Procedure file

Basic information

INI - Own-initiative procedure	2017/2072(INI)	Procedure completed
Banking union. Annual report 2017 Subject 2.50.04 Banks and credit		

Key players

European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	ECON Economic and Monetary Affairs		21/03/2017
		ECR LOONES Sander	
		Shadow rapporteur	
		EPP HÜBNER Danuta Maria	
		S&D DELVAUX Mady	
		CORNILLET Thierry	
		URTASUN Ernest	
		EFD VALLI Marco	
		ENF KAPPEL Barbara	
European Commission	Commission DG	Commissioner	
	Financial Stability, Financial Services and Capital Markets Union	MOSCOVICI Pierre	

Key events

18/05/2017	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
24/01/2018	Vote in committee		
07/02/2018	Committee report tabled for plenary	A8-0019/2018	
01/03/2018	Results of vote in Parliament		
01/03/2018	Debate in Parliament		

01/03/2018	Decision by Parliament	T8-0058/2018	Summary
01/03/2018	End of procedure in Parliament		

Technical information

Procedure reference	2017/2072(INI)
Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Annual report
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 54
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	ECON/8/09629

Documentation gateway

Committee draft report		PE612.243	20/10/2017	EP	
Amendments tabled in committee		PE613.640	24/11/2017	EP	
Amendments tabled in committee		PE613.641	24/11/2017	EP	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A8-0019/2018	07/02/2018	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T8-0058/2018	01/03/2018	EP	Summary
Commission response to text adopted in plenary		SP(2018)292	23/07/2018	EC	

Banking union. Annual report 2017

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has adopted an own-initiative report by Sander LOONES (ECR, BE) on banking union - 2017 annual report.

Members considered that the banking union, as a fundamental objective to guarantee the financial stability of the euro area and indispensable foundation of a genuine economic and monetary union, should be strengthened. Further efforts are needed, however, as the banking union remains incomplete until it has a single budget back-stop for the Single Resolution Fund and a third pillar for deposit re/insurance.

The risks to financial stability remain but have already been substantially reduced since the start of the establishment of the banking union. Members stated that the current favourable economic conditions constitute a window of opportunity to push necessary reforms to complete the banking union.

Resistance tests: the report notes that the upcoming EBA stress tests in 2018. It called on the EBA, the ESRB, the ECB and the Commission to use consistent methodologies, scenarios and assumptions when defining the stress tests.

It stressed however that the soundness of a bank cannot be captured by a point-in-time assessment of its balance sheet alone. Furthermore, that the ECBs own stress test for additional banks under its supervision could benefit from more transparency.

Supervision: Members welcomed the fact that the Banking Union has improved the exchange of relevant information between supervisory authorities and has improved the collection and exchange of data on the European banking system, contributing for example to better benchmarking and enabling a more holistic supervision of cross-border banking groups.

The exchange of information and coordination between the ECBs banking supervision and the SRB should be improved, in particular as regards the crucial issues of whether an institution is eligible for precautionary recapitalisation and whether it is failing or likely to fail.

The report stressed the need to: (i) clarify the use of asset quality reviews in order to determine whether the conditions for precautionary recapitalisation are met; (ii) increase transparency when assessing the solvency of credit institutions and considering resolution decisions.

Non-performing loans: concerned about the presence of the high-level of non-performing loans (NPLs) in some countries, Members called on the Commission to propose legislative and non-legislative actions to encourage the provision of information to potential investors, the establishment of dedicated asset management companies (bad banks) and the development of secondary markets for NPLs in order to deal with the overwhelming problem of non-performing loans.

Sovereign debt risks: Members noted that in some Member States financial institutions have over invested in bonds issued by their own governments, constituting excessive home bias. They also noted that, with a view to limiting financial stability risks, it would be better if banks' sovereign bond portfolios were more diverse.

Members also stressed the need to address the flaws identified in internal models in order to re-establish their credibility and achieve a level playing field across institutions.

IFRS 9: the report stressed the importance of the fast-track procedure that led to the agreement on the phasing-in of International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 9, as well as the transitional arrangements for the exemption from the large exposure limit available to exposures to certain public sector debt of Member States denominated in currencies of any Member States.

Members considered, however, that a transition should not unduly delay the application of IFRS. In addition, the impact IFRS 9 and the nature and allocation of loans by banks should be monitored. The ESRB and the MSU are invited to discuss these issues.

Proportionality: Members pointed out that the high costs associated with the implementation of supervisory arrangements may be particularly difficult for smaller institutions to manage. They called for the principle of proportionality to be better taken into account in certain supervisory arrangements by the ECB in the context of its supervisory activities.

Brexit: the report welcomed the work done in promoting supervisory convergence in the context of the UKs withdrawal from the EU in order to limit the development of regulatory and supervisory arbitrage risks. It stated that any supervisory cooperation model to be developed between the EU and the UK should respect the financial stability of the EU and its regulatory and supervisory regime and standards and their application.

Resolution: the report welcomed the work done by the Board to increase its bank resolution capacity at Union level. It noted, however, that resolution planning is currently still very much a work in progress.

Recalling the objectives of the directive establishing a framework for the recovery and resolution of credit institutions and investment firms (BRRD), Members that extraordinary public financial support measures may only be used to remedy a serious disturbance in the economy and to preserve financial stability and that they shall not be used to offset losses that an institution has incurred or is likely to incur in the near future.

Members welcomed the SRBs stated prioritisation of enhancing resolvability of credit institutions, as well as the progress made towards setting binding targets regarding individual minimum requirement for own funds and eligible liabilities (MREL) targets at consolidated level.

The report emphasised the importance of operational and credible resolution plans and the need for an effective regime to address breaches of this requirement and that MREL should be mindful of institutions business models for the purpose of ensuring the resolvability of these institutions. The SRB is called on to provide a comprehensive list of obstacles to resolvability encountered in national or European legislation.

Members also welcomed the agreement reached on the additional harmonisation of the priority ranking of unsecured debt instruments. They called for rapid implementation by Member States so that banks can issue debt in the new insolvency class and thereby build up the required buffers.

Deposit insurance: Members recalled that the deposit protection is a common concern of all EU citizens and that the banking union remains incomplete without a third pillar. They stressed that further harmonisation of the rules applying to deposit guarantee schemes is necessary in order to achieve a level playing field within the Banking Union.

Banking union. Annual report 2017

The European Parliament adopted by 476 votes to 116, with 25 abstentions, a resolution on the banking union - 2017 annual report.

Members considered that the banking union, as a fundamental objective to guarantee the financial stability of the euro area and indispensable foundation of a genuine economic and monetary union, should be strengthened. Further efforts are needed, however, as the banking union remains incomplete until it has a single budget back-stop for the Single Resolution Fund and a third pillar for deposit re/insurance.

The risks to financial stability remain but have already been substantially reduced since the start of the establishment of the banking union. Members stated that the current favourable economic conditions constitute a window of opportunity to push necessary reforms to complete the banking union.

Resistance tests: Parliament noted the upcoming EBA stress tests in 2018. It called on the EBA, the ESRB, the ECB and the Commission to use consistent methodologies, scenarios and assumptions when defining the stress tests.

It stressed however that the soundness of a bank cannot be captured by a point-in-time assessment of its balance sheet alone. Furthermore, that the ECBs own stress test for additional banks under its supervision could benefit from more transparency.

Supervision: Members welcomed the fact that the Banking Union has improved the exchange of relevant information between supervisory authorities and has improved the collection and exchange of data on the European banking system, contributing for example to better benchmarking and enabling a more holistic supervision of cross-border banking groups.

The exchange of information and coordination between the ECBs banking supervision and the SRB should be improved, in particular as regards the crucial issues of whether an institution is eligible for precautionary recapitalisation and whether it is failing or likely to fail.

The resolution stressed the need to: (i) clarify the use of asset quality reviews in order to determine whether the conditions for precautionary recapitalisation are met; (ii) increase transparency when assessing the solvency of credit institutions and considering resolution decisions.

Non-performing loans: the stock of non-performing loans (NPLs) stood at EUR 1 trillion in total according to the ESRB report of July 2017. Concerned about the presence of the high-level of non-performing loans in some countries, Members supported the Commissions decision to explore the potential harmonisation in prudential terms at EU level of new loans that become non-performing. Members also called on the Commission to propose legislative and non-legislative actions to encourage the provision of information to potential investors, the establishment of dedicated asset management companies (bad banks) and the development of secondary markets for NPLs in order to deal with the overwhelming problem of non-performing loans.

Sovereign debt risks: Parliament noted that in some Member States financial institutions have over invested in bonds issued by their own governments, constituting excessive home bias. They also noted that, with a view to limiting financial stability risks, it would be better if banks' sovereign bond portfolios were more diverse.

Members also stressed the need to address the flaws identified in internal models in order to re-establish their credibility and achieve a level playing field across institutions.

Noting, in this context, the BCBS endorsement of the amendments for the finalisation of Basel III, Members considered that the agreement should not result in a significant increase in capital requirements at Union level or harm the ability of banks to finance the real economy, in particular SMEs.

IFRS 9: Parliament stressed the importance of the fast-track procedure that led to the agreement on the phasing-in of International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 9, as well as the transitional arrangements for the exemption from the large exposure limit available to exposures to certain public sector debt of Member States denominated in currencies of any Member States.

Members considered, however, that a transition should not unduly delay the application of IFRS. In addition, the impact IFRS 9 and the nature and allocation of loans by banks should be monitored. The ESRB and the MSU are invited to discuss these issues.

Proportionality: Members pointed out that the high costs associated with the implementation of supervisory arrangements may be particularly difficult for smaller institutions to manage. They called for the principle of proportionality to be better taken into account in certain supervisory arrangements by the ECB in the context of its supervisory activities.

Brexit: Parliament welcomed the work done in promoting supervisory convergence in the context of the UKs withdrawal from the EU in order to limit the development of regulatory and supervisory arbitrage risks. It stated that any supervisory cooperation model to be developed between the EU and the UK should respect the financial stability of the EU and its regulatory and supervisory regime and standards and their application.

Resolution: welcoming the work done by the SRB to intensify its bank resolution capacity at Union level, Parliament noted that resolution planning is currently still very much a work in progress. It called on the SRB to intensify its recruitment efforts and on national authorities to make seconded experts easily available to the SRB. It also called for greater transparency, in particular as regards the European Parliament's access to key documents supporting resolution decisions.

Members pointed out that one of the causes of the arbitration opportunities revealed by recent resolution cases is the divergence between the state aid rules, applied under the current resolution regime, and the national insolvency law. They therefore invited the Commission to review the bank insolvency frameworks in the Union in order to draw lessons from the 2017 banking cases.

Recalling the objectives of the directive establishing a framework for the recovery and resolution of credit institutions and investment firms (BRRD), Parliament stated that extraordinary public financial support measures may only be used to remedy a serious disturbance in the economy and to preserve financial stability and that they shall not be used to offset losses that an institution has incurred or is likely to incur in the near future. It considered that extraordinary public financial support should also be accompanied, where appropriate, by remedial actions.

While welcoming the improvement in the resolvability of credit institutions, Parliament stressed the importance of operational and credible resolution plans and that the minimum requirement for own funds and eligible liabilities should take account of the institutions business models to ensure the resolvability of these institutions. It called on the SRB to provide a comprehensive list of obstacles to resolvability encountered in national or European legislation; stresses that the revision of the BRRD should in no way lag behind internationally agreed standards.

Deposit insurance: Parliament recalled that the deposit protection is a common concern of all EU citizens and that the banking union remains incomplete without a third pillar. It stressed that further harmonisation of the rules applying to deposit guarantee schemes is necessary in order to achieve a level playing field within the Banking Union.