

EBA MB 2026 120 rev. 1

Management Board

23 June 2026 / 13:00 – 17:15

Location: teleconference

EBA Regular Use

Management Board

Minutes of the conference call on 23 June 2026

Agenda item 1: Welcome and approval of the agenda (for decision)

1. The EBA Chair welcomed the Members of the Management Board (MB). He reminded the Members of the conflict-of-interest policy requirements and asked them whether any of them considered themselves as being in a conflict. No Member declared a conflict of interest.
2. The Chair welcomed two new Alternates representing Hungary – Mr Norbert Izer and Germany – Mr Adam Ketessidis.
3. The Chair informed that the Minutes of the 7 April MB conference call were approved in the written procedure and the Minutes of the 13 May MB meeting were circulated for comments in writing.
4. The Chair asked the Members if they had any comments on the agenda and the Members did not raise any comments.

Conclusion

5. The MB approved the agenda of the conference call by consensus.

Agenda item 2: Implementation of TFE Recommendations (for discussion)

6. The Chair introduced the item by noting that as in the last BoS and MB meetings this point of the agenda provided for an overview of the current progress on different deliverables under the TFE recommendations.
 7. The EBA Acting Head of Governance and External Affairs Unit (GEA) summarised the progress of implementation by deliverables and reminded the Members of the EBA dedicated website for monitoring of the implementation of the TFE Recommendations. She outlined planned deliverables for the second half of 2026 and explained that the EBA has shared a general presentation for outreach on the TFE for the MB's use. Furthermore,
-

The EBA has also been facilitating media outreach by sharing with national press officers, in the run up to EBA publications, the EBA press release and deliverable under embargo, in parallel to the EBA press office's own.

8. The Chair informed Members of the finalisation of the Report on stacking orders. The representative of the European Commission (EC) welcomed the EBA's contribution and noted that it would be taken into account in the Commission's upcoming consultation.
9. Two Members reflected on recent discussions regarding SNCI at various technical levels, observing that there could be scope for enhanced coordination among European institutions on this topic. One Member emphasised the importance of clearly communicating the distinct roles and responsibilities of the different institutions to a broader audience. In particular, the Member highlighted the EBA's role in drafting regulation applicable across all 27 EU Member States, as compared to the ECB's role within the EU framework.
10. The Chair acknowledged the comments and indicated that the issues raised would be further discussed during the EBA Board of Supervisors (BoS) Strategy Day in July 2026.
11. Updates on individual Recommendations followed.
12. With regard to Recommendation 3 on Consolidated Single Rulebook, the Acting Head of Legal noted that over recent years, the EBA has updated and improved the Interactive Single Rulebook (ISRB), with the objective of providing a comprehensive presentation of the relevant Union banking legislation under the EBA's remit and the related EBA regulatory products, such as Technical Standards (TS), Guidelines (GL) and Q&As. Considering the TFE Recommendation, the EBA is planning to focus on five key components of the ISRB, in particular to improve the ISRB and make it more user friendly; to efficiently display GLs and Reporting and Transparency Q&As; to increase interoperability between outward facing displays and internal systems, and to provide a more efficient search engine.
13. The EBA Legal Expert continued by describing to the Members how the EBA website currently provided two complementary views of the Consolidated Single Rulebook: a full overview, divided by topic, of the legal texts drafted the EBA (including status and versions) and an interactive navigation of Level 1 acts, linking each provision to its mandated Level 2 and Level 3 measures and Q&As. She explained that the current tool relied heavily on manual updates and that it has reached its limits. In the first step, the EBA aims at ensuring that the ISRB is fully up to date (e.g. new Q&As, Level 1 amendments, Level 2 measures in force); the legal text should be directly embedded rather than linking to EUR-Lex, and the ISRB automatically synchronized with EUR-Lex content and related materials. She presented several additional areas for improvement, namely a dedicated portal for Competent Authorities (CAs) to submit comply or explain forms for EBA Guidelines, fully interconnected with an internal monitoring system and automatically

generating and publishing compliance reports on the EBA website; the achievement of full interoperability between outward-facing displays and internal systems (internal Q&A tool, website Q&A tool, ISRB). The Legal Expert concluded by specifying that as a priority, the EBA would ensure that Level 2/3 acts and Q&As which were published but were overwritten by the 2025 release will be linked to the ISRB; that applicability of older texts (e.g. CEBS Guidelines) would be reviewed, and the search function through ISRB and thematic pages improved. These improvements would be deployed by the end of 2026.

14. The Chair highlighted the transparency aspect of the work.
15. The Members supported the work. One Member requested regular updates to both the MB and the BoS, particularly regarding any IT-related developments and associated budget implications. Another Member queried how artificial intelligence (AI) tools were being integrated into the work and whether the EBA was considering developing its own AI tool, as was the case in some CAs. One Member welcomed the initiative and the possibility of providing an update to the BoS but noted that the proposed improvements could be seen as part of expected developments rather than a significant efficiency gain. Finally, one Member suggested incorporating relevant Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) case law, noting that leveraging AI-based tools to identify and map the relevance of judgments to specific policy areas or Single Rulebook provisions could significantly enhance legal certainty and practical usability.
16. On Recommendation 14 on Supervisory Platforms, the EBA Head of Supervisory Review, Resolution and Recovery Unit (SRRR) referred to the discussion at the BoS and MB meetings earlier in 2026 and reminded the Members of the approach for the organization of the Pilot cases with four banking groups that have been selected by the EBA for workshop meetings. Two workshops took place already and the Head of SRRR summarised initial takeaways related to three areas – (i) planning and execution of supervisory/resolution activities; (ii) information and data requests, and (iii) application of measures (capital, resolution, buffers). He said that bank representatives emphasised complexity of the EU framework and need of interactions with many different authorities. In the area of (i) planning and execution of supervisory/resolution activities, they proposed to develop a joint calendar of supervisory/resolution activities to avoid overlaps in on-site missions and parallel missions at the same time and to align, ex ante, supervisory/resolution activities and organisation of joint work. At the workshops, CAs discussed how to efficiently identify shared priorities, synergies and planned activities between authorities and whether there was room to enhance coordination across authorities through existing structures (including supervisory colleges) and through existing platforms and tools. With regard to the area of (ii) information and data requests, banks noted a multitude of sometimes overlapping information and data requests and asked for enhanced coordination of information and data requests; strengthening of the ‘re-use first principle’, and potential use of data sharing platform for selected topics of common interest. In this regard, the Head of SRRR clarified that some of these points were

linked to the ongoing EBA work on the implementation of TFE Recommendations 6 and 7, in particular through the upcoming public repository of the data requests and development of common guidelines on making and designing data requests by competent and resolution authorities. Nevertheless, open questions were discussed with the CAs at the workshops and the Head of SRRR said that the EBA would focus on pragmatic and practical solutions, involvement of existing structures; transparency on planned requests and flexibility for ad hoc and a need for additional IT platforms. Finally, on the area of the (iii) application of measures, banks suggested to complement the work on the instruments (simplification of the capital stack) with the integrated cooperation among (macro- and micro-prudential and resolution) authorities. They highlighted the need for i) enhanced coordination and information exchange between authorities for setting measures; ii) centralised oversight of the overall capital stack, and iii) exploring the use of single stress test for setting P2G and buffers. While the interconnections with the revised SREP GL and the stacking order report were further investigated, the EBA discussed with the CAs at the workshops the information exchange between authorities on the application of measures and the underlying risk drivers. Whereas there was room to have a more integrated perspective, CAs underlined the need to take into account the different mandates of the authorities and their necessary independence.

17. The Chair highlighted the constructive nature of the dialogue with banks, noting that the objective was to identify potential improvements. He also underlined that the EBA did not intend to introduce additional bureaucracy or create new processes.
18. Members welcomed the update on the workshops with banks and provided several observations. One Member asked how the EBA distinguished between platform-related activities and supervisory tasks. Another Member suggested that discussions with banks and CAs should ultimately result in a “lessons learned” document. One Member supported continued discussions within the relevant committees and subgroups, emphasising the need to complement the key messages with more detailed practical guidance on how banks’ concerns could be effectively addressed. This would enable a comprehensive assessment of the various initiatives, including their relevance, feasibility (e.g. taking into account existing constraints), and implementation timeline (short- to medium-term). The Member further suggested that, once this phase of work is completed, dedicated feedback could be provided to participating banking groups to help manage expectations regarding the scope and timing of any potential simplification measures. One Member highlighted the good organisation of the workshops and the efficiency of the discussions and asked to keep the solutions efficient without creating new layers of bureaucracy.
19. In response, the Head of SRRR clarified that most of the issues raised by banks were already known to the EBA and that efforts were underway to address them. He noted that, as a first step, the EBA was focusing on supervisory tasks and where the coordination between authorities could be enhanced, and that pragmatic solutions were sought not to

create additional layers of bureaucracy. Afterwards, in a sequential approach the focus would move to the platforms that could support enhanced coordination.

20. The European Commission representative welcomed the timeliness of the work.
21. On Recommendation 18 related to quantitative impact assessment of major regulatory requirements affecting EU banks, the EBA Head of Economic Analysis and Impact Assessment Unit (EAIA) noted that current system suffered from complexity, overlaps and inconsistencies which have been creating additional costs for EU banks reducing their competitiveness and lending capacity. The EBA's proposal was to identify the main inefficiencies overlaps between various requirements by assessing the impact and interaction of the various current regulatory constraints and analytically comparing the EU framework with the relevant major jurisdictions. The work was divided into four separate deliverables: (i) Comparison between the EU and the US going concern regulatory frameworks; (ii) A quantitative impact assessment of major regulatory requirements affecting EU banks; (iii) Analysis of complementarities of various sets of regulatory requirements and the implications of interactions; (iv) Assessment of impact of regulatory changes on competitiveness, via bank lending and the broader macro environment. He summarised the progress on each of these deliverables and said that considering deliverable (i), an EBA note was discussed in two consecutive BoS meetings in March and April 2026. After a round of BoS written comments, final versions of a technical and a non-technical note have been finalised and circulated to the BoS members for their information. On deliverable (ii), work has been ongoing according to schedule. It focused on identification of constraints that were least impactful and could be subject to amendment/ deletion. It covered case studies to identify overlaps in individual versus consolidated requirements, with proposals for simplification. Also, under this deliverable, the EBA also prepared a quantitative analysis for Recommendation 10 on the SNCI regime. The Head of EAIA further continued with the deliverable (iii), a research paper drafted jointly by EBA staff and two renowned academics, which identified the circumstances where different capital and liquidity constraints were binding for the EU banks, has been prepared and presented at internal EBA seminar and a research seminar at the BIS. The next step would be to present the paper as the technical and BoS level. Finally, on the deliverable (iv), the Head of EAIA informed that the work has been ongoing. The EBA developed a macroeconomic model with endogenous banking sector and microprudential parameters, which was designed to serve as a simulation tool to analyse broader impacts of proposed changes in regulatory products, would be presented in a research conference in London in July 2026. After further model development work the plan was to proceed to the BoS towards the end of 2026.
22. Members expressed their general support for the work. One Member proposed expanding deliverable (iii) to also include a resolution dimension. Another Member raised concerns regarding resource implications, recalling the process required to finalise the Report on stacking orders.

23. The EC representative suggested that the EBA should broaden its analysis beyond the impact on banks to consider wider effects on the economy. He also cautioned against direct comparisons between EU and US frameworks, noting that there was a risk of drawing one-sided conclusions that could be counterproductive for future international discussions.
24. The Head of EAIA explained that the team has been relying, to a large extent, on data already collected for other purposes, and that the analysis also fed into other EBA deliverables. He acknowledged the input received from CAs and clarified that, under deliverable (iv), the EBA's analysis covered not only the entire banking sector, but broader economic envisionment via the appropriate transmission channels.
25. The Chair announced that the EBA has prepared Single Market KPIs, which would be presented to the MB and BoS in September. These KPIs would focus on, among other aspects, the contribution of the banking sector to the EU economy, including a comparison between EU and non-EU banks. He also noted that EU-US comparison was a sensitive topic and indicated that the EBA's detailed analysis was intended for internal use only.
26. With regard to the Recommendation 19 on Supervisory Convergence and training, the EBA Legal Officer updated the Members and said that following first presentations on the topic to the February MB and the April BoS, EBA staff have progressed with this work based on the steer received. The EBA i) identified convergence topics (peer reviews and high-priority topics) for 2027, covered in the EBA priorities / work programme for 2027 and discussed in the June BoS, and ii) began further developing a convergence cycle, to be completed by Q4 2026 and starting to be applied Q1 2027. This would enable bottom-up evidence collection and the development of a holistic priorities document for May/June 2027. The Legal Office continued by reminding the Members that with its supervisory convergence framework, the EBA aimed to continue to build a common, effective supervisory culture and approaches across the EU, focused on the homogeneity of the application of rules by all CAs involved; and aligning supervisory practices, tools, methodologies, and judgments across CAs to ensure that financial institutions are overseen in a consistent, comparable, and effective way. There were three key elements of supervisory convergence for CAs - to adhere to common standards and frameworks so CAs apply harmonised rules (e.g. Basel standards, EU CRR/CRD) and interpret them similarly; to achieve consistent supervisory practice leading to comparable supervisory outcomes, and to improve information sharing and cooperation, as well as share best practices. Conversely, the EBA's aim for improved supervisory convergence aimed to help prevent regulatory arbitrage by financial institutions and differences in regulatory / supervisory frameworks being exploited. The Legal Officer explained that the convergence work would be carried out through a predefined cycle based on 4 pillars - risk identification and assessment, planning and prioritisation; execution of convergence activities, and feedback and follow-up. In this context, the EBA would also establish an internal working structure to develop these four

pillars and ensure EBA wide involvement/coordination. He also listed different convergence activities and tools for these activities and added that each chosen convergence topic would be assigned a tool in the EBA Work programme. This has been completed for the 2027 priorities presented during the June 2026 BoS conference call and the EBA was planning to launch its first convergence cycle to be in Q4 2026 / Q1 2027. The Legal Officer then continued by noting that by Q4 2026, the EBA would establish a model for structured evidence collection based on internal/external data and stakeholder input to identify the most impactful supervisory convergence topics, assess them consistently, and prioritise them for action. This would lead to a revised Annual Priorities document for May MB / June BoS which set out the findings of the assessment exercises and proposed which convergence topics to prioritise. He concluded on the convergence framework by announcing that the EBA would present how to measure convergence, reshape EBA and CAs' work and developing ex ante supervisory expectations during upcoming MB meetings in autumn 2026. The Legal Officer then continued by providing an outline of the Supervisory Convergence Handbook to be shared with CAs to provide a comprehensive guide for the different elements of convergence work, with the main purpose to facilitate achieving consistent supervisory outcomes across institutions and supervisors. He concluded by referring to the simplified peer review process with three main elements - replacing methodology and framework decisions with this simplified process overview (by Q3 2026); setting up a peer review network to explain findings and explain upcoming peer reviews and PRC resourcing (by Q3 2026) and establishing upfront communications with CAs in scope of a peer review.

27. The Acting Head of GEA added on training to competent authorities as important dimension of the EBA's work on supervisory convergence. The EBA's training has been supporting capacity-building in the supervisory community. She highlighted the tabled information booklet which gave account of reflections, also with other stakeholders, of how to improve alignment of training with the EBA strategic priorities. The booklet contained recommendations and actionable steps outlining where training could be leveraged to increase the value provided to CAs in the Member States and beyond (e.g. accession countries or EFTA). In the information brochure, the EBA highlighted the recently conducted survey results among CA training coordinators on how they rate the EBA's efforts in this domain. The Acting Head of GEA announced that the EBA was planning, by Q3 2026, to establish a clearer link to the activities stipulated in the Single Programming Document 2027 – 2029 and 2026 Work Programme (e.g., re-organise courses on the EBA Learning Hub and in yearly training plan) and foster regular exchanges with CA training contact points to capture needs better (e.g., pre-registration form, enhanced training needs analysis, share training statistics, regular exchanges between training professionals). Furthermore, by Q1 2027, the EBA was planning to build on its expertise in training and act as good service provider to the community (e.g., service provider for other EU authorities (AMLA, ESMA, EUI)), open up our programme for neighbouring and accession countries, and spotlight EBA priorities through training to onboard CAs to EBA working structures.

28. The Members supported the work. One Member stressed the value in reinforcing both the ex-post dimension; i.e. systematically analysing practices and outcomes, and the ex-ante side, through clearer expectations. The Member mentioned a potential issue in the interaction between different sets of priorities and said that while supervisory convergence priorities were, by nature, more through-the-cycle, supervisory priorities tend to be more point-in-time. This could create some misalignment that should be further discussed. The same Member also asked for a thorough assessment of the current degree of convergence to allow for an informed identification of areas where enhanced harmonization would be most beneficial, including defining ex-ante goals. Other Members highlighted, for the purpose of the training, a need to cooperate with other institutions.
29. The EC representative highlighted the value of the peer reviews, and the EBA's mandate and tools in the areas of intervention and enforcement, noting that further work could be undertaken in this field.
30. In response, the Acting Head of LC provided an overview of the EBA's activities related to the handling of breaches of Union law, as well as the complaints received during the first half of 2026.
31. The Chair added that, as would be discussed further during the forthcoming conference call, the EBA has observed significant improvements following a particular peer review exercise. He also emphasised the EBA's expectation of increased transparency as a result of its ongoing work on supervisory independence.
32. The Chair concluded by acknowledging the Members' comments and indicated that the EBA would continue its work, with further updates to be presented during the BoS conference call in September.

Agenda item 3: Update on the preparation of items for the EBA BoS Strategy Day on 9 July 2026 (for discussion)

33. The Chair reminded the Members of the previous MB discussions and said that the EBA prepared a leaflet to lay out key information about the EBA giving account of its mission/purpose, tasks and positioning the institutional setup. He invited the Members to comment on how these three aspects could be discussed during the EBA BoS Strategy Day.
34. The Acting Head of GEA continued by explaining that the main aim of the leaflet was to provide an accessible and understandable set of information about the EBA as an organization. The leaflet also highlighted the unique membership of the EBA and its priorities in 2027.

35. The Acting Executive Director presented the second tabled documents and explained that for further discussion during the Strategy Day and based on the input from the Members, the EBA also drafted a discussion note on three proposals on (1) roles and responsibilities in the EBA regulatory lifecycle, (2) EBA working structures, (3) charter for EBA products and he briefly summarised these proposals. With regard to the clear roles and responsibilities in the EBA regulatory lifecycle, the EBA was proposing to explicitly mandate some specific steps to foster accountability, quality assurance and the joint supervisory culture. The whole EBA regulatory lifecycle should adhere to a dedicated EBA Risk Appetite and the Charter for EBA Products and in addition, specific actions were to happen during the lifecycle. On the refinement of the EBA's working sub-structures, the Acting Executive Director noted that the last review of EBA working structures took place in 2021. To support consistency, enhance synergies and to better account for the EBA's scope and tasks, especially in the area of payment and innovation, the EBA was proposing review of the mandates of its working sub-structures, transformation of task forces and removal of some sub-structures due to their inactivity. Finally, on the Charter for EBA products, the Acting Executive Director explained that the Charter would lay down principles to guide the EBA's approach to regulation and supervision. It would establish clear principles what constituted an efficient and fit-for-purpose EBA product and helped to align EBA products with EBA objectives, transparency and accountability standards.
36. Members expressed support for the tabled documents. Regarding the leaflet, Members agreed that it should remain high-level and convey simple, accessible messages. One Member emphasised that it should help a wider audience understand and distinguish between the EBA, ESAs, ECB and CAs, including their respective tasks, roles and responsibilities. Another Member suggested incorporating visuals to illustrate both the impact of the EBA's work and the scope of institutions it covered. With regard to the note, Members raised concerns about the review of the EBA's regulatory products. They highlighted that, under the current set-up, co-chairs of working sub-structures have been facing an increasing workload. Members stressed the importance of an effective drafting process for regulatory products, noting that documents should be clear, concise, and efficiency-enhancing, without introducing requirements beyond Level 1. One Member proposed exploring the establishment of an external review panel or, alternatively, making use of the Advisory Committee on Proportionality (ACP) for reviewing regulatory products. On sub-structures, Members called for a more ambitious approach to further evolve the current framework towards a more efficient and integrated model, in line with the spirit of the TFE. In this context, one Member suggested that the EBA could explore merging the existing subgroups on credit risk and model validation to leverage potential synergies. Additionally, the Member proposed expanding the mandate of the operational risk group to include ICT risks, given their growing importance. Finally, one Member suggested sharing all MB proposals on this topic with the BoS during the Strategy Day.

37. The Director of the Prudential Regulation and Supervisory Policy Department (PRSP) noted that ensuring documents remain concise and efficient would require a diligent approach, including the rotation of resources and experts.
38. The Chair took note of Members' comments and agreed that the leaflet should convey simple and clear messages. While he supported considering the ACP as a review panel, he acknowledged that engaging experts to review all regulatory products could prove challenging. He also observed that the proposed changes to the working sub-structures would not significantly alter the current set-up. He confirmed that the EBA would take the discussion into account and submit updated versions of the two documents for further consideration during the Strategy Day.

Agenda item 4: Follow-up peer review on the supervision of creditors' treatment of mortgage borrowers in arrears (for discussion)

39. The EBA Expert introduced the item by reminding the Members that in 2023 the EBA published its peer review on forbearance measures under Art 28 MCD and EBA Guidelines on arrears and foreclosure. In line with the rules set out in the EBA Regulation, two years after (Q1 2026) EBA started the follow-up review. The follow-up review has focused on six areas - Organisational set-up and resources; Compliance with Article 28 MCD and EBA Guidelines; Supervision of creditors' engagement with borrowers; Supervision of creditors' provision of information to borrowers; Supervision of creditors' forbearance measures, and Supervision reflecting risks to borrowers. The Expert also reflected on the methodology and said that the follow-up review focused on those CAs that were originally reviewed where benchmarks were not largely or fully compliant in the 2023 Report so had specific follow-up measures. In addition, all CAs that were not in scope of the 2023 Report were assessed on the follow-up measures addressed to all CAs in the report. She listed preliminary findings on CA-specific follow-up measures as well as preliminary findings on general measures and best practices. The Expert concluded by saying that as a next step, the EBA would launch a written procedure on the approval of the report by the MB in July and subsequently BoS in September with an aim to publish the report by the end of Q3 2026.
40. The Acting Executive Director noted that, for one CA, based on the responses submitted, the EBA had observed improvements compared to practices in 2023.
41. Members expressed support for the work but requested a longer period for submitting written comments, given the summer period. Two Members also sought clarification on the concept of best practices and how they would be supervised.
42. In response, the Expert acknowledged the constraints of the summer period and indicated that the EBA would accommodate the request. She emphasised, however, that the EBA would aim to publish in Q3 2026, or at the latest at the beginning of Q4. She further clarified that the best practices were primarily intended for CAs to consider within their

existing frameworks, and that the EBA assessed these practices based on two criteria: adequacy and effectiveness.

43. The Chair concluded by agreeing to the Members' request for an extended period for written comments.

Agenda item 5: Translation of instructions of ITS on reporting and disclosures – CAs involvement to check quality of translation

44. The EBA Head of Reporting and Transparency Unit (RT) introduced the item by explaining that under the previous process, reporting and Pillar 3 instructions were translated by the EC as part of the adoption of the technical standards and their publication in Official Journal (OJ). Following CRR3, these instructions were no longer published in the OJ but only on the EBA website, and the EC translation support was no longer available. Given the large volume of instructions and the limited EBA budget for professional translation services, AI-generated translations were being used by the EBA, and published with a relevant disclaimer, but recent experience has shown that an AI-only process may create accuracy issues and give way to errors. The Head of RT reflected on the EBA reporting framework and said that for the amending ITS now under consultation, there were over 700 pages of instructions under review. She added that for the translation of guidelines, the EBA followed a process where there was a first machine translation using AI tools which was revised by professional translation services and sent for fatal flaw review by the network of national editors. However, this process would not be feasible for the mentioned package on simplification. To address the issue and considering budgetary restrictions, the EBA has decided to continue with machine-generated translations, without using professional translators to review them. However, to mitigate the issues with accuracy of translations, the EBA has identified three options for the MB discussion – (i) review through the existing network of national editors who could perform a targeted revision of the machine translated instructions, focusing primarily on the identification of material inaccuracies and ensuring that the content remains sufficiently clear and comprehensible, without requiring an exhaustive linguistic review of all editorial details; (ii) creation of a specialised editing team dedicated to translation review; and (iii) maintaining the current approach of relying exclusively on machine-supported AI tools without the introduction of an additional structured review mechanism. In this case, the EBA and CAs should all acknowledge that there may be inaccuracies and errors in the translations and expect to receive questions or comments from external stakeholders on translation errors and inconsistencies. Furthermore, the EBA would seek the support of CAs to address them on a case-by-case basis.
45. Members supported option (iii), noting that, at the technical level, competent authorities have relied almost exclusively on the English versions of EBA regulatory products. They also expected that banks rely mostly on the English versions and highlighted the increasing use of AI at the national level, the expectations that AI tools should get better

and better, and indicated that revision of translations could be considered only in very limited and specific cases. One Member opposed the creation of any new structures for translation purposes. Another Member supported Option 1, noting that relying exclusively on machine-supported AI tools might entail the risk of significant material errors and unintended consequences.

46. The Chair took note of the Members' comments and concluded that the EBA would go for the third of the options proposed, in line with the current approach.

Conclusion

47. The MB supported the EBA's proposal to maintain the current approach for translation when the EBA would rely exclusively on machine-supported AI tools without the introduction of an additional structured review mechanism by consensus.

Agenda item 6: Provisional agenda of the BoS conference call on 10 September 2026

48. The Chair reminded Members that the next BoS meeting would take place as a conference call on 10 September 2026. He noted that the EBA planned to present elements on the Single Market KPIs for discussion and invited the EC representative to consider presenting the Commission's report on competitiveness.
49. The EC representative welcomed the proposal and confirmed their readiness to present a summary of the Commission's competitiveness report.

Agenda item 7: AOB

50. The Acting Executive Director thanked the Members for approving the 2025 Annual Accounts and informed them that the EBA was expecting feedback from the European Court of Auditors regarding the proofreading contract. He further noted that the EBA had recently appointed a property advisor as the next step in its premises project, with a call for tenders planned for launch during the summer.
51. Two Members informed of recent national legislative proposals relating to competitiveness mandates.

Participants at the Management Board conference call on 23 June 2026

Chair Francois-Louis Michaud

Member Louise Mogensen

Member Nikolas Speer

Member Kristine Cernaja-Mezmale

Member Marko Myller

Member Levente Sipos-Tompa

Alternate Norbert Izer

Alternate Adam Ketessidis

European Commission representative

Ugo Bassi

EBA

Acting Executive Director

Jonathan Overett Somnier

Directors

Isabelle Vaillant

Kamil Liberadzki

Marilin Pikaro

EBA Heads of Unit

Anne Tiedemann

Jenny Giotaki

Olli Castren

Francesco Mauro

Pilar Gutierrez

Experts

Tea Eger

Margaux Morganti

Alex Herr

Enrica Piovesan

For the Management Board,

Done at Paris on 9 September 2026

[signed]

Francois-Louis Michaud

EBA Chair