



EBA BS 2014 277rev1

EBA Staff

13-14 May 2014

Location: London

EBA Board of Supervisors – Final Minutes

Agenda item 1: Restricted session

Confidential discussion held only for voting BoS Members, and non-voting BoS Members with direct supervisory functions.

Agenda item 2: Opening, welcome and approval of agenda and minutes

1. The Chairperson opened the BoS meeting and welcomed all participants. He informed of the following changes to the BoS Membership: Danièle Nouy would be the BoS Member as nominated by the Supervisory Board of the ECB, with Korbinian Ibel as her alternate; John Fell would continue representing the ECB's Financial Stability Division; Anthony Kruizinga would be replaced by Paul Hilbers as alternate to the Netherlands' BoS Member. In light of Anthony Kruizinga's departure, a vacancy notice would be issued shortly to appoint the Chair of SCConFin.
2. The meeting agenda was approved. The minutes of the BoS meeting of 25-26 February 2014 and of the teleconferences of 17 February and 26 March 2014 were approved.

Agenda item 3: Update on Risks and Vulnerabilities

3. EBA staff presented an update on risks and vulnerabilities. The SCOP Chair presented also a SCOP letter to BoS Members where he highlighted three issues: a) execution risks associated with the burden on institutions to have sufficient resources to cope with regulatory requirements; b) an improved environment for funding opportunities whilst remaining cautious of possible swift changes in market sentiment; and c) IT and conduct risks.
 4. One BoS Member noted the importance of IT systems for data aggregation purposes. Another BoS Member pointed out the increasing importance of complex IT structures; also,
-

the reluctance of some credit institutions to adequately provision as concerned conduct risk could be viewed as an assumption of liability, and the impact this could have on the bank's capital ratios.

5. The ESRB representative noted that to date it had received notification from four Member States of national macroprudential measures. He also informed of the regular follow-up activities on Ukraine.

Conclusion

6. BoS Members took note of the update presented. The next risk report would look further at the interlinkages on provisioning for conduct and IT risk and capital.

Agenda item 4: Stress testing – Process steps and publication strategy

7. The Chairperson referred to the BoS teleconference of 16 April 2014 on the EU wide Stress Test exercise and the associated methodology published on 29 April 2014. He recalled previous discussions concerning the establishment of a common reference point for capital benchmarks, and an additional one to allow stakeholders to assess national differences. It had been agreed that the EBA would undertake further work on the disclosure of national discretions other than prudential filters for sovereign Available for Sale (AFS) positions. The Chairperson also presented the main process steps leading to the publication of final results in October 2014.
8. The Chairperson informed that the EU-wide stress test results and the comprehensive assessment would likely be published before the end of October, including, where relevant, the results of the AQR. The proposal would be: a) for national stress tests of non-EBA sample banks (including subsidiaries of the EBA sample banks), based on the EBA's scenario, methodology and threshold, publication should be on the EBA publication date; b) for national stress tests, or variants, with differences in terms of scenario, methodology and thresholds, there should be some distance (at least one month) to avoid confusion and unwarranted comparisons; and c) for the publication of national stress test based on the EBA's scenario, methodology and threshold, NCAs would have to decide on a possible alignment of disclosure templates to facilitate comparison.
9. Some BoS Members expressed their preference for the publication of highly aggregated AQR results.
10. On the possibility to publish the supervisory reaction functions of the EU wide stress test, BoS Members expressed different views with some suggesting the reaction should be published after the results, but there was agreement on the need for some commonality across competent authorities.

Conclusion

11. The Chairperson took note of the different views expressed and approaches to capital benchmarks, and suggested that the Taskforce on Stress Tests (STTF) continued working on proposals on additional disclosure of a common capital ratio to support the national transitional arrangements that would form the common threshold and that could be acceptable to all. This would be tabled at the BoS June meeting for decision. On the publication of results, it was agreed that the EBA could coordinate efforts with ESMA and ECB; the proposal to publish EBA and national results at the same time if the same methodology was used, but at different times if not, was agreed by BoS Members. On supervisory reaction functions, the STTF would look further into it and propose different options to the BoS by June.

Agenda item 5: Final Draft RTS on content of recovery plans; Final Draft RTS on assessment of recovery plans; Final GL on scenarios for recovery plans

12. A first set of draft technical standards that would need to be endorsed following adoption and publication of the Banking Recovery and Resolution Directive (BRRD) was presented. The Chairperson noted that these did not contain material changes following the consultation process and the discussions at SCRePol, but just a few minor adjustments on proportionality and more flexibility for the assessments to be conducted by supervisors.

13. A BoS Member requested a clarification on the scope of application, namely whether or not recovery plans would be aimed only at group-level, or also to subsidiaries (noting that the change to Art. 5, BRRD made by the European Parliament merely refers to “institutions”). Another BoS Member recalled the importance of the proportionality principle, given that recovery plans would apply to all banks in the EU, while the FSB targets G-SIBs.

14. The European Commission’s representative thanked the EBA for the work done on this first package, and asked for some cross-references to BRRD provisions to be corrected; he also suggested that a stronger emphasis be placed on the use of stress-tests including reverse stress-tests in the Guidelines (hereafter, GL).

Conclusion

15. BoS Members supported the package as presented. It would be submitted via written procedure to BoS for approval following the formal adoption and publication of the BRRD. The question on the scope of application of the recovery plans would be addressed to the Commission.

Agenda item 6: Final RTS, ITS and GL on the identification of G-SIIs

16. The Chairperson presented a final draft RTS on G-SII identification, a final draft ITS on G-SII disclosure of indicators, and final draft GL on disclosure of indicators of Global Systemic Importance. He noted that the package had received broad support from SCRePol, and explained that they replicated the identification methodology applied by the BCBS.
17. BoS Members expressed broad support. One BoS Member expressed reservations with the GL on disclosure of underlying data of the 12 indicators; however, a majority of BoS Members who expressed their views on this package considered that there should not be any concerns with such disclosure as the data concerned should not be regarded as sensitive.
18. The Commission representative showed also his support to the documents but asked for their review should further developments occur at the international level.

Conclusion

19. The final draft RTS, the final draft ITS and the final draft GL were submitted to vote of BoS Members. They were approved following the rules on qualified majority voting. As a result, the draft final RTS/ITS would be sent to the Commission for endorsement, and the GL, published on the EBA's website.

Agenda item 7: Reporting Strategy

20. The Chairperson presented a paper on changes to reporting requirements and a release strategy for 2014. He recalled the discussion at the MB meeting of 9 April 2014, where it was agreed to establish a streamlined Q&A solution, supported by staff from both the EBA and NCAs, as well as the publication of lists of incorrect validation rules on EBA website (initially published on 16 April 2014 and to be updated regularly). It was recognised that the BoS should now decide on several issues, namely: a) whether or not to limit the number of releases to two per year (one minor on technical amendments, to be implemented within 6 months; and a major one to be implemented within 12 months); b) approval of the proposal to carry out patch releases to fix taxonomy technical errors, or to disable validation rules found to be wrong/inconsistent/etcetera on an ad hoc basis, to which resource support from NCAs was sought; and c) to submit a proposal to the Commission with a view to removing annexes XV (validation rules) and possibly XIV (data point categorisation) from the ITS on reporting.
21. With regard to errors in existing validation rules, the Chairperson noted that the proposal to remove Annexes XV and possibly also XIV from the ITS on reporting could resolve this problem for reporting institutions having to comply with an outdated list of requirements. The Commission representative supported this proposal as a means to facilitate speedier solutions to wrong validation rules. A more refined long-term legal solution to reporting

requirements would have to be found, though, in order not to lose the benefit of having harmonized requirements for all institutions in the EU.

22. A number of BoS Members showed support for the strategy presented by the Chairperson on both the number of releases per year and implementation timelines. They also called for the EBA to set out a clear communication strategy so that external stakeholders could be properly informed of changes to the reporting requirements. In order to do so, the BoS would need to decide as soon as possible on the applicable dates for the upcoming reporting requirements regarding (a) funding plans, (b) internal model benchmarking and (c) revised LCR and NSFR.

23. BoS Members were asked for support in the increasing resource demands on the EBA in relation to reporting issues. To this end it was noted that only four countries had volunteered for the “validation task force” and no applications received for various SNE positions.

24. Some BoS Members raised their concern that the latest publication of liquidity reporting templates was inconsistent with the EBA tables and taxonomies. This would lead to a situation in which institutions would be required by a delegated act to comply with a set of requirements not in line with what they have implemented based on the EBA December publication. It was mentioned that in practice there would be no realistic chance to change institutions' implementation in time before the first data submission date. It was also mentioned that it would be crucial for the EBA and the Commission to coordinate very closely and timely in regard to the application date of the upcoming delegated act on revised liquidity requirements.

Conclusion

25. The release strategy was accepted and relevant Standing Committees should set timelines for development and reporting dates accordingly. The EBA would draft a proposal to remove Annexes XV and XIV from the ITS on reporting. The EBA would also be contacting NCAs to get staffing support as well as test data for the validation task force, and other reporting needs. The validation task force would need to decide on priority areas to be addressed.

26. The Chairperson also took note of the need to streamline the information vis-à-vis external stakeholders for an effective communication of changes to reporting requirements.

27. On liquidity and leverage, it was concluded not to update their reporting in the absence of delegated acts.

Agenda item 8: Way forward for data collection for LCR, NSFR and LR

28. Further to the BoS meeting of 25-26 February 2014, the EBA Staff had prepared a note on data collection covering liquidity (NSFR and LCR) and leverage ratio (LR). BoS Members were reminded of the absence of a final NSFR and LR framework under the CRDIV for which this work could be conducted. Notwithstanding that, it was noted that given the short deadlines for the EBA's reports mandated under the CRDIV/CRR, it was key for EBA to decide now on how to proceed to collect the data for the EBA to conduct its required analysis. Accordingly BoS Members were presented with three different options. The following considerations were also made: i) the need to ensure representativeness in terms of business models needed for the calibration of the NSFR and LR; ii) adjustment of the QIS monitoring templates by the ISG as a follow up to the January 2014 GHOS agreement for LCR, NSFR and LR; and iii) need to refer as a cut-off date to data collected one year before the deadline for the report in order to have sufficient time to process such material, conduct the analysis and finalise the policy recommendations, i.e. December 2014 for the NSFR report and December 2015 for the LR report.

29. The majority of BoS Members expressing views considered that, given the current scenario, a temporary continuation of the Basel III/EU ISG QIS templates on the voluntary exercise sample was the feasible option. The Commission representative also supported this option.

30. The DE member also confirmed that the EBA would be able to continue relying on the infrastructures of the Bundesbank with respect to the Basel III/EU ISG QIS work.

Conclusion

31. BoS Members agreed to proceed with a temporary continuation of the Basel III/EU ISG QIS templates as well as with 2 reference dates per year. Stopping the extra data collection would be reassessed in 1Q2015 for NSFR and 4Q2015/1Q2016 for the LR to assess whether supervisory needs could be fulfilled with the ITS on reporting only.

Agenda item 9: Final Draft RTS on Professional Indemnity Insurance for mortgage credit intermediaries

32. The Chairperson presented a final draft RTS on professional indemnity insurance for mortgage credit intermediaries, as mandated by Article 29(2)(a) of Directive 2014/17/EU. He recalled that BoS had agreed to the publication of a CP at its meeting of 11-12 December 2013, following which a public consultation opened between 19 December 2013 and 18 March 2014.

33. It was clarified that the EBA was mandated to review the minimum amount per claim and year every 3 years, i.e. the next time would be in 2018.

Conclusion

34. BoS Members approved the proposal in accordance with the rules of qualified majority voting. The final draft RTS would therefore be sent to the Commission for endorsement.

Agenda item 10: Discussion note on remuneration requirements for sales staff

35. A note on remuneration requirements for sales staff in credit institutions selling retail banking products was presented by the EBA staff. It was explained that a fact-finding exercise was being conducted, yet a possible opportunity had arisen to merge the final output of this initiative with the separate EBA output to be produced implementing the CRDIV mandate to issue GL on remuneration policies. EBA staff explained that, if the initiatives were merged, this would most likely take the form of a separate, shorter chapter to be added to the GL being developed under CRDIV. BoS Members were thus asked whether the option presented was worth being considered.

36. Views expressed by BoS Members were mixed in this respect. Some expressed concerns about the different nature of the risks incurred by different categories of staff, thus justifying not to merge the work. By contrast, other BoS Members pointed to the common elements of, and interdependencies between, the initiatives, such as the fact that consumer detriment could have an impact on the prudential position of financial institutions; that some sales staff could be deemed as “material risk takers”; and that a merger of chapters would be an efficient way of addressing the same issue. A majority of BoS Members who expressed views took note of the differences, but were of the opinion that it would be preferable to have just one CP with different chapters addressing these matters separately.

Conclusion

37. It was agreed that both SCRePol and SCConFin would work on their initiatives separately, however coordinating efforts in order to avoid, for example, inconsistencies in the terminology used. BoS Members would decide at a later stage, once progress had been made on the two chapters, whether or not the one-CP option was desirable.

Agenda item 11: Finalisation of the first list of CET1 instruments

38. The EBA staff presented a cover note and a list of CET1 instruments in accordance with the EBA’s mandate under Article 26 CRR, which should have been published by July 2013. It was explained that this list was based on information communicated by NCAs and contained instruments issued before the CRR entered into force. It was proposed that this list be accompanied by some caveats as included in the note. Further, the list would also be subject to regular updates, for which a close monitoring of the terms and conditions of the instruments, would be performed before inclusion.

39. The Chairperson expressed concerns that the instruments listed had not been subject to a peer review to ensure their eligibility as CET1 instruments; however, he also took note of the caveats included, which were intended to capture these concerns for future updates.
40. As to the regular updates of the list, BoS Members agreed that the NCAs in the Subgroup on Own Funds should discuss proposed new instruments to be included and their compliance with legal requirements.
41. The Commission representative reminded the importance of an adequate communication of the list as, among other things, markets would rely on it.
42. BoS Members discussed structuring the communication around the list, and whether to distinguish between plain vanilla and non-plain vanilla instruments, and regroup instruments by classes, like cooperative shares or non-cooperative shares, but did not find a suitable solution.
43. Further, the Subgroup on Own Funds was requested to scrutinize instruments to ensure a common understanding of the CRR criteria, certainly for instruments issued after the CRR entered into force, but also for the legacy instruments. EBA staff confirmed that for the next update of the list, it would include those instruments issued after the entry into force of the CRR.

Conclusion

44. An update of the list would be tabled at either the BoS October or December 2014 meeting.

Agenda item 12: Response to Call for Advice (CfA) on Macroprudential policy

45. The EBA staff presented an oral update in view of the preparation of a draft report, in accordance with Article 513 CRR, on the macroprudential rules contained in both the CRR and CRDIV. The update summarised the views of EBA members as well as some specific aspects raised by the Commission. The main topics covered in the update and in view of the draft report were: a) the classification of tools as micro/macro, structural versus countercyclical, bank-specific versus system-wide (Articles 124 and 164 CRR, Pillar 2); b) the pecking-order of instruments (order of the Systemic Risk Buffer (SRB) versus Pillar 2); c) the SRB and the 2% cap on the O-SII buffer; c) Article 458 CRR.
46. BoS Members noted that macroprudential matters were already under actual discussion following the notification of such measures submitted by some Member States. They shared their views in the perspective of the draft report, notably: i) the need to coordinate, to the best extent as possible, with the ESRB; ii) the importance to remain open and flexible to react in case of potential episodes of systemic risk, whilst not putting at risk the objectives of the single rulebook; and iii) aim for further transparency and clarity on the scope, definition and methodology of the different macroprudential instruments.

Conclusion

47. SCRePol would further assess the recommendations to be presented in the draft report such that the BoS could decide at the June BoS meeting, to enable the report to be submitted to the Commission by the end of June.

Agenda item 13: CP on RTS/ITS on Benchmarking of internal models

48. The Chairperson explained that, in light of the anticipated submission to the Commission by 30 September 2014 of the draft RTS and ITS on benchmarking of internal models for the calculation of risk weighted exposure amounts or own fund requirements, the EBA needed to conduct a benchmarking exercise in 2014 to enable the Commission to report to the Parliament by 1 April 2015. Accordingly, it was necessary for the BoS to agree on the launch of the respective CP on the RTS/ITS on benchmarking and also decide on the 2014 exercise format and planning.

49. BoS Members were presented with a draft CP on draft RTS and ITS on benchmarking, plus annexes to the draft ITS with benchmarking portfolios (rotation approach between low and high default portfolios (LDP/HDP) for credit risk, and a selection of portfolios for market risk) and were invited to express their views on the proposal.

50. Some BoS Members were concerned that the proposal could go beyond the mandate of Article 78 CRDIV and that the metrics for some of the benchmarks proposed could contain drawbacks, in particular comparing internal models with the standardised approach, given the lack of sufficient risk-sensitiveness of the latter. Other BoS Members supported, however, the proposed benchmarks (use of quartiles, standardised approach and back-testing) and agreed with the selection of benchmarking portfolios and combinations of real/hypothetical transactions for credit risk would allow for a more comprehensive review. One BoS Member pointed out that the role of EBA should consist in supporting other competent authorities (instead of taking the lead in the college dialogue) and pointed out that Art. 1 is unclear.

51. The Commission representative explained that indeed Article 78 CRDIV intended to give the EBA a strong role in determining the portfolios and the way that NCAs should conduct their supervisory assessment.

52. As to the proposal for the 2014 benchmarking, it consisted of launching in the fourth quarter of 2014 a benchmarking exercise for credit (EBA Low Default Portfolios) and market risk (Basel HPE) involving a sample of banks broadly in line with the recent TCOR exercises. Additional credit institutions would be identified by BoS members.

53. A BoS Member questioned the overlapping with both the 2014 EU wide stress test and the AQR exercise, and the communication challenges that this could pose. Another BoS

Member asked whether or not it would be possible to align it with the ongoing Basel exercise for credit risk (Low Default Portfolios). The EBA staff pointed to the different sample of banks for both exercises, EU legal obligations and non-final Basel decision regarding a new exercise in 2015.

Conclusion

54. The BoS supported to launch of the consultation by end-May, leaving the rotation approach for credit risk, as well as the proposed set of benchmarks, and the two alternative market risk benchmarking portfolios (EBA vs Basel) in the consultation paper. Acknowledging the technical complexities of this topic and the different views expressed, the Chairperson invited BoS Members to send to the EBA, over the coming days in advance of the CP publication, suggestions in order to review and expand the list of questions for consultation (Section 5.2), with particular reference to a) the opportunity to better assess the pros and cons of the different benchmarks suggested in Article 3 of the proposed draft RTS, b) receive suggestions for alternative benchmarks, and c) identify sensible additional exemptions from reporting for the participating institutions beyond the ones included in Article 3 of the proposed draft ITS. As to the 2014 benchmarking exercise, it was agreed to proceed with the proposal as submitted (LDP for credit risk and Basel HPE portfolios for market risk).

Agenda item 14: Covered Bond Report

55. The Chairperson introduced this topic, and gave the floor to the EBA staff, who presented the draft report on covered bonds with recommendations in response to, first, the ESRB request to identify principles of best practice, and second, the Commission's Call for Advice on the appropriateness of the current qualifying criteria for covered bonds' preferential risk-weight treatment and the appropriateness of including specific classes of cover assets in the preferential risk-weight treatment. The EBA staff clarified that the definition of covered bonds was not limited to the definition as provided in the UCITS Directive.

56. BoS Members supported in general the recommendations contained in the draft report. Further they requested to reflect further on some, notably: ESRB 2-C on independent business administrator; ESRB 3-A on consistency of the regulatory limits to impose on mortgage cover pools including both residential and commercial mortgages; the possibility to differentiate commercial mortgages from agricultural ones; ESRB 7-A on clarification on the role of competent authorities to authorise each covered bond programme; and ESRB 6-B on the use of derivatives. A BoS member pointed out that the recommendations might imply burdensome administrative impacts on the on-going supervisory activities; the recommendations should rather aim at ensuring that competent authorities set up a specific system of controls that enables them to assess the compliance of the issuing banks' and of CB transactions with the regulatory criteria.

57. The ESMA representative informed that, in relation to ESRB 8 on disclosure to investors, ESMA was conducting work on structured finance instruments and suggested to coordinate efforts such that disclosures to end investors would be strengthened.

58. Another BoS Member requested that the report contain a clause to clarify that the report did not contain all possible recommendations, but just a selection which the EBA and NCAs had looked into.

Conclusion

59. The EBA staff took note of the comments made by BoS Members. The next SCRePol meeting would continue working on the report, taking into account the views expressed by BoS Members, with a view to tabling a final report at the next BoS June meeting.

Agenda item 15: Supervisory Review and Evaluation Process (SREP) Guidelines

60. The SCOP Chair, updated BoS Members on the state of play of the draft SREP GL. He recalled that the BoS agreed at the October 2013 meeting on a number of key concepts and principles for the common SREP framework that were reflected in the draft GL. The GL intended to address four main elements: (1) business model analysis; (2) assessment of internal governance and institution-wide controls; (3) assessment of risks to capital and capital to cover them; and (4) assessment of liquidity risk and liquid assets to cover them. The Chair of SCOP also highlighted three innovative components: (a) assessment of liquidity adequacy, this being the first time that there would be GL on it also supporting joint decision for cross-border banks; (b) link between SREP and triggers for early intervention measures, and supervisory determination of whether institution could be considered as 'failing or likely to fail' with the latter two being new concepts contained in BRRD; and (c) composition and definition of binding capital requirements for Pillar 2 purposes.

61. Further, he noted that the SREP GL would include, next to the traditional 1-4 scoring system, an additional score 'F' to be used only for the purposes of the overall SREP score to indicate banks as 'failing or likely to fail'. The overall SREP score would look into risk profile and viability of an institution. A BoS Member pointed out that the precise identification of the failing and likely to fail institutions should be made outside the SREP process since it involves consideration that do not typically enter the SREP analysis (e.g. the necessity of public support). In this respect, and noting the requirement for triggers for early intervention embedded in the BRRD, the SCOP Chair considered that the SREP GL could indeed provide the required link. He noted that the plan was to deliver the draft CP for discussion at the BoS June meeting with the aim to launch a public consultation in early-July. Such timing should allow for the SREP GL to be in place by the time the SSM takes up its function.

62. Some BoS Members supported this approach, whereas others considered that this timeline was a bit ambitious, since more work would be needed in some specific aspects, such as capital and liquidity adequacy assessments. One BoS Member stressed that there is too much a focus of a Pillar one plus approach and thus a more holistic approach/assessment of banks is missing. The Commission representative highlighted the importance of the SREP GL for the purposes of supervisory convergence, and considered that it would be positive to have them in place on time for the SSM establishment.

63. The SSM representative informed that the SSM was working on its own methodology and he considered that it would need to be consistent with the upcoming SREP GL, for which he asked for the SSM to join the work of the EBA's SREP WG.

Conclusion

64. A CP with the draft SREP GL would be tabled at the BoS June meeting. It would then be decided whether or not the GL were ready for publication, or subject to further discussion.

Agenda item 16: Review Panel – Work Programme

65. The EBA Executive Director informed that the Review Panel was nearing finalising its Peer Review of the EBA's GL on Concentration Risk, and appealed for support from NCAs in conducting the proposed on site visits to a few selected NCAs.

66. He presented the proposed 2015-2016 Review Panel Work Programme, as approved by the Review Panel, and highlighted that the next Peer Review exercises should be a review on the GL on the assessment of the suitability of members of the management body and key function holders; the ITS on supervisory reporting requirements; the Recommendation on the development of recovery plans; the RTS on prudent valuation; the (revised) GL on Remuneration Policies/RTS on criteria to identify categories of staff; BRRD.

67. Some BoS Members called for more flexibility in the approach to peer reviews, focusing on fewer although broader topics rather than on specific, isolated GL. Some BoS Members also called to postpone by 6 months the proposed peer review work planned for the second half of 2014, noting the high workload caused by the AQR and the EU-wide stress-test exercise and their related resource constraints.

Conclusion

68. It was agreed that the Review Panel should work further on the methodology for conducting peer reviews with a view to providing a framework for a more comprehensive assessment to take into account common elements of supervisory practice. The BoS approved the Work Programme, with the agreement that the timelines be extended so that the next peer review exercise would be concluded within six months.

Agenda item 17: Project Management tool

69. The EBA Executive Director gave a presentation on the new portfolio management tool that the EBA staff was implementing to assist the EBA in its planning, managing, monitoring and prioritising of the EBA's Work Programme. BoS Members took note of the presentation on the project management tool.

Agenda item 18: Report on EBA new premises

70. The EBA Executive Director informed BoS Members of the state-of-play of the EBA's project to move premises. He confirmed that the lease contract for the new premises (One Canada Square) had now been signed and that the EBA would be moving into the new premises in December 2014. Accordingly the EBA was now launching competitive procedures related to the move. BoS Members took note of the report on the EBA's new office.

Agenda item 19: Reports from Committees

71. The Chairperson referred to the Progress Reports submitted to BoS Members for information from the following Committees: SCRePol, SCARA, SCOP, Joint Committee and SCConFin. BoS Members took note of the Progress Reports.

Agenda item 20: AoB

72. The Chairperson informed BoS Members that the BoS Away-Day would take place in Krakow, Poland, on 10-11 July 2014, under the auspices of the Polish Financial Supervision Authority (Komisja Nadzoru Finansowego). He thanked Andrzej Reich, Polish BoS Member representing the Polish Financial Supervision Authority, for hosting the meeting.

73. He suggested a few topics for this meeting, as also discussed at the MB meeting of 9 April 2014, and noted one of particular interest, namely whether or not the new regulatory framework was fit to address the concerns stemming from the financial crisis. BoS Members showed support for this topic. Other topics under consideration included the EBA's international role going forward; the interaction between macro and micro-prudential policy coordination. He sought BoS Members thoughts, including suggestions for possible speakers.

Conclusion

74. The EBA would finalise the agenda. Organisational matters would be coordinated with the Polish Financial Supervision Authority, so BoS Members would be kept duly informed.

Participants at the Board of Supervisors' meeting

13-14 May 2014, London

Chairperson: Andrea Enria

<u>Country</u>	<u>Voting Member or Alternate</u> ¹	<u>Representative NCB</u>
1. Austria	Michael Hysek	Philip Reading
2. Belgium	Jo Swyngedouw/Rudi Bonte	
3. Bulgaria	Tsvetan Gounev	
4. Croatia	Željko Jakuš	
5. Cyprus	-	
6. Czech Republic	David Rozumek	
7. Denmark	Ulrik Nødgaard /Jesper Bo Nielsen	Brian Liltoft Andreasen
8. Estonia	Andres Kurgpõld	Indrek Saapar
9. Finland	Marja Nykänen	Kimmo Virolainen
10. France	Edouard Fernández-Bollo/Frédéric Visnovsky	
11. Germany	Peter Lutz	Erich Loeper
12. Greece	Vassiliki Zakka	
13. Hungary	Péter Gábrriel	
14. Ireland	Cyril Roux/Mary Bourke	
15. Italy	Federico Luigi Signorini/Andrea Pilati	
16. Latvia	Kristaps Zakulis	Vita Pilsuma
17. Lithuania	Vytautas Valvoniš	
18. Luxembourg	Claude Simon	Norbert Goffinet
19. Malta	Raymond Vella	Alexander Demarco
20. Netherlands	Jan Sijbrand	
21. Poland	Andrzej Reich	Maciej Brzozowski
22. Portugal	Pedro Duarte Neves/M. Adelaide Cavaleiro	
23. Romania	Nicolae Cinteza	
24. Slovakia	Vladimir Dvoracek/Tatiana Dubinova	
25. Slovenia	Stanislava Zadavec-Capriolo	
26. Spain	Fernando Vargas /Cristina Iglesias-Sarrià	
27. Sweden	Martin Noréus	Olof Sandstedt
28. UK	Andrew Bailey	

<u>Country</u>	<u>Observer</u> ²
1. Iceland	Lilja Rut Kristófersdóttir
2. Liechtenstein	Rolf Brüggemann
3. Norway	Morten Baltzersen

¹ Accompanying experts: Ingeborg Stuhlbacher (Austrian Finanzmarktaufsicht); Veerle de Vuyst (National Bank of Belgium); Marek Zokol (Czech Česká národní banka); Julia Blunck (German Bundesanstalt für Finanzdienstleistungsaufsicht); Maurizio Trapanese (Banca d'Italia); Mascha van der Marel (De Nederlandsche Bank); Izabella Szaniawska (Polish Komisja Nadzoru Finansowego); Duncan Mackinnon and Lisa Robinson-Hammond (UK Prudential Regulation Authority); Fiona Mann (Bank of England)

² Accompanying experts: Örn Hauksson (Iceland's Fjármálaeftirlitið); Sindre Weme (Norwegian Finanstilsynet)

Institutions**Representative**³

- | | |
|---------------|------------------------|
| 1. ECB SSM | Korbinian Ibel |
| 2. ECB | John Fell/Jukka Vesala |
| 3. Commission | Dominique Thienpont |
| 4. EIOPA | Manuela Zweimüller |
| 5. ESMA | Verena Ross |
| 6. ESRB | Francesco Mazzaferro |

EBA Staff

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Executive Director | Adam Farkas |
| Director of Oversight | Piers Haben |
| Director of Regulations | Isabelle Vaillant |

Mario Quagliariello; Slavka Eley; Delphine Reymondon; Lars Overby; Stefano Capiello; Dirk Haubrich; Corinne Kaufman; Jonathan Overett Somnier; Paolo Bisio; Wolfgang Strohbach; Santiago Barón Escámez

³ Accompanying experts: Paul Hiebert (European Central Bank)