



EBA BS 2015 391rev1

EBA Staff

27-28 October 2015

Location: London

EBA Board of Supervisors – Final Minutes

Agenda item 1.: Welcome, Approval of Agenda and Minutes

1. The Chairperson informed of changes to the BoS membership of the Danish Finanstilsynet (new member, Mr Jesper Berg), the Bulgarian National Bank (new member, Mr Dimitar Kostov), the Central Bank of Ireland (new high-level alternate, Mr Gerry Cross) and the Liechtenstein's Financial Market Authority (new Observer, Mr Heinz Konzett).
2. The Board of Supervisors (BoS) adopted the meeting's draft agenda and approved the minutes of the meeting of 08 September 2015.
3. The Chairperson informed that the Czech National Bank had kindly offered to host the BoS Away Day on 07-08 July 2016 in Prague.
4. The Executive Director invited BoS members to put forward their candidacies for the Advisory Committee on Conflicts of Interest (ACCI), a body under the EBA's Conflict of Interest Policy.

Agenda item 2.: Update on Risks and Vulnerabilities

5. The EBA Director of Oversight updated the BoS on the risks and vulnerabilities of the EU banking sector. He focused on, inter alia, capital evolution, asset quality, profitability and funding market developments. He referred to the developments on conduct and litigation risk, and noted the industry concerns on the regulatory and legal environment. He mentioned the currently observed contagion trends from China to emerging markets via commodities trade, noting the systemic risks of commodity and energy exposures.
 6. The SCOP Chair presented a letter to the BoS, noting that the most relevant issues had been appearing recurrently in the past. Amongst other, he mentioned the issue of business models and profitability together with the current low interest rate environment. On the developments in China, he highlighted various channels of potential impact on Europe and its banking sector: direct bank exposures, financial markets and the macroeconomic channel.
-

7. Members discussed the trends presented. One member called for a better understanding of the combined effects of all the regulatory changes and argued that supervisors should be better prepared to explain the changes yet to come. The challenges at the macro prudential level of the regional differences in the housing market both within and between countries were also discussed.
8. The Commission representative noted the importance of getting regulation right and referred to the Commission's Call for Evidence issued on 30 September 2015 on the EU regulatory framework for financial services, aimed at obtaining a clearer understanding of the interaction of the individual rules and cumulative impact of the legislation as a whole including potential overlaps, inconsistencies and gaps.
9. The Chairperson wrapped up the discussion by mentioning two areas of criticism: a) the uncertainty caused by the regulatory changes yet to come, and b) the effects of regulation on the competitive position of EU banks vis-à-vis US banks. On the first area, he deemed necessary to distinguish between reforms close to being finalised and agreed by the G20 in 2009 and possible new requirements. On the second area, he argued that it was difficult to believe that US banks were gaining market share as a result of the regulatory environment in the EU, but argued for identifying whether the allegations had any substance.
10. The EBA Director of Oversight informed the BoS that the Transparency Report would be published on 24 November 2015 and that the data contained therein would be used for the annual Risk Assessment Report due in mid-December 2015.

Agenda item 3.: Business Plan for EBA Training Activities 2016-2018

11. The Chairperson presented a business plan on the proposed training activities for the period 2016-2018 following the discussion at the BoS away day meeting on 9-10 July 2015. The business plan revolved around three main ideas in order to develop a common training framework for supervisors and resolutions experts in the EU: a) a core curriculum to promote convergence with a possible certification system, including a summer school for managers; b) a partnership with European and national initiatives which would help deliver efficiency gains in using existing training resources (human and financial); and c) providing online training with a single market perspective. He explained that the EBA, together with the European University Institute (EUI), had developed a pilot online training module on recovery plans, which had been successfully tested with staff of competent authorities (CAs). An estimated budget, including dedicated staff, was also presented.
12. Members praised the idea of developing an EBA-based training hub in partnership with and supporting national initiatives. In particular they viewed very positively the emphasis on online training tools and considered that the EBA was well placed to pull together synergies with national initiatives (avoiding however possible overlaps) as well as to design an EU-wide core curriculum.

13. Some members deemed the financial scenarios and projections as too optimistic and asked the EBA to review them. They asked, amongst other things, to find more synergies with other initiatives and to consider the number and range of on-site seminars as a means to possibly achieve further budget savings. Members also showed concerns on the impact of increasing fixed costs given the budget constraints faced by the EBA, and asked whether a possible change in the ESAs' future financial arrangements, as proposed by the Commission, could have an impact on this training initiative. Having this in mind, members considered that the project should be subject to future revisions based both on performance and on financial and human resources availability.
14. The EBA Director of Oversight opined that indeed the core curriculum would require an initial investment with an impact on fixed costs although it could be done rather efficiently with costs savings in the medium term for national authorities. In response to concerns on possible overlaps, he noted that the EBA's proposal was unique in that it was EU-specific and enabled direct interaction among participants.
15. The Commission representative noted that the training initiative should be framed within the current ESAs financial arrangements. He also asked the EBA to liaise with DG FISMA services on the discussion of the training proposal.

Conclusion

16. The Management Board would be involved in the revision of the financial aspects; further investigation would be carried out regarding the possible partnership with other initiatives.

Agenda item 4.: EBA's Opinion on Suitability Requirements for Key Function Holders and Cooperation between Competent Authorities on Suitability Assessments

17. The Executive Director presented a draft Opinion, following the discussion on the adoption of the Peer Review Report on the EBA Guidelines on the assessment of the suitability of members of the management body and key function holders (EBA/GL/2012/06) at the BoS meeting of 16-17 June 2015. The draft Opinion contained various proposals addressed to the European Commission to consider changes to the Capital Requirements Directive (CRDIV), notably a) on the clarification of the definition of key function holder in credit institutions, and b) on greater cooperation between CAs to exchange any information relevant for the performance of a suitability assessment.
18. Members opined that there was not a clear distinction of the scope for the assessment of suitability of key function holders between institutions and CAs. They considered that CAs' assessments should focus on a well-defined number of key function holders, in particular fit-and-proper assessment of Board members, and have regard to the Solvency II Directive.
19. They disagreed with the idea that the EBA be mandated to develop a draft regulatory technical standards (RTS) to define a list of 'key functions' or the processes for the determination of key function holders and key functions with specific importance to the sound and prudent

management of a credit institution. Furthermore, members viewed that the principle of proportionality was not adequately addressed in the proposal and asked the EBA to strengthen it, e.g. with regard to small subsidiaries and the withdrawal of an institution's authorisation.

Conclusion

20. The draft Opinion would be amended in light of the comments by the BoS and tabled at a future BoS meeting. The Standing Committee on Regulation and Policy (SCRePol) would be involved to assess different policy options.

Agenda item 5.: Draft Terms of Reference and Timeline of next Peer Review

21. The Executive Director introduced the draft terms of reference and the timeline to carry out the next peer review on the ITS on supervisory reporting requirements, as approved by the Review Panel. He clarified that the SSM would be considered as a CA under this peer review.

22. The BoS supported the draft. It was requested to define what was meant by quality assurance of CAs processes. Furthermore, a clarification was sought that the peer review should only concern data collected by CAs in their capacity as competent authorities for banking supervision and not where they would exercise functions in a different capacity.

23. Some members supported the exclusion of ad hoc information requests by CAs from the Peer Review, whilst noting that the Peer Review could cover the information regularly requested by CAs.

24. On the timeline, there was a request to adjust it to take into consideration the reporting calendar and the resulting workload of CAs.

Conclusion

25. The BoS approved the draft Terms of Reference and timeline with the changes suggested.

Agenda item 6.: Draft Final Report on the Use of Allowances

26. The EBA Director of Regulation introduced the report describing the measures adopted by CAs to ensure the observance by credit institutions of the findings reflected in the EBA's Opinion on the principles on remuneration policies of credit institutions and investment firms and the use of allowances of 15 October 2014.

27. The BoS supported the content of the report and its publication and further transmission to the European Commission.

Conclusion

28. The BoS adopted the report. Members were invited to send drafting suggestions further to which the report would be published and transmitted to the European Commission.

Agenda item 7.: Draft Final Report on Approved Higher Ratios for Variable Remuneration

29. The EBA staff presented a draft report based on the information submitted by CAs on the approval by institutions of higher ratios than 100% for variable remuneration of identified staff.

30. The BoS supported the content of the report. Some members noted some minor inaccuracies with some figures relative to some countries and suggested deleting the number of staff from figure 1. One member showed concerns that the bonus cap could reduce the cost flexibility of banks.

Conclusion

31. The BoS adopted the report which would be adjusted and submitted for information to the BoS before publication and transmission to the European Commission.

Agenda item 8.: Discussion on IT Strategy

32. The EBA's Head of IT gave an overview of the IT strategy for the period 2015-2017. The three main objectives of the strategy would be a) to further optimise the implemented IT Solutions, b) to promote standardisation in the EU in terms of data exchange, data collection and regulatory reporting, and c) to optimise and standardise the IT processes for governance, program and project management. He explained that the implementation of the IT strategy relied entirely on the EBA's budget.

33. Members agreed with the IT strategy. Some expressed their concerns on the impact that further cuts to the EBA's budget could have on it. The Executive Director explained that in that case, the strategy would have to be revisited to adjust it to the new financial scenario, noting however that it was not subject to exchange rate risks since IT costs were based in Euros.

34. There were also questions on the implications for CAs of the different activities envisaged in the strategy, most notably on data exchange and collection, and on the lessons learnt so far. The Executive Director explained that the EBA aimed for consolidation, standardisation and optimisation of data reporting systems, and that advanced planning should underpin better supervisory reporting compliance outcomes.

35. Finally, the Executive Director mentioned the two major IT projects going forward, namely the design and adoption of a document management system (DMS), and the improvement of analytical capabilities to reduce the number of ad-hoc data requests.

Conclusion

36. The BoS approved the IT Strategy 2015-2017 and delegated on the Management Board the approval for the implementation of individual projects (Project Briefs and Project Charters).

Agenda item 9.: 2016 EU-wide Stress Test – Methodology

37. The EBA Director of Oversight introduced the discussion on the draft methodology and templates that would be applicable to the 2016 EU-wide stress test; they would form the basis for discussions with industry if adopted by the BoS. He asked the BoS to approve the final sample of banks further to the discussion at the meeting on 08 September 2015 and taking into account the approval by the SSM Supervisory Board of the SSM sample. He noted three main aspects for discussion: the treatment of old defaulted assets; the approach to adjustments of cost and income items for non-recurring events (“one-off costs”); and the different options for calculating conduct risk floors.
38. Members supported the final sample presented. They also agreed with the approach presented on old defaulted assets, and some noted that it was necessary to have a transparent, credible approach to avoid divergences. There was support for the publication of coverage ratios.
39. Members broadly agreed with the approach to one-off costs. One member considered that the methodological note should only take into consideration those which had actually occurred. Another suggested an alternative approach whereby one-off costs would be extended to future events for which decisions had been already adopted; however, this was not deemed appropriate due to negative experience in the past.
40. On conduct risk floors, members expressed diverging views on their preference with the options presented, with a majority supporting the options of floors calculated either based on all historical losses or for new non-material conduct risk events only. They also opined it would be necessary to go out for discussion with the industry with just one option (flagged as option b) in the cover note). One member favoured a different quantitative approach to the calculation of conduct risk floors while taking into account historical losses; others supported this option although considered that further elaboration was needed.
41. One member considered that a review of the calibration was necessary for net interest income.
42. On the proposed exclusion of insurance activities from the balance sheet and the revenues and costs side of the profits and losses, one member disagreed with it and suggested instead a treatment for holdings consolidated through the equity method (stressing the projections of income and recognising the profit or loss at least for the share that could be distributed to the bank through dividend) and for non-consolidated holdings (stressing the projections of dividend). Members supported this approach.

Conclusion

43. The BoS approved the sample of banks and the templates. The draft methodology note would be amended in view of the comments raised on the treatment of one-off costs, calculation of conduct risk floors and treatment of income from insurance subsidiaries. The revised version would be circulated to the BoS for information before its publication.
44. The BoS also agreed to a preliminary discussion of the narrative of stress test scenarios at its meeting on 08-09 December 2015; a final decision would be expected in early 2016.

Agenda item 10.: EBA Report on Investment Firms

45. The EBA Director of Regulation introduced the report on investment firms, drawn up by a project team composed of EBA and ESMA members in response to the Commission's call for advice to analyse whether the prudential requirements applicable to investment firms as laid down in the CRR and in the CRD were appropriate or should be modified. She explained the main recommendations addressed to the Commission, inter alia the adoption of measures for a simpler, more proportionate and risk sensitive categorisation of investment firms.
46. The BoS adopted the report and considered that the recommendations addressed the main prudential issues of investment firms. A suggestion to retain the flexibility of Pillar 2 was made, as well as to conduct more work in order to further substantiate any differentiation in the prudential approach between so-called "non-systemic" investment firms, and very small firms with non-interconnected services and not holding client money. One member did not agree with the recommendation on providing further definition and harmonisation of the treatment of holdings of client money and securities, and considered that the report should not go beyond a mere statement that the holding of client money is something genuine to investment firms.
47. The Commission representative confirmed the Commission's intention to issue to the EBA a second call for advice for recommendations on the prudential regime of investment firms. He confirmed too that the Commission services were looking into the possible extension of the waiver for commodity trading firms.

Conclusion

48. The report would be adjusted in light of the comments and circulated to the BoS for a fatal-flaw check before its publication and transmission to the European Commission.

Agenda item 11.: Net Stable Funding Ratio (NSFR) Draft Report

49. The EBA Director of Regulation presented the NSFR draft report, based on December 2014 data, and ahead of the discussion for approval of the final report at the BoS meeting on 08-09 December 2015. The EBA staff introduced the main findings of the draft report and referred to the main concerns expressed by the industry at the public hearing on 15 October 2015, e.g. impact on financial markets and treatment of some specific business models like trade finance.

50. Members agreed with the list of findings included in the draft report. Some asked to be cautious with the wording of some conclusions, particularly in the context of the impact on lending and on financial markets, on the database used as well as when referring to the shortfall observed.
51. Concerning the principle of proportionality, they cautioned against providing for fewer requirements in the case of small institutions, notably if done based only on their size. But they were also of the view that a proportionate treatment in terms of reporting frequency and granularity could be considered.
52. On the policy recommendations included in the draft report, members viewed that they should be as consistent as possible with the Basel NSFR standard, and that any deviations should be based on EU specificities, notably on trade finance, and thoroughly justified.
53. One member asked for caution in the application of the NSFR at the individual level, as no impact assessment had been conducted at this level and breaches in times of stress might be appropriate under certain circumstances.
54. The ESRB representative confirmed that the ESRB was looking at the NSFR as a tool to address macroprudential risks.

Conclusion

55. The EBA took note of the comments, notably the wording concerning the conclusions, the deviations from the Basel NSFR standard on trade finance, and on proportionality.

Agenda item 12.: Future of IRB Models

56. The Chairperson presented a draft follow-up report to the “Discussion Paper on the future of the IRB”, which included, amongst other, the sequence of next steps and a time plan for regulatory deliverables. He also presented a draft Opinion, addressed to CAs, which intended to clarify how to deal with the implementation of the regulatory review of the IRB Approach; inter alia, the draft Opinion suggested leaving some flexibility to CAs to agree with institutions on the implementation timelines, depending on their specific situation. The Chairperson noted that an important aspect to take into account was the alignment and coordination with the BCBS’ work on IRB approach, and in particular the overlapping with some of the EBA’s work and the need therefore to address it.
57. The BoS supported broadly both the draft report and draft Opinion and made some comments for consideration for the final report and Opinion. In particular, members considered that the timelines were too ambitious, although noted that they were also dependent on the pace of work by the BCBS and should therefore be reassessed at the BoS meeting of 08-09 December 2015. Some members also viewed that the EBA should start as soon as possible work in some areas, e.g. definition of default, and then reassess should possible misalignments with the BCBS work appear.

58. On the hybrid approach, a few members noted that the EBA should start considering an EU stance as the BCBS stood ready to make recommendations. Members also opined that the BoS should soon agree on areas not subject to modelling.

59. Members discussed at length on the issue of modellability and floors. They deemed crucial the appropriate design of models and their use by institutions, for which the role of CAs when approving them was fundamental. As a means to address some of the problems with models, some members opined that the use of floors for certain class of assets could be a good, quick solution, and that the idea of using them as a temporary backstop could be worth exploring. But the opinions of members in this respect diverged.

Conclusion

60. The BoS in principle supported the content of the draft report and draft opinion, but agreed that the wording on modellability would be revisited after the decisions of the Basel Committee. Noting divergences between the feedback received yet the need to react quickly on some matters, the proposed timeline would be reconsidered. Both the report and the Opinion would be tabled at the BoS meeting of 08-09 December 2015 for adoption.

Agenda item 13.: Final Report on Benchmarking of Scenarios in Recovery Plans

61. The EBA Director of Oversight presented the third comparative analysis on recovery plans in the EU. He explained that the focus was on the recovery plan scenarios analysed for the 19 European cross-border banking groups with parents institutions in 10 countries included in the report.

62. Members welcomed the report. Some considered that there was a need to distinguish between recovery plans developed before and after the entry into force of the BRRD. Suggestions were also made on analysing not only group recovery plans but also individual recovery plans.

63. A few clarifications on the scope and content of the report for publication were requested, e.g. on the importance of recovery plans for the design and creation of resolution plans, that the report only covered one component of recovery plans and that the report did not provide a summary of the assessment conducted by CAs.

Conclusion

64. A revised version of the report with the changes suggested would be submitted to the BoS for approval by written procedure before publication.

Agenda item 14.: Discussion on EBA's Possible Way Forward on Options and National Discretions

65. The Chairperson explained that, as part of its tasks, the EBA was assessing the divergences in the regulatory framework and supervisory practices in the EU; he recalled that an ITS on supervisory

disclosure had been adopted to this effect in June 2014. In particular, the EBA was looking at how Member States were exercising the options and discretions provided for in both the CRDIV and the CRR, and the discrepancies and implications thereof. He noted that the SSM was also carrying out work aimed at agreeing a joint exercise of the options and discretions by the SSM in line with its founding Regulation. The outcome of such exercise would be subject to public consultation in the coming weeks. The BoS was asked to agree on an update of the ITS, also moving from a mere transparency exercise to a more in-depth exercise on convergences and divergences of national practices, thus catching all relevant options and discretions to allow for further analyses.

66. Members broadly agreed with the EBA's approach on this issue. They had comments on the paper presented and suggested that technical details should be reviewed with the relevant EBA subgroups. With some exceptions, many members considered that it was a good moment to push for further harmonisation, possibly including those in the BRRD, although cautioned that a thorough analysis had to be conducted to assess each of them in their own merits. Also noted that many options and discretions were well anchored in national laws and thus the broad implications had to be considered.

67. Another member considered that in carrying out this exercise, the EBA had to be cautious to clearly differentiate between transposition of EU law and the existence of actual options and discretions.

68. The Commission representative supported the EBA's work on this matter and asked for clarity on the way forward and whether it would take the form of a peer review or a report addressed to the Commission.

Conclusion

69. The BoS agreed on the revision of the ITS on supervisory disclosure by updating the list of national options and discretions so that future discussions could focus on those with a higher impact on comparability. On case-by-case options, it was agreed that they would not be included in the ITS but included in the EBA's work for further analysis on their impact. The BoS would continue discussing on the way forward.

Agenda item 15.: Final Report on MREL Quantitative Impact Study (internal report)

70. The Chairperson asked the BoS whether it could agree to the publication of a version of the MREL quantitative impact study (QIS), which could inform the EU industry of the summary of the analysis performed, similar to that which was being proposed by the BCBS with the TLAC QIS public report and in line with what was announced by the EBA in the published RTS on MREL. He explained that the Resolution Committee (ResCo) had opposed such a possibility. The Chair of ResCo noted that, amongst other reasons, caution was required since the assumptions made in the QIS may not necessarily reflect resolution authorities' decisions when calibrating the MREL and could therefore pre-empt those decisions.

71. The Chairperson then proposed a compromise whereby a sanitised version of the QIS internal report would be published with ResCo being consulted beforehand. He noted that the BoS adoption of the RTS on MREL could justify such a publication, and recalled that Article 45(19) BRRD required the publication of an impact assessment by October 2016 although given the delay by many Member States to implement the BRRD a postponement could be expected. The EBA staff presented the main conclusions of the MREL QIS and the content of a possible published version.
72. A large majority of members viewed that it was not the right moment to publish even a sanitised version of the MREL QIS. They expressed multiple reasons, inter alia, the accuracy of the assumptions and scenarios presented in the QIS, and the need to analyse the impact of the subordination which could give rise to questions by the markets. It was also held too premature to publish anything given that the final calibration of the MREL by Resolutions Authorities had not yet been finalised and the results of the QIS on TLAC were not yet known. Another member considered that the EU's state aid rules and the bail-in rules were not totally aligned and this called for extra caution.
73. A few members viewed however that it would be positive to publish a sanitised version, partly as a transparency exercise towards the markets, and suggested that the QIS be referred to as a working document rather than a final one. Also, they held that the sample of banks should be widened, and that the QIS should not only focus on the consolidated level. Other members proposed a compromise solution addressing the concerns showed by many members on the shortfalls.
74. The Commission representative noted that the Commission had not yet endorsed the EBA's final RTS on MREL, and that it was an area subject to some uncertainty given the unknown response, at present, by the EU to the finalisation of TLAC.

Conclusion

75. The BoS rejected the possibility of publishing a version of the MREL QIS. The EBA would prepare a narrative to explain the reasons thereof in particular in view of the BCBS publishing the TLAC results.

Agenda item 16.: Draft Consultation Paper on ITS on Common procedures, Forms and Templates for the Consultation Process between relevant Competent Authorities on Acquisitions and Increases in Qualifying Holdings

76. The EBA staff presented a draft consultation paper on ITS which further developed the requirements of the CRDIV regarding the consultation between CAs when carrying out an assessment of an acquisition of a qualifying holding in a credit institution by an acquirer being a relevant financial sector entity authorised in another Member State or in a sector other than that

in which the acquisition was proposed, the parent undertaking of such an entity or a person controlling such an entity.

77. One member objected to the provisions which would make the request of certain information mandatory, although this did not gain support among other members.

Conclusion

78. The BoS endorsed the consultation paper for publication.

Agenda item 17.: Draft Consultation Paper on Guidelines on DGS Stress Testing

79. The EBA staff introduced a draft consultation paper on own-initiative Guidelines on the content of stress tests for deposit guarantee schemes (DGS) and presented both the timelines in the run up to the first peer review on their results in 2020 and the core content of that first peer review.

80. The BoS supported the draft but requested some changes, namely: a) the introduction of the requirement of objectivity in the definition of assumptions for the stress test, the running of the test and the elaboration of unbiased conclusions for all participants; b) to tweak the question on temporary high balances to reflect the differences between applicable systems and between their ex-ante calculation, and the assessment of arrangements in place for their identification upon failure; and c) to strengthen the question on the limited cross-border tests in order to obtain more information on whether fully-fledged cross border tests would be necessary.

Conclusion

81. The BoS endorsed the consultation paper for publication with the comments made by members.

Agenda item 18.: Draft Consultation Paper on Guidelines on Treatment of CVA Risk under SREP

82. The EBA staff presented the draft consultation paper on guidelines on treatment of CVA risk under SREP setting out the common approach to the determination of relevance of CVA risk, the assessment of material CVA risk under SREP, the assessment of the adequacy of own funds to cover material CVA risk, and the determination of additional own funds requirements where the risk would not be adequately covered by the minimum own fund requirements.

83. Members expressed a strong support to the draft.

84. A few comments were made. In particular, one member showed his concern with the approach taken to address via guidelines issues that should be addressed in the level 1 text. Furthermore, that member cautioned against the existence of some automatism in the application of additional own requirements, in particular in paragraph 25 of the draft guidelines that should be properly addressed. With regard to the algorithm to calculate the supervisory benchmark, it was

noted that it was a matter still under discussion in the BCBS. Further, it was noted that the unintended consequences of including sovereign exposures had not been properly assessed.

85. A suggestion was made to align the templates for the monitoring of CVA risk with those of the BCBS. Also, to remove some institutions from the list of banks to be included in the scope of the qualitative impact study (QIS) to calibrate the threshold values.

Conclusion

86. The BoS agreed to publish the consultation paper addressing the concerns regarding paragraph 25 and revising the list of institutions to be included in the QIS based on the comments received. The draft would be recirculated to the BoS before its publication.

Agenda item 19.: Reports from Standing Committees

87. The BoS took note of the Standing Committees reports.

88. Following a request by the Standing Committee on Oversight Practices (SCOP), the BoS agreed to mandate SCOP to develop guidelines, addressed to CAs, specifying what information institutions should include in their ICAAP (Internal Capital Adequacy Assessment Process) and ILAAP (Internal Liquidity Adequacy Assessment Process) submissions to CAs. The consultation paper would soon be submitted to the BoS.

Agenda item 20.: AoB

89. The SCOP Chair informed that, in accordance with the EBA's Work Programme, SCOP would start developing Guidelines on IT risk supervision.

90. The Chairperson informed the BoS that, noting differences across jurisdictions on the approach towards the maximum distributable amount (MDA) provisions under the CRDIV, the EBA would carry out some work to ensure consistency in their interpretation. To this effect, the EBA would table a proposal for adoption at the BoS meeting of 08-09 December 2015.

END OF MEETING

Andrea Enria

Chairperson

Participants at the Board of Supervisors' meeting

27-28 October 2015, London

Chairperson: Andrea Enria

<u>Country</u>	<u>Voting Member/Alternate</u> ¹	<u>Representative NCB</u>
1. Austria	- ²	Michael Boss
2. Belgium	Jo Swyngedouw ³	
3. Bulgaria	-	
4. Croatia	Damir Odak	
5. Cyprus	Argyro Procopiou	
6. Czech Republic	David Rozumek	
7. Denmark	Jesper Berg	Peter E. Storgaard
8. Estonia	- ⁴	Indrek Saapar
9. Finland	Anneli Tuominen	Kimmo Virolainen
10. France	E. Fernández-Bollo/Frédéric Visnovsky	
11. Germany	Raimund Roeseler	Karlheinz Walch
12. Greece	Sissy Papagiannidi/K.Flesiopoulou	
13. Hungary	Gábor Gyura	
14. Ireland	Gerry Cross	
15. Italy	Andrea Pilati	
16. Latvia	Kristaps Zakulis	Vita Pilsuma
17. Lithuania	Renata Bagdonienė	
18. Luxembourg	Christiane Campill	Norbert Goffinet
19. Malta	Raymond Vella	Alexander Demarco
20. Netherlands	Jan Sijbrand/Olaf Sleijpen	
21. Poland	Andrzej Reich	Maciej Brzozowski
22. Portugal	Pedro Duarte Neves/M.Adelaide Cavaleiro	
23. Romania	Nicolae Cinteza	
24. Slovakia	Vladimír Dvořáček	
25. Slovenia	Miha Kristl	
26. Spain	Fernando Vargas/Cristina Iglesias-Sarria	
27. Sweden	Uldis Cerps	Olof Sandstedt
28. UK	Andrew Bailey/Sasha Mills	Fiona Mann

¹ Accompanying experts: Ingeborg Stuhlbacher (Austrian Finanzmarktaufsicht); Dries Cools (National Bank of Belgium); Marek Sokol (Czech Česká Národní Banka); Julia Blunck (BaFin); Mary Burke (Central Bank of Ireland); Maurizio Trapanese (Banca d'Italia); Olena Loboiko (De Nederlandsche Bank); Damjana Igljč (Národná Banka Slovenska); Mei Jie, Gurmaj Dhillon and Christine Boykiw (UK's Prudential Regulation Authority)

² Represented by Eva Désirée Lembeck-Kapfer

³ The National Bank of Belgium was represented on Tuesday 27 October by Jürgen Janssens

⁴ Represented by Ilja Hlebov

<u>Country</u>	<u>Observer</u> ⁵
1. Iceland	Jon Thor Sturluson
2. Liechtenstein	Johannes Küng
3. Norway	Emil Steffensen

<u>Non-voting Members</u>	<u>Representative</u>
1. SSM	Korbinian Ibel ⁶
2. European Commission	Dominique Thienpont
3. EIOPA	⁷
4. ESMA	Verena Ross
5. ESRB	⁸

<u>Observer</u>	<u>Representative</u>
1. SRB	Dominique Laboureix

EBA Staff

Executive Director	Adam Farkas
Director of Oversight	Piers Haben
Director of Regulation	Isabelle Vaillant

Lars Overby; Delphine Reymondon; Slavka Eley; Corinne Kaufman; Jonathan Overett Somnier; Luis del Olmo; Philippe Allard; Mira Lamriben; Emilian Dima; Charles Canonne; Santiago Barón-Escámez

⁵ Representatives from central banks: Jonas Thordarson (Central Bank of Iceland); Sindre Weme (Norges Bank);

⁶ Accompanied by Sergio Nicoletti Altamari (ECB)

⁷ Represented by Manuela Zweimüller

⁸ Represented by Tuomas Peltonen