

In column F, you will find the French Banking Federation position on CEBS Proposals (Agreement in green Disagreement in red)
 When we agree, there is no special comment except on rare occasions
 When we disagree, we give our position on the different solutions proposed by CEBS

- A Keep as national discretion
- Bi Binding mutual recognition
- Bii Non binding mutual recognition
- Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor
- Cii Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision + judgement and choice by the supervisor
- D Transform into a general rule
- Ei Delete or remove an option - Only one option is maintained
- Eii Delete or remove a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory
- Eiii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Delete immediately or after a transition period
- F Option for credit institution
- G Joint assessment process

| | Area | Dir. | Denomination | Description | FBF Agreement on CEBS proposal CP18 | FBF Position |
|----|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | OWN FUNDS | Article 57 (second last paragraph) | Inclusion of interim profits | Member States may permit the inclusion of interim profits before a formal decision has been taken on the accounts, subject to conditions. Final foreseeable dividends shall be deducted from year end results | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |
| 2 | OWN FUNDS | Article 58 | Waiver on certain deductions | Shares in another credit institution, financial institution, insurance or reinsurance undertaking may not be deducted if held temporarily for the purposes of a financial assistance operation designed to reorganise and save the entity. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |
| 3 | OWN FUNDS | Article 59 | Alternatives to deductions | As an alternative to deductions of participations and capital instruments held in other financial institutions, credit institutions may be allowed to apply, with the necessary changes, any of the methodologies set out in Annex 1 to the Conglomerates Directive. | No | F Option for Credit institution |
| 4 | OWN FUNDS | Article 60 | Deductions for stand-alone requirements purposes | For the purposes of the calculation of their stand alone requirements, institutions may not be required to deduct holdings and participations in institutions included in the | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |
| 5 | OWN FUNDS | Articles 61, 63.1, 64.3 and 65 | List of own funds | The list of own funds elements in the Directive is a maximum, both in items and amounts. Member States may choose not to admit certain elements or to apply lower ceilings. They can add further deductions. Member states may choose to accept other elements of own funds different from those in article 57, subject to conditions. Finally they can decide on the possible inclusion of cumulative preferential shares and | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |
| 6 | OWN FUNDS | Article 13.2 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Alternative form of calculation for investment firms not providing certain services and applying Article 21 | Investment firms that, in view of the services they provide, are allowed to calculate their own funds as a percentage of the turnover of the previous year (Article 21), may be also authorised to apply a definition of own funds other than that prescribed by the directive 2006/48/EC. | No | Eiii Delete immediately or after a transition period |
| 7 | OWN FUNDS | Article 13.5 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Flexibility in the composition of own funds for investment firms making use of the option in Article 13.2 | If an institution is calculating its own funds in accordance with the alternative offered in Article 13.2 of directive 2006/49/EC, it can be allowed to substitute subordinated loans by other elements described in Article 57 of directive 2006/48/EC, mainly as Tier 2. | Yes | |
| 8 | OWN FUNDS | Article 14 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Excess of subordinated capital | The Competent Authorities may allow investment firms to hold subordinated capital in excess of ordinary thresholds, up to certain limits. | Yes | |
| 9 | SCOPE OF APPLICATION | Article 69.1 | Individual waiver for subsidiaries | Member States may grant individual institutions which are subsidiaries within a group, subject to the fulfilment of certain conditions, an exemption from individual requirements. The same applies where the parent company is a financial holding company. | Yes | |
| 10 | SCOPE OF APPLICATION | Article 69.3 | Individual waiver for parent credit institutions | Member States may grant individual institutions which are the parent company within a group, subject to the fulfilment of certain conditions, an exemption from individual requirements. | Yes | |
| 11 | SCOPE OF APPLICATION | Article 70 | Solo consolidation | Member States may allow, on a case-by-case basis, for the purpose of the calculation of the individual requirements of the parent institution, and subject to certain conditions, the incorporation of subsidiaries whose material exposures or liabilities are all to that parent institution. | No | A Keep as national discretion |
| 12 | SCOPE OF APPLICATION | Article 72.3 | Exemption from Pillar III | The Competent Authorities may decide to exempt, fully or partially, a credit institution from Pillar III requirements provided such institution is included within a group complying with comparable disclosures on a consolidated basis in a third country. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory Moreover, we wish the extension of the provision to parent undertaking established in the European Union. |
| 13 | SCOPE OF APPLICATION | Article 73.1 | Exemption from consolidation | Member States may decide that, if certain conditions are met, some subsidiaries need not be included in consolidation. | No | F Option for Credit institution |
| 14 | SCOPE OF APPLICATION | Articles 22, 24 & 25 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Consolidated waiver for investment firms | A group of investment firms may be exempted from consolidated capital requirements, on a case-by-case basis, provided conditions are met. | Yes for article 22 No for article 24 and 25 | Ci Keep or transform into a supervisory decision No choice for the supervisor |
| 15 | COUNTERPARTY RISK IN DERIVATIVES | Annex III, Part 3 | Alternative template for the calculation of potential future value in certain cases | For institutions complying with certain requirements in their trading activities in commodities, gold and other products, Member States may allow percentages for the calculation of potential future value other than the general ones. | No | F Option for Credit institution |
| 16 | COUNTERPARTY RISK IN DERIVATIVES | Annex III, Part 6, point 7 | Higher value of coefficient Alpha (multiplier to calculate the exposure value of certain contracts) | Member States may set a value for coefficient Alpha higher than 1.4. | No | Eiii Delete immediately or after a transition period |
| 17 | COUNTERPARTY RISK IN DERIVATIVES | Annex III, Part 6, point 12 | Internal determination of the value of coefficient Alpha (multiplier to calculate the exposure value of certain contracts) | Member States may allow institutions to calculate Alpha internally, subject to a floor of 1.2. | Yes | |
| 18 | COUNTERPARTY RISK IN DERIVATIVES | Annex III, Part 7c (ii) | Calculation (separate/aggregate) of 'net-to-gross ratio' | At the discretion of Competent Authorities, credit institutions may use either separate calculation or aggregate calculation when calculating the 'net-to-gross ratio'. If Member States permit credit institutions a choice of methods, the method chosen is to be used consistently. | | |
| 19 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Article 80.3 & Annex VI, Part 1, point 24 | Risk-weighting exposures to credit institutions | Member States may choose between two alternative methods for risk-weighting exposures to credit institutions: (a) on the basis of the risk-weight of the corresponding central government and (b) on the basis of the credit assessment of the institution itself. | Yes | |

Fédération Bancaire Française Responses to CP 18

In column F, you will find the French Banking Federation position on CEBS Proposals (Agreement in green Disagreement in red)

When we agree, there is no special comment except on rare occasions

When we disagree, we give our position on the different solutions proposed by CEBS

A Keep as national discretion

Bi Binding mutual recognition

Bii Non binding mutual recognition

Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor

Cii Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision + judgement and choice by the supervisor

D Transform into a general rule

Ei Delete or remove an option - Only one option is maintained

Eii Delete or remove a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory

Eiii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Delete immediately or after a transition period

F Option for credit institution

G Joint assessment process

| | Area | Dir. | Denomination | Description | FBF Agreement on CEBS proposal CP18 | FBF Position |
|----|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| 20 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Article 80.7 | Exemption of intra-group exposures from risk-weighted exposures | If certain conditions are met, the Competent Authorities may assign a 0% risk-weight on exposures not forming part of "own funds" of a credit institution to its parent undertaking, its subsidiary, a subsidiary of its parent undertaking or an undertaking linked by a relationship within the meaning of Article 12(1) of Directive 83/349/EEC. | Yes | We wish competent authorities to verify ex post if conditions are met. |
| 21 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Article 80.8 | Treatment of exposures to a counter-party which is member of the same institutional protection scheme. | If certain conditions are met, the Competent Authorities may assign a 0% risk weight on exposures not forming part of "own funds" to counterparties which are members of the same institutional protection scheme as the lending institution. | Yes | |
| 22 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Article 83.2 | Permission to use unsolicited ratings | In order to use unsolicited ratings, credit institutions must get permission from the Competent Authorities. To make this possible, that alternative should be incorporated to legislation (implicit discretion). | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national - Discretion discretion becomes mandatory + agreement on the drafting |
| 23 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 5 | Recognition of a third country's treatment of central government and central bank exposures | When a third country with supervisory/regulatory arrangements at least equivalent to those in the Community, assigns for the exposures to its own central government and central bank denominated and funded in the domestic currency a lower risk weight than the one applicable in principle, a member state may allow the risk-weight of such exposures in the same manner. | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition |
| 24 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 11 | Recognition of a third country's treatment of regional governments and local authorities | When a third country with supervisory/regulatory arrangements at least equivalent to those in the Community treats exposures to regional government and local authorities as exposures to its central government, a Member State may allow the risk-weight of such exposures in the same manner. | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition |
| 25 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 14 | Treatment of public sector entities as institutions | Exposures to public sector entities may be treated as exposures to credit institutions, without applying the preferential weights applicable to short term exposures to institutions. | Yes | Bi Binding mutual recognition We wish competent authorities to publish the list of exposures to public sector entities treated as exposures to institutions. |
| 26 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 15 | Treatment of exposures to public sector entities guaranteed by central governments | The Competent Authorities may, in exceptional cases, treat exposures to public sector entities as exposures to the central government in whose jurisdiction they are established where, in their opinion, there is no difference in the risk between such exposures because of the existence of an appropriate guarantee from the central government. | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition Agreement on the wording added. We wish competent authorities to publish the criteria used or the list of exposures treated as exposures to the central government. |
| 27 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 17 | Recognition of a third country's treatment of public sector entities | When a third country with supervisory/regulatory arrangements at least equivalent to those applied in the Community treats exposures to its public sector entities as exposures to institutions, a Member State may allow the risk-weight of exposures to such public sector entities in the same manner. | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition + "shall" instead of "may" "a Member State shall allow the risk-weight of exposures to such public sector entities in the same manner" |
| 28 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 37 | Treatment of short term exposures to EU institutions in their national currency | A Competent Authority may allow short term exposures to Member States' institutions denominated and funded in the national currency a risk weight that is one category less favourable than the preferential risk weight applicable on exposures to EU central governments. | Yes | |
| 29 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 40 | Treatment of exposures in the form of minimum reserves held by an intermediary credit institution. | Provided that certain conditions are met, a Member State may permit exposures in the form of minimum reserves required by the ECB or by the central bank of a Member State to be held by a credit institution, in accordance with the relevant ECB regulation on the application of minimum reserves, to be risk weighted as exposures to the central bank of the member state concerned. | Yes | |
| 30 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 63 | Risk-weighting past due exposures secured by non eligible collateral | A risk weight of 100% may be assigned on past due exposures which are fully secured by non eligible collateral when value adjustments reach 15% of the exposure gross of the value adjustments, if strict operational criteria exist to ensure the good quality of the collateral. | Yes | |
| 31 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 64 | Risk-weighting of past due exposures secured by mortgages on residential property | The applicable risk weight on past due exposures secured by mortgages on residential property net of value adjustments may be reduced to 50%, if value adjustments are no less than 20% of the exposure amount gross of the value adjustments. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |
| 32 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 66 | Risk-weighting items belonging to regulatory high risk categories | The Competent Authorities have the discretion to assign a risk weight of 150% on exposures associated with particularly high risks. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |
| 33 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 67 | Regulatory high risk categories - lower risk weight due to value adjustments | The risk weight on non past due exposures receiving a 150% risk weight may be reduced to (a) 100% if value adjustments exist which are no less than 20% of the gross exposure and (b) 50% if value adjustments are no less than 50% of the gross exposure. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |
| 34 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 68(e) | Loans secured by commercial real estate as collateral for covered bonds | The Competent Authorities may recognise loans secured by commercial real estate as eligible collateral for covered bonds where the required loan to value ratio of 60% is exceeded up to a maximum level of 70%, if certain defined criteria and conditions are met. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |
| 35 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 85 | Risk-weighting institutions specialising in the inter-bank and public debt market | Member States may allow a risk weight of 10% for exposures to institutions specialising in the interbank and public debt markets in their home member states, if such institutions are subject to close supervision and the exposures are adequately secured. | Yes | |
| 36 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 3, point 17 | Exceptions to the non-use of domestic currency ratings for foreign-currency exposures | The Competent Authorities may allow the domestic currency rating of an obligor to be used for its foreign currency exposures provided such exposures arise from institutions' participation in a loan extended by a Multilateral Development Bank. | Yes | |
| 37 | IRB | Article 84.2 | Requirements for IRB standards for parent and EU subsidiaries altogether | When IRB approach is used by an EU parent or financial holding company and its subsidiaries, Member States may allow the minimum requirements to qualify for IRB to be met by parent and subsidiaries considered together. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |

Fédération Bancaire Française Responses to CP 18

In column F, you will find the French Banking Federation position on CEBS Proposals (Agreement in green Disagreement in red)

When we agree, there is no special comment except on rare occasions

When we disagree, we give our position on the different solutions proposed by CEBS

A Keep as national discretion

Bi Binding mutual recognition

Bii Non binding mutual recognition

Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor

Cii Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision + judgement and choice by the supervisor

D Transform into a general rule

Ei Delete or remove an option - Only one option is maintained

Eii Delete or remove a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory

Eiii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Delete immediately or after a transition period

F Option for credit institution

G Joint assessment process

| | Area | Dir. | Denomination | Description | FBF Agreement on CEBS proposal CP18 | FBF Position |
|----|------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| 38 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 1, point 6 | Lower rate for specialized lending | The Competent Authorities may authorise a credit institution to generally assign a 50% risk weight to SL-Category 1 and 70% to SL-Category 2 (regardless of maturity) if certain conditions are met. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |
| 39 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 1, point 13 (last sentence) | Special treatment for revolving retail exposures secured by a link to a wage account | The requirement that retail revolving exposures be unsecured (Annex VII, Part 1, Para. 13 b) may be waived by the Competent Authorities in respect of collateralised credit facilities linked to a wage account. | Yes | |
| 40 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 1, point 18 | Treatment of ancillary banking services | Exposures to ancillary banking services undertakings (equity) can be treated as non-credit obligation assets. | Yes | |
| 41 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 2, point 5, 7 & Annex VIII, Part 1, point 26 | Possibility to extend the list of unfunded protection providers for the purposes of recognition of unfunded credit protection in PD | For the purposes of the recognition of unfunded credit protection in PD by institutions, the Competent Authorities may extend the list of unfunded credit protection providers further than those included in Annex VIII, Part 1, Para. 26. | Yes | |
| 42 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 2, point 12 & 13 | Alternatives for the calculation of maturity | The Competent Authorities may require all institutions in their jurisdiction to use maturity (M) for each exposure in accordance with formulae instead of using values by default (0.5 years for repos and 2.5 for other exposures). | No | Eiii Delete immediately or after a transition period |
| 43 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 2, point 15 | Maturity for EU-firms (< EUR 500 mio.) | The Competent Authorities may allow maturity of exposures to European corporates with consolidated assets of less than EUR 500 million to be set at values by default, even if they apply the formulae option. | Yes | |
| 44 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 2, point 15 (last sentence) | Maturity for EU-firms investing primarily in real estate (< EUR 1,000 mio.) | The Competent Authorities may allow maturity of exposures to European corporates that invest primarily in real estate with consolidated assets of less than EUR 1,000 million to be set at values by default, even if they apply the formulae option. | Yes | |
| 45 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 2, point 20 & Annex VIII, Part 1, point 26 | Possibility to extend the list of unfunded protection providers for the purposes of calculation of dilution risk | For the purposes of the calculation of dilution risk, the Competent Authorities may extend the list of unfunded credit protection providers further than those included in Annex VIII, Part 1, Para. 26. | Yes | |
| 46 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 4, Para 56 | Flexibility in data collection | The Competent Authorities may apply less stringence as regards the data needed for estimation and collected before the implementation of the directive, provided the credit institution makes appropriate adjustments. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |
| 47 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 1, point 15 | Recognition of shares in Finnish housing companies as eligible collateral | The Competent Authorities may authorise their credit institutions to recognise as eligible collateral shares in Finnish housing companies that are operating in accordance with the Finnish Housing Company Act of 1991 provided that certain conditions are met. | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition |
| 48 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 1, point 20 | Amounts receivable as eligible collateral | The Competent Authorities may recognise as eligible collateral amounts receivable linked to a commercial transaction or transactions with an original maturity of less than or equal to one year. Eligible receivables do not include those associated with securitisations, sub-participations or credit derivatives or amounts owed by affiliated parties. | Yes | |
| 49 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 1, point 21 | Other physical collateral | The Competent Authorities may recognise as eligible collateral physical items of a type other than real estate collateral, if satisfied as to the following: (a) liquid markets for disposal of the collateral do exist in an expeditious and economically efficient manner; and (b) well-established, publicly available market prices for the collateral do exist. the institution must be able to demonstrate that there is no evidence that the net prices it receives when collateral is realised deviates significantly from these market prices. | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition We wish competent authorities to publish the list of eligible collateral or the criteria used for recognition of eligible collateral. |
| 50 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 1, point 28 | Eligible protection providers | Member states may also recognize as eligible providers of unfunded credit protection, other financial institutions authorised and supervised by competent authorities and subject to prudential requirements equivalent to those applied to credit institutions. | Yes | Bi Binding mutual recognition |
| 51 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 2, point 9a (ii) | Minimum requirements for the recognition of receivables as collateral | Credit institutions must take all steps necessary to fulfil local requirements in respect of the enforceability of security interest. There shall be a framework which allows the lender to have a first priority claim over the collateral subject to national discretion to allow such claims to be subject to the claims of preferential creditors provided for in legislative or implementing provisions. | Yes | Bi Binding mutual recognition |
| 52 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 3, point 12 | Permission of internal models approach for calculation of fully adjusted exposure value (E*) | The Competent Authorities may permit credit institutions meeting certain requirements to use an internal models approach taking into account correlations to calculate the adjusted exposure value for exposures resulting from the application of a master netting agreement. | Yes | |
| 53 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 3, point 19 | Permission to use empirical correlations within and across risk categories | The Competent Authorities may allow credit institutions to use empirical correlations within risk categories and across risk categories if they are satisfied that the credit institution's system for measuring correlations is sound and implemented with integrity. | Yes | |
| 54 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 3, point 43 | Own estimates of volatility adjustments (categories of security) | When debt securities have a credit assessment from a recognised ECAI equivalent to investment grade or better, the Competent Authorities may allow credit institutions to calculate a volatility estimate for each category of security. | Yes | |
| 55 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 3, point 72 | Reduced LGDs for leasing transactions | Until 31 December 2012, the Competent Authorities may, subject to the indicated levels of collateralisation, allow credit institutions to assign lower levels of LGD for senior exposures in the form of Commercial Real Estate leasing and of equipment leasing. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |

Fédération Bancaire Française Responses to CP 18

In column F, you will find the French Banking Federation position on CEBS Proposals (Agreement in green Disagreement in red)

When we agree, there is no special comment except on rare occasions

When we disagree, we give our position on the different solutions proposed by CEBS

A Keep as national discretion

Bi Binding mutual recognition

Bii Non binding mutual recognition

Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor

Cii Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision + judgement and choice by the supervisor

D Transform into a general rule

Ei Delete or remove an option - Only one option is maintained

Eii Delete or remove a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory

Eiii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Delete immediately or after a transition period

F Option for credit institution

G Joint assessment process

| | Area | Dir. | Denomination | Description | FBF Agreement on CEBS proposal CP18 | FBF Position |
|----|--|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 56 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 3, point 89 | Sovereign guarantees | The Competent Authorities may apply reduced risk weights to exposures or portions of exposures guaranteed by the central government or central bank, where the guarantee is denominated in the domestic currency of the borrower and the exposure is funded in that currency. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion discretion becomes mandatory |
| 57 | SECURITISATION | Article 152(10)(b) | Discretion to disapply the securitisation framework | For banks that do not move to standardised approach in 2007, the treatment of securitisation may be disappplied by competent authorities. | Yes | |
| 58 | SECURITISATION | Annex IX, Part 4, point 30 | Treatment of certain retail exposures subject to early amortisation provision | The Competent Authorities may apply a treatment analogue the lines of para. 26 to 28 in the case of securities subject to an early amortisation provision of certain retail exposures (uncommitted, unconditionally cancellable without prior notice, early amortisation is triggered by a quantitative value in respect of something other than the three months average excess spread) for determining the conversion figure. | Yes | |
| 59 | SECURITISATION | Annex IX, Part 4, point 53 (last sentence) | Application of the simplified Supervisory Formula Method | The Competent Authorities may permit credit institutions to apply for securitisations involving retail exposures the Supervisory Formula Method using simplifications for certain risk parameters. | Yes | |
| 60 | OPERATIONAL RISK | Article 102.4 & Annex X, Part 4, point 1 and 2 | Combination of approaches | The Competent Authorities may allow institutions to use a combination of approaches. | Yes | |
| 61 | OPERATIONAL RISK | Article 104.3 | Alternative Standardised Approach | The Competent Authorities may under certain conditions authorise institutions to use an alternative indicator to calculate its capital requirements. | Yes | Ci Keep or transform into a supervisory decision No choice for the supervisor + "shall" instead of "may" "The competent authorities shall..." |
| 62 | OPERATIONAL RISK | Article 105.4 | Qualifying criteria for AMA within the same group | The Competent Authorities may allow the qualifying criteria set out to be met by the parent and its subsidiaries considered together. | Yes | Ci Keep or transform into a supervisory decision No choice for the supervisor + "shall" instead of "may" "The competent authorities shall..." |
| 63 | OPERATIONAL RISK | Annex X, Part 2, point 3 and 5 | Alternative Standardised Approach | The Competent Authorities may authorise institution to calculate its capital requirement using an alternative standardised approach. | Yes | Ci Keep or transform into a supervisory decision No choice for the supervisor + "shall" instead of "may" "The competent authorities shall..." |
| 64 | OPERATIONAL RISK | Article 20.2 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Minimum level of own funds | The Competent Authorities may allow investment firms with limited licence to provide own funds which are always more than or equal to the higher of the capital requirement for credit and market risk or 25% of the preceding years fixed overheads. | No | F Option for Credit institution |
| 65 | OPERATIONAL RISK | Article 20.3 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Minimum level of own funds | The Competent Authorities may allow investments firms which hold 730 000 EUR in initial capital, but which fall within certain categories, to provide own funds which are always more than or equal to the higher of the capital requirement for credit and market risk or 25 % of the preceding years fixed overheads. | Yes | |
| 66 | QUALIFYING HOLDINGS OUTSIDE THE FINANCIAL SECTOR | Article 122.1 | Special treatment for insurance undertakings | Member States may exempt insurance sector undertakings from the general limits established for qualifying holdings. | Yes | |
| 67 | QUALIFYING HOLDINGS OUTSIDE THE FINANCIAL SECTOR | Article 122.2 | Alternative - deduction | Member States may decide not to apply limits on qualifying holdings, provided excess is deducted from own funds. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory + "shall" instead of "may" "The Members States shall provide..." |
| 68 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 153, point 1 (first sentence) | Transitional treatment for certain property leasing transactions | The Competent Authorities may, until December 31, 2012, allow leasing exposures on offices or commercial premises in their territory and subject to certain conditions, to be rated 50%. | Yes | |
| 69 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 153, point 2 (second sentence) | Transitional definition of the secured portion of a loan | The Competent Authorities may, until December 31, 2010, allow, for the purpose of defining the secured portion of a past due loan, recognise eligible collateral other than the one meeting the requirements. | Yes | |
| 70 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 154.1 | Transitional use of a different definition of past due | Until December 31, 2011, the Competent Authorities may set the number of days past due up to 180 days if local conditions make it appropriate (for the purposes of application of the standardised approach). The specific number may differ across product lines. | Yes | |
| 71 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 154.2 | Transitionally shorter test of use | Institutions applying for the use of IRB before 2010 may benefit from a test of use shorter than 3 years but above 1, until December 31, 2009. | Yes | |
| 72 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 154.3 | Transitionally shorter requirement of use for LGD/conversion factors estimates | For those institutions applying for the use of their own LGD/conversion factors estimates, the three-year period of experience in use required by Article 84.4 may be reduced to two until December 31, 2008. | Yes | |
| 73 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 154.4 | Transitional treatment for certain types of participations | The Competent Authorities may, until December 31, 2012, allow credit institutions to continue to apply Basel I treatment to certain types of participations. | Yes | |
| 74 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 154.6 | Transitional exemption for certain equity exposures | The Competent Authorities may, until December 31, 2017, exempt from IRB certain equity exposures held on December 31, 2007. | Yes | |
| 75 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 155 | Transitional calculations: standardised approach - operational risk (credit institutions) | Until December 31, 2012, the "trading and sales" business line may be applied a 15% factor, if it represents at least 50% of the total relevant indicators. | Yes | |
| 76 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Annex VII, Part 2, point 8 (second subparagraph) | Transitional LGD for covered bonds | Until December 31, 2010, covered bonds may be assigned an LGD of 11.5% | Yes | |
| 77 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Annex VII, Part 4, point 66, 71, 86 and 95 | Transitional reduction of minimum length of observation periods | Member States may transitionally allow a reduction of the minimum length of the observation periods required for own estimations of PD, LGD and CCF, subject to an absolute minimum of 2 years. | Yes | |

Fédération Bancaire Française Responses to CP 18

In column F, you will find the French Banking Federation position on CEBS Proposals (Agreement in green Disagreement in red)

When we agree, there is no special comment except on rare occasions

When we disagree, we give our position on the different solutions proposed by CEBS

A Keep as national discretion

Bi Binding mutual recognition

Bii Non binding mutual recognition

Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor

Cii Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision + judgement and choice by the supervisor

D Transform into a general rule

Ei Delete or remove an option - Only one option is maintained

Eii Delete or remove a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory

Eiii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Delete immediately or after a transition period

F Option for credit institution

G Joint assessment process

| | Area | Dir. | Denomination | Description | FBF Agreement on CEBS proposal CP18 | FBF Position |
|----|-------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 78 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 44 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Transitional calculations: standardised approach - operational risk (investment firms) | Until December 31, 2012, the "trading and sales" business line may be applied a 15% factor, if it represents at least 50% of the total relevant indicators. | Yes | |
| 79 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 46 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Alternative transitional operational risk requirement | Until December 31, 2011, the Competent Authorities may choose not to apply requirements for operational risk as set out in Article 75(d) of directive 2006/48/EC to low size investment firms. An alternative treatment applies instead. | Yes | |
| 80 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 47 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Transitional applicability of recognized specific risk models | Until December 31, 2009, or any other date specified by the Competent Authorities on a case-by-case basis, it may be provided that for institutions that have received specific risk model recognition prior to January 1, 2007, previous requirements (as in the old directive) apply. | Yes | |
| 81 | TRADING BOOK | Article 18.2 and 3 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Application of the banking book rules to trading book, if not material | The Competent Authorities may allow institutions to apply banking book rules to their trading book exposures, provided the trading book activities does not exceed certain limits. | Yes for 18.2 No for 18.3 | F Option for Credit institution |
| 82 | TRADING BOOK | Article 19.2 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Specific risk requirement for covered bonds | Member States may set a reduced specific risk requirement for covered bonds, with reductions similar to those applied in the banking book under the standardised approach. | Yes | |
| 83 | TRADING BOOK | Article 19.3 Dir. 2006/49/EC and Annex I, point 52 | Third country CIU | A Competent Authority of one member state may make use of the approval of another one without conducting its own assessment. | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition |
| 84 | TRADING BOOK | Article 26 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Offsetting trading positions | For the purposes of calculation of consolidated capital requirements, the Competent Authorities may authorise the offsetting of trading (trading book, commodities, etc.) positions even when they are booked in different institutions within the group, subject to certain conditions. | Yes | |
| 85 | TRADING BOOK | Article 33.3 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Alternative requirements for valuation in absence of readily available market prices | The Competent Authorities, in the absence of readily available market prices, may choose not to apply daily mark to market and, instead, require institutions to apply alternative methods subject to their approval. | Yes | |
| 86 | TRADING BOOK | Annex I, point 4, 2nd subparagraph (first sentence) Dir. 2006/49/EC | Capital requirement for an exchange-traded future | Subject to certain conditions, the Competent Authorities may allow that the capital requirement for an exchange-traded future contract be equal to the margin required by the exchange. | Yes | |
| 87 | TRADING BOOK | Annex I, point 4, 2nd subparagraph (second sentence) Dir. 2006/49/EC | Capital requirement for OTC derivative cleared by a clearing house | Subject to certain conditions, the Competent Authorities may allow that the capital requirement for an OTC derivative cleared by a clearing house to be equal to the margin required by the clearing house. | Yes | |
| 88 | TRADING BOOK | Annex I, point 5, 2nd subparagraph Dir. 2006/49/EC | Prescription of specific methodologies for the calculation of delta | The Competent Authorities may prescribe that delta be calculated following methodologies specified by them. | Yes | |
| 89 | TRADING BOOK | Annex I, point 5, 3rd subparagraph Dir. 2006/49/EC | Capital requirement for exchange-traded written options and OTC options cleared by a clearing house | Subject to certain conditions, the Competent Authorities may allow that the capital requirement for an exchange-traded written option, or an OTC option cleared by a clearing house to be equal to the margins required by the exchange or the clearing house, respectively. | Yes | |
| 90 | TRADING BOOK | Annex I, point 5, 3rd subparagraph Dir. 2006/49/EC | Capital requirement for exchange-traded bought options and OTC bought options cleared by a clearing house | Subject to certain conditions, the Competent Authorities may allow that the capital requirement for an exchange-traded bought option, or an OTC bought option cleared by a clearing house to be equal to the requirement for the underlying instrument. | Yes | |
| 91 | TRADING BOOK | Annex I, point 14 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Specific risk charge for a non-qualifying issuer | The Competent Authorities may require that instruments issued by non-qualifying issuers are applied a specific risk capital charge higher than 8% or 12% and/or disallow offsetting for the purposes of general market risk between such instruments and any other instrument. | Yes | |
| 92 | TRADING BOOK | Annex I, point 26 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Use of duration instead of the standard system for calculation of the general risk of traded debt positions | The Competent Authorities may, either in general or on an individual basis, allow institutions to use a system for calculating the general risk for traded debt instruments which reflects duration instead of the system set out in the directive. | Yes | |
| 93 | TRADING BOOK | Annex I, point 35, first sentence Dir. 2006/49/EC | Reduced specific risk requirement for certain equity portfolios | The Competent Authorities may allow certain equity portfolios to be assigned a specific risk requirement of 2% instead of 4%. | Yes | F Option for Credit institution |
| 94 | TRADING BOOK | Annex I, point 35 (last sentence) Dir. 2006/49/EC | Alternative maximum weight of an individual position in an institution's equity portfolio | The Competent Authorities may authorise that individual positions represent a maximum of 10% of the total equity portfolio (instead of 5% as in the Directive), provided that the sum of such positions do not exceed 50%. | Yes | |
| 95 | TRADING BOOK | Annex III, point 2.1, last sentence Dir. 2006/49/EC | Discretionary use of net present value for determining the open position in currencies or gold | The Competent Authorities have the discretion to allow institutions to use net present value when determining their open positions in currencies or gold. | Yes | |
| 96 | TRADING BOOK | Annex III, point 3.1 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Lower capital requirements for closely correlated currencies | The Competent Authorities may allow institutions to provide lower capital requirements for positions in closely correlated currencies, as defined in the Directive. | No | F Option for Credit institution |
| 97 | TRADING BOOK | Annex IV, point 7 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Definition of 'positions in the same commodity' | The Competent Authorities may regard, in some cases, different but closely linked commodities as the same, for the purposes of calculating the position in a commodity. | Yes | |

Fédération Bancaire Française Responses to CP 18

In column F, you will find the French Banking Federation position on CEBS Proposals (Agreement in green Disagreement in red)

When we agree, there is no special comment except on rare occasions

When we disagree, we give our position on the different solutions proposed by CEBS

A Keep as national discretion

Bi Binding mutual recognition

Bii Non binding mutual recognition

Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor

Cii Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision + judgement and choice by the supervisor

D Transform into a general rule

Ei Delete or remove an option - Only one option is maintained

Eii Delete or remove a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory

Eiii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Delete immediately or after a transition period

F Option for credit institution

G Joint assessment process

| | Area | Dir. | Denomination | Description | FBF Agreement on CEBS proposal CP18 | FBF Position |
|-----|------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| 98 | TRADING BOOK | Annex IV, point 8 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Capital requirement for exchange-traded commodities OTC commodity derivatives cleared by a clearing house | Subject to certain conditions, the Competent Authorities may allow that the capital requirement for an exchange-traded commodity, or an OTC commodity derivative cleared by a clearing house to be equal to the margins required by the exchange or the clearing house, respectively. | Yes | |
| 99 | TRADING BOOK | Annex IV, point 10 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Prescription of specific methodologies for the calculation of delta for derivatives on commodities | The Competent Authorities may prescribe that delta for commodity derivatives be calculated following methodologies specified by them. | Yes | |
| 100 | TRADING BOOK | Annex IV, point 10, three last subparagraphs Dir. 2006/49/EC | Capital requirement for exchange-traded options and OTC options cleared by a clearing house | Subject to certain conditions, the Competent Authorities may allow that the capital requirement for an exchange-traded written option, or an OTC option cleared by a clearing house to be equal to the margins required by the exchange or the clearing house, respectively. Also OTC bought options may be assigned the same requirement as the underlying commodity. | Yes | |
| 101 | TRADING BOOK | Annex IV, point 14 Dir. 2006/49/EC | Offsetting positions in the same commodity | The Competent Authorities may allow positions in the same commodity - or in commodities regarded as the same - to be offset prior to assignment to the appropriate maturity band. | No | Eii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory |
| 102 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 1, point 16 | Waiver to definition of RRE | Waiver eligibility criterion RRE: "the competent authorities may waive the requirement for their credit institutions to comply with condition (b) in § 13 for exposures secured by residential real estate property situated within the territory of that Member State if the competent authority | No | Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor |
| 103 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 1, point 16 (last sentence) | Mutual recognition of waiver to definition of RRE | The competent authorities of a Member State, which do not use the waiver may recognise as eligible residential real estate property recognised as eligible in another Member State by virtue of the waiver. | Yes | |
| 104 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 1, point 17 | Commercial real estate property waiver | Waiver for condition (for CCR) that risk of borrower does not materially depend upon the performance of the underlying property or project (point 13 (b)). | No | Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision no choice for the supervisor |
| 105 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 1, point 19 | Mutual recognition of the waiver | Application of the waiver in §17 within EU: "the competent authorities of a Member State, which do not use the waiver in §17, may recognise as eligible commercial real | Yes | |
| 106 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 1, point 25 | Instruments repurchased on request | Instruments issued by third party institutions which will be repurchased by that institution on request may be recognised as eligible credit protection | Yes | |
| 107 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 1, point 8 | Unrated listed institutions | Recognition as collateral of unrated, listed institution securities: "debt securities issued by credit institutions which securities do not have a credit assessment by an eligible ECAR may be recognised as eligible collateral if | Yes | |
| 108 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 2, point 16 | Treatment of exposure protected by a guarantee which is counter-guaranteed by a central government or | Treatment where an exposure is protected by a guarantee which is counter-guaranteed by a central government or central bank (...): the exposure may be treated as protected by a guarantee by the entity in question provided the following conditions are satisfied : | Yes | |
| 109 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 3, point 59 | 0% volatility adjustment for repurchase transactions and securities lending or borrowing transactions | Where a competent authority permits a 0% volatility adjustment for repurchase transactions or securities lending or borrowing transactions in securities issued by its domestic government, then other competent authorities may choose to allow credit institutions | Yes | |
| 110 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 3, point 73 | Cap at 50% RW for CRE | Cap for RRE: "subject to the requirements of this paragraph and §75 and as an alternative to the treatment in § 69 to 73, the competent authorities of a Member State may authorise credit institutions to apply a 50% risk weighting to the part of the exposure fully collateralised by RRE property or CRE property situated within the territory | No | A Keep as a national discretion |
| 111 | CREDIT RISK MITIGATION | Annex VIII, Part 3, point 75 | Mutual recognition of Cap at 50% RW for CRE | The competent authorities, which do not authorise an alternative treatment for real estate collateral, may authorise credit institutions to assign the risk weights permitted under this treatment in respect of exposures collateralised by residential real estate property of commercial real estate property respectively located in | Yes | |
| 112 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 4, point 44 | Number of days past due | "In all cases, the exposure past due shall be above the threshold defined by the competent authorities and which reflects a reasonable level of risk" | Yes | |
| 113 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 4, point 48 | Number of days past due | DoD days past due for retail and PSEs: " for retail and PSE exposures, the competent authorities of each Member States shall set the exact number of days past due that all credit institutions in its jurisdiction shall abide by under the definition of defaults set out in §44, for | No | Eiii Delete immediately or after a transition period |
| 114 | IRB | Annex VII, Part 4, point 48 (last sentence) | Mutual recognition of number of days past due | For retail and PSE exposures to such counterparts situated in the territories of other Member States, the competent authorities shall set a number of days past due which is not higher than the number set by the competent authority of the respective Member State. | No | Eiii Delete immediately or after a transition period This ND should be treated according to the preceding ND (§113) |
| 115 | IRB | Article 85, 1+2 | Roll-out possibility | "(1): Subject to the approval of the competent authorities, implementation may be carried out sequentially across the different exposure classes (...) (2) Implementation as referred to §1 shall be carried out within a reasonable | No | A Keep as a national discretion |
| 116 | IRB | Article 89 last sentence | Mutual recognition within EU of the use of standardised approach for the exposures listed : | Mutual recognition within EU of the use of standardised approach for the exposures listed : 'this paragraph shall not prevent the competent authorities of other Member States to allow the application of the rules of Subsection 1 (standardised approach) for equity exposures which have | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition |
| 117 | IRB | Article 89.1 | Partial use of the standardised approach | Subject to the approval of the competent authorities, credit institutions permitted to use the IRB approach (...) for one or more exposure classes may apply Subsection | No | A Keep as a national discretion |
| 118 | IRB | Article 89.1 (f) | Partial use equity exposures | Credit institutions permitted to use the IRB approach may apply the Standardised approach for equity exposures to entities whose credit obligations qualify for a 0% risk | No | A Keep as a national discretion |
| 119 | IRB | Article 89.1 (g) | Partial use equity exposures | Credit institutions permitted to use the IRB approach may apply the Standardised approach for equity exposures incurred under legislative programmes. | No | A Keep as a national discretion |
| 120 | LARGE EXPOSURES | Article 110.3 | Reporting on concentration | Reporting of concentrated exposures to the issuers of collateral taken: "Member States may require the reporting of concentrated exposures to the issuers of collateral taken by the credit institutions". | | Dealt with in Large Exposures review |

Fédération Bancaire Française Responses to CP 18

In column F, you will find the French Banking Federation position on CEBS Proposals(Agreement in green Disagreement in red)

When we agree, there is no special comment except on rare occasions

When we disagree, we give our position on the different solutions proposed by CEBS

A Keep as national discretion

Bi Binding mutual recognition

Bii Non binding mutual recognition

Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor

Cii Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision + judgement and choice by the supervisor

D Transform into a general rule

Ei Delete or remove an option - Only one option is maintained

Eii Delete or remove a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory

Eiii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Delete immediately or after a transition period

F Option for credit institution

G Joint assessment process

| | Area | Dir. | Denomination | Description | FBF Agreement on CEBS proposal CP18 | FBF Position |
|-----|-----------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 121 | LARGE EXPOSURES | Article 114.1 | Large exposure limit calculation : comprehensive approach | Use of Financial Collateral Comprehensive Method in calculation of exposure amounts for purposes of LE limits: " subject to § 3, for the purposes of calculating the value of exposures for the purposes of article 111 (1) to (3), Member States may, in respect of credit institutions using the Financial Collateral Comprehensive Method () permit such credit institutions to use a value lower | | Dealt with in Large Exposures review |
| 122 | LARGE EXPOSURES | Article 114.2 | Use of own estimates of collateral effect in LE limit calculation | Allow Advanced IRB institutions to use own estimates of collateral effects in calculation of exposure amounts for purposes of LE limits: " a credit institution permitted to use own estimates of LGDs and conversion factors for an exposure class under articles 84 to 89 may be permitted, where it is able to the satisfaction of the competent authorities to estimate the effects of financial collateral on | | Dealt with in Large Exposures review |
| 123 | LARGE EXPOSURES | Article 114.4 | Substitution approach | "where the effects of collateral are recognised under the terms of §1 or 2 above, MS may treat any covered part of the exposure as having been incurred to the collateral issuer rather than to client" | | Dealt with in Large Exposures review |
| 124 | OPERATIONAL RISK | Annex X, Part 3, point 11 | Process for quantitative standards | Correlations in operational risk losses across individual operational risk estimates may be recognised only if credit institutions can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the competent authorities that their systems for measuring correlations are sound, implemented with | Yes | |
| 125 | SECURITISATION | Annex IX, Part 4, point 43 | The Internal Assessment approach | Use of 'internal assessment approach' for unrated ABCP exposures: "subject to the approval of the competent authorities, when the following conditions are satisfied, a credit institution may attribute to an unrated position in an asset backed commercial paper programme a derived rating as laid down in §43" | Yes | |
| 126 | SECURITISATION | Annex IX, Part 4, point 43 last sentence | Public availability of the ECAI's assessment | The requirement for the assessment methodology to be publicly available may be waived by the competent authorities ... | Yes | |
| 127 | SECURITISATION | Annex IX, Part 4, point 58 | Exceptional treatment when KIRB cannot be calculated | When it is not practical for the credit institution to calculate the risk-weighted exposure amounts for the securitised exposures as if they had not been securitised, a credit institution may, on an exceptional basis and subject to the consent of the competent authorities, temporarily be allowed to apply the following method for the calculation | Yes | |
| 128 | SECURITISATION | Article 97.1 | ECAI | Recognition of ECAIs general (securitisation) | Yes | |
| 129 | SECURITISATION | Article 97.2 | ECAI | Recognition of ECAIs criteria (securitisation) | Yes | |
| 130 | SECURITISATION | Article 97.3 | Recognition of ECAI : mutual recognition | Recognition of ECAI within EU for securitisation purposes: "if an ECAI has been recognised as eligible by the competent authorities of one Member State for the purpose of paragraph 1, the competent authorities of the other Member States may recognise that ECAI as eligible | No | Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor + Binding mutual recognition |
| 131 | SECURITISATION | Article 98.1 | ECAI | Association of ECAI credit assessments with risk weights (securitisation) | No | Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor + Joint assessment |
| 132 | SECURITISATION | Article 98.2 | Mutual recognition of quality steps | Recognition of mapping within EU for securitisation purposes: When the competent authorities of a Member State have made a determination under paragraph 1, the competent authorities of the other Member States may recognise that determination without carrying out their | Yes | |
| 133 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 29 | Exposures to rated institutions with an original effective maturity of more than three months (quality steps) | "Exposures to institutions with an original effective maturity of more than three months for with a credit assessment by a nominated ECAI is available shall be assigned a risk weight according to Table 4 in accordance with the assignment by the competent authorities (...) | Yes | |
| 134 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 31 | Preferential RW treatment for claims on institutions with an original maturity of 3 months or less under Option 2 (quality steps) | "Exposures to an institution with an original effective maturity of three months or less for with a credit assessment by a nominated ECAI is available shall be assigned a risk weight according to Table 5 in accordance with the assignment of the competent authorities. | Yes | |
| 135 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 41 | Treatment of exposures to corporate (quality steps) | Exposures for which a credit assessment by a nominated ECAI is available shall be assigned a risk weight according to the following table in accordance with the assignment by the competent authorities of the credit assessments of eligible ECAIs to six steps in a credit quality assessment scale. | Yes | |
| 136 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 49 | Definition of Residential Real Estate : wave to independence condition on any cash flow generated by the underlying property | Waiver eligibility criterion residential real estate (RRE): "competent authorities may dispense with the condition contained in § 45(b) for exposures fully and completely secured by mortgages on residential property which is situated within their territory, if they have evidence that a well-developed and long-established residential real | No | Ci Keep or transform into a supervisory decision No choice for the supervisor |
| 137 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 50 | Mutual recognition of the waiver | Recognition of the treatment in §46 within EU: "when the discretion contained in §46 is exercised by the competent authorities of a Member State, the competent authorities of another Member State may allow their credit institutions to apply a risk weight of 35% to such | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition |
| 138 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 51 | RW 50% for CRE | 50% RW for commercial real estate (CRE): "Subject to the discretion of the competent authorities, exposures fully and completely secured, to the satisfaction of the competent authorities by mortgages on offices or other commercial premises situated within their territory may be | No | Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor + Binding mutual recognition |
| 139 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 52 | 50% RW for Finnish Housing CRE | Subject to the discretion of the competent authorities, exposures fully and completely secured, to the satisfaction of the competent authorities, by shares in Finnish housing companies operating in accordance with the Finnish Housing Company Act of 1991 or subsequent equivalent legislation in respect of offices or other | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition |
| 140 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 53 | Exposures related to property leasing transactions | Property leasing transactions: "Subject to the discretion of competent authorities, exposures related to property leasing transactions concerning offices or other commercial premises situated in their territory and governed by statutory provisions whereby the lessor retains full ownership of the rented assets until the tenant exercises his option to purchase, may be assigned a risk weight of 50%." Art.162() the competent authorities | Yes | |

Fédération Bancaire Française Responses to CP 18

In column F, you will find the French Banking Federation position on CEBS Proposals(Agreement in green Disagreement in red)

When we agree, there is no special comment except on rare occasions

When we disagree, we give our position on the different solutions proposed by CEBS

A Keep as national discretion

Bi Binding mutual recognition

Bii Non binding mutual recognition

Ci Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision - No choice for the supervisor

Cii Keep as or transform into a supervisory decision + judgement and choice by the supervisor

D Transform into a general rule

Ei Delete or remove an option - Only one option is maintained

Eii Delete or remove a national discretion - Discretion becomes mandatory

Eiii Delete or remove an option or a national discretion - Delete immediately or after a transition period

F Option for credit institution

G Joint assessment process

| | Area | Dir. | Denomination | Description | FBF Agreement on CEBS proposal CP18 | FBF Position |
|-----|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| 141 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 57 | Mutual recognition of the waiver (for CRE) | When the discretion contained in points 51 to 53 is exercised by the competent authorities of one Member State, the competent authorities of another Member State may allow their credit institutions to risk weight at 50 % such exposures fully and completely secured by mortgages on commercial property. | Yes | |
| 142 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 58 | Waive on definition of the CRE | Waiver eligibility criterion CRE: "competent authorities may dispense with the condition contained in § 51 (b) for exposures fully and completely secured by mortgages on commercial property which is situated within their territory if they have evidence that (...) with loss rates do not | No | Ci Keep or transform into a supervisory decision No choice for the supervisor |
| 143 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 60 | Mutual recognition of the waiver relating to the definition of CRE | When the discretion contained in point 58 is exercised by the competent authorities of a Member State, the competent authorities of another Member State may allow their credit institutions to assign a risk weight of 50 | Yes | |
| 144 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 77(a) | CIUs | Eligibility of third country CIUs | Yes | |
| 145 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Annex VI, Part 1, point 78 | Mutual recognition - Third country CIU - recognition process | If a competent authority approves a third country CIU as eligible, then a competent authority in another Member State may make use of this recognition without conducting its own assessment. | Yes | Bi Binding mutual recognition + "shall" instead of "may" ".../... then a competent authority in another MS shall make use of this recognition without conducting its own assessment " |
| 146 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Article 81.1 | ECAI | Recognition of ECAs general | Yes | |
| 147 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Article 81.2 | ECAI | Recognition of ECAs criteria | Yes | |
| 148 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Article 81.3 | Mutual recognition of an ECAI | If an ECAI has been recognised as eligible by the competent authorities of a Member State, the competent authorities of other Member States may recognise that ECAI as eligible without carrying out their own evaluation process | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition + "shall" instead of "may" ".../... the competent authorities of other Member State shall recognise that ECAI ..." |
| 149 | STANDARDISED APPROACH | Article 82.2 | Mutual recognition of an ECAI | When a competent authorities of a Member State have made a determination under § 1 (ECAI assessment associated with credit quality step), the competent authorities of other Member State may recognise that determination without carrying out their own determination | No | Bi Binding mutual recognition + "shall" instead of "may" "the competent authorities of other Member State shall recognise..." |
| 150 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 154.1 (second subpoint) | Mutual recognition of Transitional use of a different definition of past due | Competent authorities which do not set a number of days past due in relation to exposures to counterparties situated in their own territory may set a higher number of days for exposures to counterparties situated in the territories of other Member States, the competent authorities of which have exercised that discretion. The specific number shall fall within 90 days and such figures as the other competent authorities have set for exposures to such counterparties within their territory. | Yes | |
| 151 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 154.7 | Days past due for corporate | "Until 31 December 2011, for corporate exposures the competent authorities of each Member State may set the number of days past due that all credit institutions in its jurisdiction shall abide by under the definition of default set out in Annex VII, Part 4, 544 for exposures to such | Yes | |
| 152 | TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | Article 154.7 (last sentence) | Mutual recognition of days past due for corporate | For corporate exposures to such counterparts situated in the territories of other Member States, the competent authorities shall set a number of days past due which is not higher than the number set by the Competent Authority of the respective Member State | Yes | |