

Appendix III – validation errors identified in the COREP templates

We have identified the following perceived template and validation errors, and have provided suitable corrections where possible. We would be pleased to work with the EBA in testing future proposed validations and would be happy to advise on how they are likely to work in practice.

CR-SA

Validation rule errors

Given: For columns 010 to 030, 150 to 210 and 500: rows 010 = 200 + 130 + 140 + 160

+180 + 200 + 230 + 250 + 260 + 300 + 340 + 350 + 360

Correction: For columns 010 to 030, 150 to 210 and 500: rows 010 = 110 + 130 + 140 + 160

 $+\ 180 + 200 + 230 + 250 + 260 + 300 + 340 + 350 + 360$

Reason: Typographical error in the formula

Given: For column 240: rows 010 = 020 + 030 + 040

Correction: For column 240: rows 010 = 020 + 030 + 040 + 070

Reason: Row 070: Article 297(1) an institution shall apply a risk weight of 2% to the

exposure values of all its trade exposures with CCPs

Given: For column 240: row 040 = 060

Given: For column 240: row 050 = 090

Reason: Rows 060 and 050 are grey cells in CR SA Total template and are not populated

Given: For rows 010, 030 and 110 to 550: columns 200 = 110 - 160 - (0.8*170) - (0.5*180)Correction: For rows 010, 030 and 110 to 550: columns 200 = 150 - 160 - (0.8*170) - (0.5*180)

Territoria (17, 550 and 110 to 550. Columns 200 = <u>150</u>-100-(0.6 170

Reason: Typographical error in the formula

Given: For rows 010 to 100 and 380 to 550: columns 110 = 040 + 090 + 100

Correction: For rows 010 to 100 and 380 to 550: columns $110 = 040 + \underline{070} + 100$

Reason: Column 090 is an 'of which' column – it is greyed out for the column / row

combination indicated and is not populated

Given: For rows 010 to 070 and 380 to 550: columns $500 \ge (0.02*240) + (0.1*250) +$

(0.2*280) + (0.35*310) + (0.5*320) + (0.7*350) + (0.75*370) + 3800 + (1.5*410)

+(2.5*450) + (12.5*460)

Correction: For rows 010 to 070 and 380 to 550: columns $500 \ge (0.02*240) + (0.1*250) +$

(0.2*280) + (0.35*310) + (0.5*320) + (0.7*350) + (0.75*370) + 380 + (1.5*410)

+(2.5*450) + (12.5*460)

Reason: Typographical error in the formula

Given: For rows 0100: columns $500 \ge (0.1*250) + (0.2*280) + (0.35*310) + (0.5*320) +$

(0.7*350) + (0.75*370) + 3800 + (1.5*410) + (2.5*450) + (12.5*460)

Correction: For rows 0100: columns $500 \ge (0.1*250) + (0.2*280) + (0.35*310) + (0.5*320) +$

(0.7*350) + (0.75*370) + 380 + (1.5*410) + (2.5*450) + (12.5*460)

Reason: Typographical error in the formula



Given: Row 080 of which: OTC-Derivatives

Correction: Row 080 of which: OTC-Derivatives, not centrally cleared

Reason: Typographical error in the formula

Given: Row 090 Centrally cleared through compliant CCP

Correction: Column 090 of which: Centrally cleared through compliant CCP

Reason: Typographical error in the formula

Given: For row 151, 171, 211, 281, 331 and 371

of which: with a **credit** assessment derived from central government of which: with a **credit** assessment derived from central government

Reason: Typographical error in the formula

Given: For row 120, 150, 170, 210 and 330

of which: without credit assessment by a nominated ECAI

Correction: of which: with credit assessment by a nominated ECAI

Reason: Typographical – legal references / Instructions and CR SA Total spreadsheet state

these columns should be populated with

CR SA Totals specific

Correction:

Given: For row 400; Public sector entities

Correction: For row 400; Public sector entities

Correction: For row 400; Public sector <u>entities</u> **Reason:** Typographical error in the formula

Given: For rows 151, 171, 211, 281, 331 and 371

of which: with a crdit assessment derived from central government

Correction: For rows 151, 171, 211, 281, 331 and 371

of which: with a credit assessment derived from central government

Reason: Typographical error in the formula

Validation rule(s) indicated as CR SA but actually specific to CR SA Totals:

For columns 010 to 030, 150 to 210 and 500: row $200 \ge 220$

 Row 220: 50% of which secured by commercial immovable property doesn't appear on the CR SA Details template.

For columns 010 to 030, 150 to 210 and 500: row $260 \ge 270 + 290$

 Row 270: 100% of which in default and row 290: 100% of which secured by mortgages on immovable property don't appear on the CR SA Details template.

For columns 010 to 030, 150 to 210 and 500: row $300 \ge 310 + 330$

The row 310: 150% of which in default doesn't appear on the CR SA Details template.
 In the Details template exposure secured by mortgages on immovable property and exposures in default are only reported within the 'Memorandum Items'



For rows 010 and 040 to 410: column 040 = 010 + 030

• Rows 380 to 410 are the first four lines of the 'breakdown of total exposures by exposure class' and only appear on the CR SA Totals template.

For rows 010 to 100 and 380 to 550: column 150 = 110 + 120 + 130

 Rows 380 to 550 are for the 'breakdown of total exposures by exposure class' and only appear on the CR SA Totals template.

Inconsistencies in restricted cells between CR SA Totals and Details templates

The grey cells are inconsistent between the total and details templates. These inconsistencies are outlined below - we ask the EBA to amend the templates accordingly.

REF	COLUMN	ROW	CR SA Totals	CR SA Details
1	020 of which: arising from default fund contributions	030 off balance sheet exposures subject to credit risk		
2	020 of which: arising from default fund contributions & 040 - 150 fully adjusted exposure value (E*) & 200 exposure value & 210 of which: arising from counterparty credit risk & 500 risk weighted exposure amount	080 of which: OTC-Derivatives		
3	020 of which: arising from default fund contributions & 040 - 150 fully adjusted exposure value (E*) & 500 risk weighted exposure amount	090 of which: Centrally cleared through compliant CCP		
4	510 total number of counterparties	050 of which: subject to CVA charge & 060 of which: centrally cleared through a compliant CCP also for SFTs		
5	010 original exposure pre conversion factors - 210 of which arising from counterparty credit risk	210 of which: without credit assessment by a nominated ECAI		
6	010 original exposure pre conversion factors - 210 of which arising from counterparty credit risk	211 of which: with a credit assessment derived from central government		

Formula errors within templates

(a) CR SA Details column 110 Net exposure after CRM substitution effects pre conversion factors

Given:

110 = 040 + 090 + 1000

Correction:

 $110 = 040 + 090 + \mathbf{100}$

Reason:

Typographical error in the formula.

(b) Inconsistent format between Detail and Totals template; column 150 Fully adjusted exposure value (E*)

Given:

CR SA Totals template shows the formula '150 = 110 + 120 + 130'.

Correction:

CR SA Details template shows the formula 150 = 110 + 120 + 130.

Reason:

The above formula is missing from the CR SA Details template and needs to

be inserted.



(c) CR SA Details; column 200 Exposure Value

Given: 200 = 110 - 160 - 0.8*170 - 0.5*180

Correction: $200 = \underline{150} - 160 - 0.8*170 - 0.5*180$ Reason: Typographical error in the formula.

CR-IRB

Validation rule errors applicable to CR IRB 3.3.a

Given: For columns 030, 040-090, 110, 140-210, 240

Rows 010 = rows 010 + 020 + 030 + 040 + 050 + 060

Correction: For columns 030, 040-090, 110, 140-210, 240

Rows 010 = rows 020 + 030 + 040 + 050 + 060

Reason: Typographical error in the formula

Given: For columns 010-070, 130, 140, 240, 250

Columns 090 = columns 030 + 070 + 080

Correction: For <u>rows</u> 010-070, 130, 140, 240, 250

Columns 090 = columns 030 + 070 + 080

Reason: Typographical error in the formula

Legal references, comments and regulation look to be omitted or are in error

Row 070 appears as '1.1 Exposures assigned to obligor grade or pool' instead of '1.1 Exposures assigned to obligor grade or pool; **Total'**

Also contains the population description for row 140, see ITS row instructions.

Row(s) 140 Breakdown of total exposures assigned to obligor grades or pools has been omitted.

CR-EQ

Validation errors

CREQU080

Given: {070;080}{070;060}*190%

Correction: $\{070;080\} = \{070;060\} *190\%$

Reason: '=' sign is missing from the formula

CREQU090

Given: {070;090}{070;060}*0,8%

Correction: $\{070,090\} = \{070,060\} * 0.8\%$

Reason: '=' sign is missing from the formula

CREQU100

Given: {080;080} {080;060} *290%

Correction: $\{080;080\} = \{080;060\} *290\%$

Reason: '=' sign is missing from the formula



Given:

{080;090} {080;060}*0,8%

Correction: Reason:

 $\{080;090\} = \{080;060\} *0,8\%$ '=' sign is missing from the formula

CREQU120

Given:

{090;080}{090;060}*370%

Correction:

 $\{090;080\} = \{090;060\} *370\%$

Reason:

'=' sign is missing from the formula

CREQU130

Given:

 $\{090;090\}\{090;060\}*2,4\%$ $\{090;090\} = \{090;060\}*2,4\%$

Correction: Reason:

'=' sign is missing from the formula

CREQU140

Given:

{CR EQU IRB; 010; 080}={CA2;XXX}

Correction:

{CR EQU IRB; 010; 080}={CA2;420}

Reason:

CA2 row reference not included

CREQU150

Given:

absolute value of {CR EQU IRB;020;090} + absolute value of {CR EQU

IRB;050;090 $\}$ = absolute value of {CA1;XXX}

Reason:

Should CA1;XXX be CA1;380 (-) IRB shortfall of provisions to expected losses

and equity expected loss amounts?

CR SEC SA

Validation error

Given:

Cell {010;380} Link to CA template (Item 2.1.1.2: Securitisation positions SA)

Given: Reason: Cell {020;380} Link to CA template (Item 2.1.1.2*: of which re-securitisation)

2.1.1.2 is not a valid reference within CA templates

CR SEC IRB

Validation error

Given:

Cell {010;450} Link to CA template (Item 2.1.2.4: Securitisation positions SA)

Given:

Cell {020;450} Link to CA template (Item 2.1.2.4*: of which re-securitisation)

Reason:

2.1.2.4 is not a valid reference within CA templates

OPR

Validation errors

Validation rule 1: {OPR;010;070}

Given:

If 010/010 or/and 010/020 or/and 010/030 exists then 010/70 exists



Correction:

If 010/010 or/and 010/020 or/and 010/030 exists then 010/ $\underline{0}$ 70 exists

Reason:

Typographical error in the formula

Validation rule 2: {OPR;020;070}

Given:

020/070 must exist if anything exist in the matrix between 0130/010 and

100/030

Correction:

020/070 must exist if anything exists in the matrix between 030/010 and

100/030

Reason:

Typographical error in the formula

Missing validations

We believe that the following validations are missing and need to be included in the validation rules:

• {OPR;130/070}: If 130/010 or/and 130/020 or/and 130/030 exists, then 130/070 exists.

• {OPR;010/071} = 010:071*12.5%

• $\{OPR; 020/071\} = 020/071*12.5\%$

• {OPR;130/071} = 130/071*12.5%

MKR SA CTP

Validation error

Given:

 $010;450 = \text{If } \{010;430\} >= \{010;440\} \text{ then } \{010;450\} = \{010;430\}$

If 01044 > 01043 then 01045=01044

Correction:

 $010;450 = \text{If } \{010;430\} >= \{010;440\} \text{ then } \{010;450\} = \{010;430\}$

If $\{010;440\} > \{010;430\}$ then $\{010;450\} = \{010;440\}$

Reason:

Typographical error in the formula

MKR SA EQU

Validation error

Given:

Row 010; column $070 = \{010;060\} * 12.5$

Link to {CA2;590}

Correction:

Row 010; column $070 = \{010; 060\} * 12.5$

Link to {CA2;580}

Reason:

Typographical error in the formula

MKR SA SEC

Validation errors

Given:

Columns 090 to 110, 170, 200, 230 to 290, 320 to 340, 400, 430, 460 to 520, 550

to 600 Rows

 $\{010\} = \{030\} + \{060\} + \{090\}$

 $\{010\} \ge \{020\}$

 $\{030\} = \{040\} + \{050\}$ $\{060\} = \{070\} + \{080\}$

Correction:

Columns 090 to 110, 170, 200, 230 to 290, 320 to 340, 400, 430, 460 to 520, 550

to 600



Rows

 $\{010\} = \{030\} + \{060\} + \{090\}$

 $\{010\} \ge \{020\}$

 $\{030\} = \{040\} + \{050\}$ $\{060\} = \{070\} + \{080\}$

{090}={100}+{110}

Reason:

Missing validation

Given:

Row010;column **026** =

 $\{030; \pmb{025}\} * \{030; \pmb{026}\} + \{060; \pmb{025}\} * \{060; \pmb{026}\} + \{090; \pmb{025}\} + \{090; \pmb{026}\} / 010; 025$

Correction:

Row010;column <u>260</u> =

 $\{030; \pmb{250}\} * \{030; \underline{\pmb{260}}\} + \{060; \underline{\pmb{250}}\} * \{060; \underline{\pmb{260}}\} + \{090; \underline{\pmb{250}}\} * \{090; \underline{\pmb{260}}\} / 010; \underline{\pmb{250}}\}$

Reason:

Typographical error in the formula

Given:

Row010;column **049** =

 $\{030; \boldsymbol{048}\} * \{030; \boldsymbol{049}\} + \{060; \boldsymbol{048}\} * \{060; \boldsymbol{049}\} + \{090; \boldsymbol{048}\} * \{090; \boldsymbol{049}\} / 010; \boldsymbol{049}\} / 010; \boldsymbol{048}\} * \{090; \boldsymbol{049}\} / 010; \boldsymbol{049}\} / 010; \boldsymbol{049}\} / 010; \boldsymbol{049}$

Correction:

Row010;column **490** =

 $\{030;\underline{480}\}*\{030;\underline{490}\}+\{060;\underline{480}\}*\{060;\underline{490}\}+\{090;\underline{480}\}*\{090;\underline{490}\}/010;\underline{480}$

Reason:

Typographical error in the formula

CR IP Losses

Legal references, comments and regulation appear to be omitted or are in error

Given:

Column 030, 070, 100 is calculated with the Standardised Approach of Title I

chapter 2 of part 3 of CRR

Correction:

Column 030, 070, 100 is calculated with the Standardised Approach of Part 3,

Title II, chapter 2 of CRR

Reason:

CRR reference error

Given:

Column 030, 070,100 is calculated with the Internal Ratings Based Approach of

Title I chapter 3 of part 3 of CRR

Correction:

Column 030, 070,100 is calculated with the Internal Ratings Based Approach of

Part 3, Title II, chapter 3 of CRR

Reason:

CRR reference error

CA

Validation errors

CA₁

Given:

CA1;490 = -Max[(CA4;040-CA4;090)-CA4;200,0]

(-) Deductible deferred tax assets that rely on future profitability and arise from

temporary differences = -Max[(Deferred tax assets that rely on future profitability and arise from temporary differences - Deductible deferred tax liabilities associated with deferred tax assets that rely on future profitability and arise from temporary differences)- 10% CET1 threshold in Article 45 of

CRR,0]

Given:

CA1;500 = -Max[(CA4;440-CA4;690)-CA4;200,0]

(-) CET1 instruments of relevant entities where the institution has a <u>significant</u> investment = - Max[(Holdings of CET1 capital of relevant entities where the



institution has a significant investment, net of short positions - Holdings on CET1 Capital Instruments of relevant entities where the institution has a significant

investment temporary waived)]- 10% CET1 threshold in Article 45 of CRR,0]

Question:

If CA4;200 10% CET1 threshold in Article 45 of CRR, includes amounts for (a) and (b) how can this field be used to validate the two separate categories / lines in

CA1?

Article 45 (a) deferred tax assets that are dependent on future profitability and

arise from temporary differences and

Article 45(b) where an institution has a significant investment in a relevant entity

Given:

CA1;930 = Min[CA4;170;1.25% X CA4;180]

(-) Reciprocal cross holdings in T2 Capital = Min [Total gross provisions eligible

for inclusion in T2 capital;1.25% x Risk weighted exposure amounts for

calculating the cap to the provision eligible as T2]

Correction: $\underline{CA1;920} = Min[CA4;170;1.25\% \times CA4;180]$

SA General credit risk adjustments = Min [Total gross provisions eligible for inclusion in T2 capital; 1.25% x Risk weighted exposure amounts for calculating

the cap to the provision eligible as T2]

Reason:

CRR references and validation don't seem to be compatible, should the reference

be CA1:920?

CA5 Table 1

Given:

 $CA5.1\ 020;030 = CA5.2\ 030;010 + CA.3\ 090;060$

Correction:

CA5.1 020;<u>040</u> = CA5.2 030;010 + CA.3 090;060

Reason:

Table 1 column 030 is for 'adjustments to tier 1' and

Table 2 and 3

030;010 = article 462(1) and (3) specifies 'shall qualify as tier 2 instruments'

090;060 = article 463(5) 'shall qualify as tier 2items'

Given:

CA5.1;030;**030** = CA5.5;030;040 CA5.1;030;**040** = CA5.5;030;040

Correction: Reason:

Table 1 column 030 is for 'adjustments to tier 1'

Table 5 row 030 is for 'Amounts of own funds to be included in consolidated Tier

2 capital'

Given:

CA5.1;050;**030** = CA5.6;020;060 CA5.1;050;**040** = CA5.6;020;060

Correction: Reason:

Table 1 column 030 is for 'adjustments to tier 1'

Table 6 column 020 is for 'adjustments to T2'

Given:

CA5.1;060;020= CA5.7;020;050+ CA5.7;040;050+ CA5.7;060;050+

CA5.7;090;050+

CA5.7;190;050+ CA5.8;050;130+

CA5.9;010;030+CA5.9;050;030+CA5.9;120;030+

CA5.9;150;030+CA5.9;020;050+CA5.9;130;050+CA5.9;160;050+CA5.10;130;

050+CA5.10;160;050

Reason:

Columns used in the validation don't seem to be compatible / inconsistent with

the validation rule.

Table 1 column 020 is for 'adjustments to AT1' Table 7 column 050 is for 'adjustments to T1' Table 8 column 130 is for '(-) adjustments to T1'



Table 9 'deductions from AT1' column 030 is for 'adjustments to the original

deduction'

Table 9 'deductions from AT1' column 050 is for '(-) adjustments to T1'

Table 10 column 050 is for '(-) adjustments to T1'

Given:

CA5.1;060;030= **CA5.7;010;060**+ CA5.7;060;060+ **CA5.7;080;060**+ CA5.7;190;060+ CA5.8;050;140+ CA5.9;130;060+ CA5.9;160;060+ CA5.10;010;030+ CA5.10;050;030+CA5.10;120;030+CA5.10;150;030+

CA5.10;020;060+CA5.10;130;060+CA5.10;160;060

Reasons:

(1) Column / Row in **bold** are included in the validation formula but are 'greyed'

(not for population) cells on the templates.

(2) Columns used in the validation don't seem to be compatible / inconsistent

with the validation rule.

Table 1 column 030 is for 'adjustments to Tier 1' Table 7 column 060 is for 'adjustments to T2' Table 8 column 140 is for 'adjustments to T2'

Table 9 'deductions from AT1' column 060 is for 'adjustments to T2'

Table 10 'deductions from T2' column 030 is for 'adjustments to the original

deduction'

Table 10 column 060 is for '(-) adjustments to T2'

CA5 Table 5

Given:

For rows 010, 020, 030

CA5.5;010;030= CA5 Table 5;*;010

Correction:

For rows 010, 020, 030

CA5.5;column 030 = CA5.5;column 010 * column 020

Reason:

Typographical error in the formula

CA5 Table 7

Given:

CA5.7;190;060=(-1)*CA5.7;190;040

Correction:

CA5.7;190;060=<u>(-0.5)*</u>CA5.7;190;040

CA5.7;190;050=(-0.5)*CA5.7;190;040

Reason:

Article 453(9) point (a) the amounts required to be deducted that relate to direct

holdings are deducted half from Tier 1 items and half from Tier 2 items.

Given:

Reason:

CA5.7;040;010=CA1;300 + CA1;300 CA5.7;040;010=CA1;300 + CA1;340

Correction:

Typographical error in the formula

CA5 Table 10

Given:

For rows 010, 050, 120, 150

CA5.10; column 030 = (-1) * (100-CA5.10; column 020) * CA5.10; column 010

Correction:

For rows 010, 050, 120, 150

CA5.10; column 030 = (-1) * (100% - CA5.10; column 020) * CA5.10; column

010

Reason:

Typographical error in the formula



GS

Validation errors

Given:

Column 070 = CA2;040 + CA2;500

Correction:

Column 070 = CA2;040 + CA2;500 + CA510

Reason:

the formula included CA2:510 Settlement/delivery risk in the Trading book?

Given:

Column 080 = CA2;530

Correction:

Column 080 = CA2;520

Reason:

CA2;530 is for 'Risk exposure amount for position, foreign exchange and commodities risks under standardised approaches (SA)' and not 'Total risk

exposure amount for position, foreign exchange, commodities risks'

Given:

Column 090 = CA2;630

Correction:

Column 090 = CA2;620

Reason:

CA2;630 is for 'OpR Basic indicator approach (BIA)', should this be CA2;630

'Total risk exposure amount for operational risk'?

Given:

Column 100 = CA2;680 + CA2;700 + CA2;740

Correction:

Column 100 = CA2; 720 + CA730 + CA740

Reason:

CA;680 is for 'Advanced method' and CA;700 'Total risk exposure amount related to large exposures in the trading book', this does not validate to column

100 'Other and transitional risk exposures'