including IFRS 7 and IFRS 13, the disclosure requirements of all IFRSs have been implemented. Banks are required to prepare and issue their financial statements according to TFRSs and TASs, which are fully compliant with the IFRSs and IASs. Hence, they disclose their exposure to credit risk, including their expected credit loss estimates, and relevant information on their underwriting practices on their financial statements. CMB Investment funds have to disclose their “monthly portfolio reports” and also their financial reports in the Public Disclosure Platform, which is easily accessible by all investors. Regarding risk management disclosures, as Guideline On Investment Funds came into force as of 01.07.2014, investment funds which are going to invest in derivatives and engage in other leveraged transactions, became obligated to disclose; A) Risk calculation methodology, under which circumstances the fund will create leverage, through which channels that leverage will be created (derivatives, etc.) and risks related to those</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transactions. B) Information about VAR method that is going to be used. C) Leverage limit of the fund and calculation method of leverage. D) Information about reference portfolio (if relative-VAR is chosen for risk calculations) In their prospectus. Also, risks related to the fund’s investment strategy and risk rating of the fund on a 1 to 7 scale have to be disclosed in the Key Investor Information Document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:**
CMB: We are still monitoring the results.

**Web-links to relevant documents:**
### VIII. Strengthening deposit insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18 | Strengthening of national deposit insurance arrangements | National deposit insurance arrangements should be reviewed against the agreed international principles, and authorities should strengthen arrangements where needed. (Rec. VI.9, FSF 2008) | Jurisdictions 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). | ☐ Not applicable | ☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment  
If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged …” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:  
☐ Implementation ongoing:  
Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:  
☐ Draft in preparation, expected publication by: No definite timeframe  
☐ 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:  
☐ Implementation completed as of:  
Issue is being addressed through:  
☐ Primary / Secondary legislation  
☐ Regulation /Guidelines  
☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:  
Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:  
To Introduce missing powers in deposit insurance system and improve the current framework in line with the international standards (IADI, FSB) NOTE FROM SAVINGS DEPOSIT INSURANCE FUND (SDIF) The SDIF | Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:  
As resolution reforms will no longer be recorded in this survey, we deleted our previous planned reform (bridge bank proposal) from the IMN follow-up table. On the other hand, there is an ongoing work to address various shortcomings in both our deposit insurance(*) and bank resolution frameworks compared to international standards. Savings Deposit Insurance Fund (SDIF) finalized the draft document. The draft has presented to the Turkish Financial Stability Committee but not submitted to the Parliament yet. (*) Required amendments related with DIS activities: - Expanding coverage to include commercial deposits, - Empowering the SDIF Board with the power for determining target reserve ratio, - Citing the Single Customer View System in the text of the legislation, - Empowering the SDIF with onsite examination power for issues related to deposit insurance mandate.  
Web-links to relevant documents: |

(18)
was established in 1983 under the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey (CBRT) and became an autonomous legal entity in 2003. The SDIF is governed by a Board of Directors (“Fund Board”) which is the decision making body of SDIF and is made up of seven members including the Chairman. The Chairman of the Fund Board also serves as President of the SDIF. All members are appointed by the Council of Ministers, which also designates the Chairman. SDIF operates independently in fulfillment of its mandate and resolutions of SDIF may not be supervised for appropriateness. The main policy objectives of the SDIF are to protect the rights of depositors and participation fund owners and to ensure confidence and stability in financial markets. In addition, the SDIF has a role in resolution of failed banks. The mandate and power of the SDIF are clearly defined and formally specified in the Banking Law (BL). In this context, the SDIF is authorized to insure deposits and participation funds; manage the banks whose management and control have been transferred to the SDIF; strengthen and restructure their financial standing; transfer, merge, sell or liquidate these banks; execute and conclude the follow-up and collection transactions of the receivables of the SDIF and manage the SDIF’s assets and resources. The SDIF insures the savings deposit accounts and participation funds opened by only real persons, in Turkish Lira, foreign currency, or precious metals. These accounts must be held at domestic branches of credit institutions operating in Turkey. Savings deposits deposited in foreign branches of credit institutions are not insured by the SDIF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SDIF operates independently in fulfillment of its mandate and resolutions of SDIF may not be supervised for appropriateness. The main policy objectives of the SDIF are to protect the rights of depositors and participation fund owners and to ensure confidence and stability in financial markets. In addition, the SDIF has a role in resolution of failed banks. The mandate and power of the SDIF are clearly defined and formally specified in the Banking Law (BL). In this context, the SDIF is authorized to insure deposits and participation funds; manage the banks whose management and control have been transferred to the SDIF; strengthen and restructure their financial standing; transfer, merge, sell or liquidate these banks; execute and conclude the follow-up and collection transactions of the receivables of the SDIF and manage the SDIF’s assets and resources. The SDIF insures the savings deposit accounts and participation funds opened by only real persons, in Turkish Lira, foreign currency, or precious metals. These accounts must be held at domestic branches of credit institutions operating in Turkey. Savings deposits deposited in foreign branches of credit institutions are not insured by the SDIF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>institutions and credit institutions engaged in off-shore banking, among others, are specifically excluded from coverage under Turkish Banking Law and related regulations. The SDIF Board sets the coverage and amount of insured deposit. The SDIF board sets also the tariff, collection time, method and other conditions of the risk-based insurance premium. The rules and procedures with regard to the insurance of savings deposits-participation funds and the premiums collected by the SDIF are laid out in “Regulation on Deposits and Participation Funds Subject to Insurance and Premiums Collected by Savings Deposit Insurance Fund”. The SDIF has a differential risk based premium system and collects risk-based premiums from the banks on an ex-ante basis. As of September 2016, there are 39 deposit taking banks (including participation banks namely Islamic banks) in the deposit insurance scheme and the membership is compulsory for all deposit taking banks in Turkey. As of March 2017, there are 39 deposit taking banks (including participation banks namely Islamic banks) in the deposit insurance scheme and the membership is compulsory for all deposit taking banks in Turkey. The current deposit insurance limit is 100.000 Turkish Liras (approximately USD 27.483) per depositor per bank. As of March 2017, the total amount of covered deposits is USD 106.8 billion and 98 per cent of total bank depositors and 26.6 per cent of total deposits are insured. The SDIF has a reserve fund but no target ratio. The deposit insurance reserve (DIF) of the SDIF is about USD 6.735 Billion as of March 2017 and the current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reserve/insured deposit ratio is 6.77 per cent which is somewhat higher than in peer countries.</td>
<td>Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IX. Safeguarding the integrity and efficiency of financial markets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 19 | Enhancing market integrity and efficiency | We must ensure that markets serve efficient allocation of investments and savings in our economies and do not pose risks to financial stability. To this end, we commit to implement initial recommendations by IOSCO on market integrity and efficiency, including measures to address the risks posed by high frequency trading and dark liquidity, and call for further work by mid-2012. (Cannes) | 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). | ☐ Not applicable  
☐ Applicable but no action envisaged at the moment  
If “Not applicable” or “Applicable but no action envisaged …” has been selected, please provide a brief justification:  
☐ Implementation ongoing:  
☐ 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:  
☒ Implementation completed as of:  
30.12.2016 Dark orders 05.05.2016 HFT  
Issue is being addressed through:  
☐ Primary / Secondary legislation  
☒ Regulation /Guidelines  
☐ Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify:  
Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:  
Although no dark pool is regulated and operated, some dark orders are permitted to be submitted in Borsa İSTANBUL (BIST). In this regard, Mid-Point orders | Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:  
It is planned to follow market implications to determine needed actions if any. | Web-links to relevant documents: |
2017 IMN Survey of National Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Trade At Reference orders are newly introduced by BIST and ruled by Equity Markets Implementing Procedures and Principles amended in 30.12.2016. Algorithmic and high frequency (algo &amp; HFT) trading are also firstly defined in Borsa İstanbul’s General Letter about Pre Trade Risk Management (PTRM) Application Procedures and Principles dated 05.05.2016. With this regulation: - Members have to transmit their algo &amp; HFT clients’ orders via a dedicated FIX or OUCH[1] users provided by Borsa İstanbul. (Members of Borsa İstanbul are authorized investment firm. HFT firms are not enable to direct their order to the market) - Members have to confirm that they have executed tests in their customers’ algo &amp; HFT software, results of these software are foreseeable and will not execute trades that will abuse the market. - After putting these kind of software into use, members have to take measures to monitor risks in real time, to limit these risks and to stop order transmission immediately when it is necessary. - Members that own or have customers who operate algo &amp; HFT software, have to use BISTECH PTRM tool (pre trade risk management tool developed by Borsa İstanbul and NASDAQ) which enables them put limits or measures on orders and trades on account basis. - Members have to document how they calculated their or their customers’ risks and set limits for them. They have to provide these documents on the same day when Borsa İstanbul asks for. - Members are directly responsible for these kind of software even they are owned &amp; operated by their customers. - Users defined by Borsa İstanbul as HFT users are exempt from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conventional order cancellation/modification fees, instead they are subject to pricing scheme that is based on order to trade ratio and aims to charge excess usage. Borsa İstanbul applies base price and price limits in Equity Market. “Base price” is the price which constitutes a base for determining the upper and lower price limits of an equity between which it can be traded during a day. “Base price” is calculated by rounding the “closing price” of the previous day to the nearest price tick. The margin, which is a rate to be applied on the base price in order to determine the price limits are defined as (free margin may be applied at the certain equities and ETFs where necessary): • 20% for the equities and exchange traded funds (ETF) • 50% for the preemptive rights and ISKUR.E • Free margin for warrants and certificates Besides, a new Circuit Breaker System is introduced to the Market at 30.11.2015. In case price change calculated by a certain reference value reaches or exceeds threshold values (rates) determined by the Exchange while transactions in a stock are carried out with continuous trading method in the session, transactions of the related stock will be temporarily halted and carried on to the order collection stage of a call auction. At this stage price is determined in a call auction using single price method in the related stock. Then the related stock is again taken to continuous trading and transactions are continued after processes in single price method are completed. Besides; Equity Market transactions are monitored on real time online basis using an electronic surveillance tool called SMARTS, co-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2017 IMN Survey of National Progress in the Implementation of G20/FSB Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>developed with Nasdaq and BIST, alongside BiSTECH Trading Platform. <strong>Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web-links to relevant documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="http://www.borsaistanbul.com/docs/default-source/nasdaqgenelmektup/news-release-2016-77.pdf?sfvrsn=4" alt="Web-link" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Regulation and supervision of commodity markets</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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 <em>Principles for the Regulation and Supervision of Commodity Derivatives Markets (Sep 2011).</em> 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.</td>
<td>☒ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]: Draft in preparation, expected publication by: 31.12.2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) | | ☑ 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: ☑ Implementation completed as of: Issue is being addressed through: | Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date: Web-links to relevant documents: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

rules are applied to the market. Additionally, the project to design a new commodity market in the Borsa İstanbul is ongoing.

**Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:**

Web-links to relevant documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Reform of financial benchmarks</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Collection of information on this recommendation will continue to be deferred given the forthcoming FSB progress report on implementation of FSB recommendations in this area, and ongoing IOSCO work to review the implementation of the IOSCO Principles for Financial Benchmarks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Enhancing financial consumer protection

No: 22  
(22) Enhancing financial consumer protection

We agree that integration of financial consumer protection policies into regulatory and supervisory frameworks contributes to strengthening financial stability, endorse the FSB report on consumer finance protection and the high level principles on financial consumer protection prepared by the OECD together with the FSB. We will pursue the full application of these principles in our jurisdictions. (Cannes)

Jurisdictions should describe progress toward implementation of the OECD’s [G-20 high-level principles on financial consumer protection (Oct 2011)](http://www.oecd.org/g20). Jurisdictions may also refer to OECD’s [September 2013 and September 2014 reports](http://www.oecd.org/g20) on effective approaches to support the implementation of the High-level Principles. The effective approaches are of interest across all financial services sectors – banking and credit; securities; insurance and pensions – and consideration should be given to their cross-sectoral character when considering implementation. Jurisdictions should, where necessary, indicate any changes or additions that have been introduced as a way to support the implementation of the High-level Principles, to address particular national terminology, situations or determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Not applicable  | ☒ Implementation ongoing: Status of progress [for legislation and regulation/guidelines only]:  
- 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: 03.10.2014 (BRSA); 28.11.2015 (GTB)  
- Implementation completed as of:  
- Issue is being addressed through:  
- Primary / Secondary legislation  
- Regulation /Guidelines  
- Other actions (such as supervisory actions), please specify: BRSA: Supervisory process related to financial consumers issues takes place upon complaints sent by financial consumers. GTB: Under The Law on Consumer Protection and the secondary regulations, supervision has started about the 35 bank and fine was imposed to 18 |

Planned actions (if any) and expected commencement date:

GTB The Directorate General for Consumer Protection and Market Surveillance is proposing to apply for an Erasmus KA2 strategic partnership project about Improving Financial Literacy in the scope of Consumer Academy by the end of March. The project is proposed to be complementary to the Consumer Academy project by improving the general knowledge and consciousness level of consumers about financial issues such as budgeting, saving, investment. Project will be implemented if only it is granted by EU in case of positive evaluation of the application by Turkish National Agency.

Web-links to relevant documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>G20/FSB Recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bank. In 2016, Arbitration Committees for Consumer Problems have 1,039,032 (%74 of total) applications about banking sector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short description of the content of the legislation/ regulation/guideline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BRSA has issued a regulation (Regulation On Principles And Procedures Related To Fees To Be Taken From Financial Consumers) on fees that can be charged on financial consumers and principles and procedures regarding contracts, reimbursement of the fee. TREASURY According to the article 32 of the Insurance Law:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)Insurance companies and intermediaries shall not design their brochures, explanatory notices, other documents and their advertisements and commercials in a way that results in an understanding outside the limits and scope of the rights and benefits which they shall provide to the insured, and shall not make statements that are unreal, misleading, deceiving or that give rise to unfair competition. Where violation of this provision is ascertained the matter shall be referred to the Advertising Board that acts upon the Law on Protection of Consumers. (2) Insurance companies, reinsurance companies, intermediaries and loss adjusters are obliged to refrain from acts which may endanger the rights and benefits of the insured, to act in accordance with the legislation and principles of the business plan, and to behave in compliance with the requirements of insurance and the rules of goodwill. (3) Insurance companies shall not delay the payment of insurance claims in violation of the rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of goodwill. (4) The Undersecretariat is authorized to take all the measures in order to ensure that insurance companies, reinsurance companies, intermediaries and loss adjusters comply with the above mentioned rules. (5) Rights of persons to choose an insurance company shall not be restricted. In contracts, where one of the parties are obliged to buy insurance, provisions requiring the conclusion of the insurance contract with a certain company shall be void.” According to the article 30 of the Insurance Law; to settle the disputes arising from the insurance contract between the policy holder or people benefiting from the insurance contract on the one side and the party undertaking the risk on the other side, the Insurance Arbitration Commission has been established. Guarantees can also be deemed as an important financial consumer protection, since in the “Regulation on Financial Structures of the Insurance, Reinsurance and Pension Companies” it is stated that the guarantee shall be a reserve against the receivables of the insured, and in case the licenses of a company with respect to all branches are revoked, or in case the company is liquidated or has declared bankruptcy, the guarantee shall be used for the payment of the receivables of the insured in the relevant branch first, while the remainder shall be added to the guarantees of other branches. Regulation on Furnishing Information in Insurance Contracts regulates the principles and obligations of insurers to ensure that persons who intend to enter into a specific insurance relationship do not confront any insufficient information. “Assurance account” which covers losses that arise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as a result of the occurrence of the specific conditions also aims the protection of insured rights. To solve insureds’ complaints effectively and on time, Insurance E-Application System has been established within The Undersecretariat of Treasury General Directorate of Insurance. Republic Of Turkey Ministry Of Customs And Trade (GTB) The Law 6502 aims to protect consumers by involving bank and insurance contracts under the framework of consumer issues. At the second (Consumer Credit Contracts) and third section (Housing Finance) of the Law, contracts, pre-contract notification liability, the right of withdrawal, interest rate, use of cancellation rights, default, early payment, issuing insurance and linked credit agreements and other issues are regulated. Other regulation which aimed to protect financial consumer are prepared based on Law 6502 are stated below; 1-Regulation on Distance Contracts For Financial Services, 2-Regulation on Consumer Credit Agreements 3-Regulation on House Finance Agreements 4-Regulation on Arbitration Committees for Consumer 5-Regulation on Unfair Terms in Consumer Agreements The main purpose of these Regulations is to set down the implementation rules, procedures and principles relating to consumer agreements. CMB Regarding fund investors, Communiqué on Principles Of Investment Funds, Communiqué on Portfolio Management Companies and Activities of Such Companies and Communiqué On Portfolio Depository Service And Providers Of Such Service clearly state the responsibilities of the fund manager,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>internal control and inspection units of the management firm and the depository, which are all mechanisms to ensure that the consumer protection is sufficient. In addition, Istanbul Clearing, Settlement and Custody Bank also checks if the fund share price was correctly calculated. Lastly, any complaint letters from investors are evaluated by CMB. Regarding capital markets investors who are the customers of the investment firms Communique on Principles of Establishment and Activities of Investment Firms (III-39.1) and Communique on Principles Regarding The Internal Auditing Systems of Brokerage Houses (Serial: V, No: 68) clearly mandates the responsibilities of investment firm, its managers and dealers, internal control and inspection units to ensure that the consumer protection is sufficient. These Communiques set down principles to conduct business and require sound organisational structures to establish well-functioning governance frameworks for investment firms. The CMB monitors compliance and enforce the rules through fines and sanctions. Additionally, self-regulatory authority of investment firms, Turkish Capital Markets Association (the TCMA), aims to safeguard the prudent and disciplined conduct of business by its members by establishing professional rules. And also resolve financial consumer complaints on investment firms. Highlight main developments since last year’s survey:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>G20/FSB Recommendations</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Progress to date</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web-links to relevant documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://tuketici.gtb.gov.tr/">http://tuketici.gtb.gov.tr/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.tuketiciakademisi.gov.tr">www.tuketiciakademisi.gov.tr</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communiqué on Principles of Establishment and Activities of Investment Firms (III-39.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communiqué on Principles Regarding The Internal Auditing Systems of Brokerage Houses (Serial: V, No: 68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XI. Source of recommendations

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)
FSB 2012: The FSB Report on Increasing the Intensity and Effectiveness of SIFI Supervision (1 November 2012)

XII. List of abbreviations used

Treasury: Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry Undersecretariat of Treasury
BRSA: Banking Regulation and Supervision Agency
CBRT: Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey
CMB: Capital Markets Board of Turkey
SDIF: Savings Deposit Insurance Fund
POA: Public Oversight, Accounting and Auditing Standards Authority
GTB: Republic Of Turkey Ministry of Custom and Trade