

EGFI

INDUSTRY PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSPARENCY - 28/06/2010 -

Assessment of Annual Reports and Pillar 3 disclosures as at 31/12/2009

Nathalie Beaudemoulin

Committee of European Banking Supervisors

Content

- 1. Background and overview of the assessment process
- 2- Main findings on Annual Reports' disclosures
- 3- Main findings on Pillar 3 disclosures

Industry Public Hearing on Transparency

1. Background and overview of the assessment process

Background

June 2008: first assessment in the context of the crisis

\$\ightarrow\$ identification of a set of good practices for disclosures

<u>June 2009</u>: follow-up assessment of annual reports' disclosures

tangible improvements but still room for improvement

Background

June 2009: first assessment of Pillar3 disclosures

☼ Diversity of Pillar 3 disclosures, both presentation and content and lack of compliance in some areas

April 2010: principles for disclosures in times of stress

Promote good quality disclosure practices for activities under stress

Overview of the Assessment Process

2010 assessment process

Scope

- Annual Reports: activities under stress and other sensitive issues
- ♥ Pillar 3: compliance to the CRD (Annex XII)

Methodological approach

- ♦ Sample of 24 banks
- ➡ Bi-lateral meetings with banks

Overview of the Assessment Process

Scoring graduation

```
NA = item is not applicable
0 = no information disclosed
1 = insufficient information provided
2 = disclosure could be improved
3 = disclosure adequate
```

Identification of best practices

Promote high-quality disclosures and comparability

Industry Public Hearing on Transparency

2. Annual reports

Main general findings

- Sood quality of overall disclosures
- Heterogeneity
- Still some room for improvements

Sub-prime activities

- ⇒ Room for improvement :
 - Overview of total exposures and related impacts on results
 - Reconciliation tables on the movements of the period
 - quality of underlying assets for instruments covered by low-rating insurers

GPE: provision of a summary table on overall exposures with clear link to BS (Intesa; Barclays), use of standardised formats (BNPP, CASA, SG)

Other activities under stress

- ⇒ Room for improvement :
- \$\to\$ could be better emphasised,
- when more focused and

Business model

- ⇒ Adequate description
- educational approach
- \$\times\$ Yet, limited focus on activities directly affected by the crisis

GPE: clear link between group strategy and contribution by segment of activities (Rabobank, Erste bank)

GPE: targets and key performance measures clearly set out at the start of the report (RBS, ING)

Risk and risk management

- ⇒ Adequate description
- ♥ Information on practices introduced or modified due to the crisis

GPE: clear executive summaries highlighting key areas of risk management (Santander)

Fair valuation

⇒ Improvements but further enhancement needed

Fair value hierarchy

- State
 Explanation on the criteria retained for the classification notably for the distinction between L2 and L3
- ♥ Explanation on significant transfers between L1 and L2

GPE: clear information on the instruments included in each level (Barclays)

Level 3 disclosures

GPE: explanation of all significant movements of L3 instruments (UBS)

Fair valuation (cont'd)

Level 3 sensitivity analysis

Rather generic information on approach used and underlying assumptions

GPE: clear description of assumptions used and impacts for each type of instruments (Barclays)

Valuation techniques

Rather generic information on valuation techniques not always detailed by type of instruments

GPE: description of methods, inputs and valuation adjustments (HSBC)

GPE: overview table on valuation techniques and main assumptions by class of instruments (Santander / BBVA)

Fair valuation (cont'd)

Day-one profit

Rather generic information on approach used and underlying assumptions

GPE: detailed reconciliation of changes (Deutsche Bank)

Own credit risk

- ♥ Information not always made conspicuous
- Rather generic information on the methodology applied to calculate OCR impact

Reclassification

♥ Variation in the presentation of the impacts of reclassification

Impairment

Credit impairment

- Heterogeneity
- Method used for collective provision (IBNR losses)
- Quantitative information on collateral

GPE: disclosures of synthetic measures on credit risk exposures (Commerzbank); detailed quantitative information on secured credit exposures (Unicredit)

Impairment (cont'd)

AFS impairment

- Quantitative triggers used not always provided
- Breakdown of unrealised gains and losses by category of AFS assets would be useful

Goodwill impairment

Determination of CGU and assumptions used to determine the impairment charges could be further developed

Consolidation of SPEs

Need for more in depth information about the way the test on "risks and rewards" is conducted

Liquidity

Disclosures enhanced

- More comprehensive qualitative information
- Even quantitative information
- Breakdown by contractual maturity of financial assets

Remuneration

- Qualitative information on compensation or remuneration schemes
- Quantitative information on remuneration granted to executive management
- Very few banks provided detailed quantitative and qualitative information on the remuneration granted to traders

Industry Public Hearing on Transparency

3- Pillar 3

Main general findings

- Second year of implementation
- **Section** Efforts maintained
- ♦ Some improvements compared to 2008
- Shift towards the publication of a separate allinclusive Pillar 3 report

Main general findings (cont'd)

No significant reduction of the publication timeline

- composition of own funds
- back-testing information for credit risk
- credit risk mitigation techniques
- Valuation methodology and quantitative information on derivatives

Main general findings (cont'd)

- ♥ Heterogeneity in the presentation and content
- ♥ Comparative information
- Need for fine-tuning
- Omissions for materiality reason
- Sexternal verification limited to disclosures included in FS, except for a few exceptions

Compliance with CRD

Scope of consolidation

- sometimes too generic
- ♥ reconciliation tables useful

Own funds

Improvements needed

- ♦ Aggregation of positive items and deductions
- Difference between provisions and expected losses not always disclosed

GPE: reconciliation of IFRS equity to T1 capital (UBS, DB)

Compliance with CRD (cont'd)

Credit risk

Improvements needed

- Valuation method and quantitative information on derivatives
- ♥ Overall view on credit risk mitigation effects

GPE: comparison of effective losses versus estimated losses over a 8-year period (BBVA)

GPE: discussion on the approach retained for ratings with regard to the economic cycle (Nordea)

Compliance with CRD (cont'd)

Securitisation

Disclosures enhanced

- ♦ Yet, some information is missing
- ♥ Further educational approach may be needed
- Only few banks have applied the industry good practice guidelines and have thus provided more comprehensive information

GPE: comprehensive information about securitisation (DB)

Compliance with CRD (cont'd)

Market risk

Generally in line with CRD requirements

Yet, enhancement is needed on valuation controls and back-testing information

GPE: detailed description of valuation controls (BNPP)

GPE: comparison of the daily end-of-day VaR measures to the one-day changes of the portfolio's value (Société Générale, Intesa)

Compliance with CRD (cont'd)

Operational risk

Satisfactory on the whole

GPE: chart setting out the breakdown of operational losses by B2 event type (Santander, BNPP)

Equity risk

realised and unrealised gains / losses sometimes under the accounting scope

GPE: the quantitative breakdown of exposures by objective (HSBC)

Compliance with CRD (cont'd)

Interest rate risk

♥ Information on the assumptions used for sensitivity analyses could be further developed and better explained

GPE: Presentation of interest rate gap by maturity (Nordea)

GPE: main drivers of interest rate risk by business (ING)