

Notification template for Article 124 of the Capital Requirements Regulation (CRR) – Risk Weights

Template for notifying the European Banking Authority (EBA), European Central Bank (ECB) and European Systemic Risk Board (ESRB) of higher risk weights being set for immovable property pursuant to Articles 125(1) and 126(1) CRR or on applying stricter criteria than those set out in Articles 125(2) and 126(2) CRR

Please send/upload this template to:

- macropru.notifications@ecb.europa.eu when notifying the ECB (under Article 5 of the Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM) Regulation¹);
- notifications@esrb.europa.eu when notifying the ESRB;
- eportal.eba.europa.eu when notifying the EBA.

The ESRB will publish the risk weights and criteria for exposures referred to in Articles 125, 126 and 199(1)(a) of the CRR as implemented by the relevant authority. This notification will be made public by the ESRB after the relevant authorities have adopted and published the notified macroprudential measure².

E-mailing/uploading this template to the above addresses constitutes official notification; no further official letter is required. To facilitate the work of the notified authorities, please submit the notification template in a format that allows the information to be read electronically.

1. Notifying national authority	
1.1 Name of the notifying authority	Liechtenstein Financial Market Authority
1.2 Country of the notifying authority	Liechtenstein
2. Scope of the notification and description of the measure	
2.1 Exposures secured by mortgages on residential property	<p>a) Do you intend to set a higher risk weight than that set out in Article 125(1) CRR for exposures fully and completely secured by mortgages on residential property?</p> <p>No. The notified measure is aimed at repealing the regulation, under national law – specifically, the Banking Ordinance (Art. 21h BankV; Annex 4.5 BankV) – that imposed alternative risk weights on such exposures. With the implementation of CRR III on April 1, 2025, the standard risk weights set out in CRR III will become applicable. As a result, the higher risk weight requirements previously imposed under national regulation are no longer necessary and are withdrawn.</p>

¹ Council Regulation (EU) No 1024/2013 of 15 October 2013 conferring specific tasks on the European Central Bank concerning policies relating to the prudential supervision of credit institutions (OJ L 287, 29.10.2013, p. 63).

² On request by the notifying authority, it may be agreed with the Head of the ESRB Secretariat that this notification, or a part thereof, should not be published for reasons of confidentiality or financial stability.

	<p>b) If yes, please specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which risk weight you intend to change. Please specify the new risk weight to be set (between 35% and 150%). - To which part(s) of your Member State territory will the new risk weight for exposures set out above apply? - To which property segment(s) will the new risk weight for exposures set out above apply? <p>n/a</p> <p>c) Do you intend to apply stricter criteria than those set out in Article 125(2) CRR for exposures fully and completely secured by mortgages on residential property?</p> <p>No</p> <p>d) If yes, please specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What criteria you intend to add or tighten. - To which part(s) of your Member State territory the stricter criteria set out above will apply? - To which property segment(s) will the new risk weighting for exposures set out above apply? <p>n/a</p>
<p>2.2 Exposures secured by mortgages on commercial immovable property</p>	<p>e) Do you intend to set a higher risk weight than that set out in Article 126(1) CRR for exposures fully and completely secured by mortgages on commercial immovable property?</p> <p>No</p> <p>f) If yes, please specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What risk weight you intend to set. Please specify the new risk weight to be set (between 50% and 150%). - To which part(s) your Member State territory will the new risk weight set out above apply? - To which property segment(s) will the new risk weight set out above apply? <p>n/a</p> <p>g) Do you intend to apply stricter criteria than those set out in Article 126(2) CRR for exposures fully and completely secured by mortgages on commercial immovable property?</p> <p>No</p> <p>h) If yes, please specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What criteria you intend to add or tighten. - To which part(s) of your Member State territory will the stricter criteria set out above apply? - To which property segment(s) will the new risk weight set out above apply? <p>n/a</p>
<p>2.3 Other relevant information</p>	<p>Any other relevant information</p> <p>The CRR III framework aims to enhance the resilience of the banking sector and further strengthen financial stability by introducing more risk-sensitive, granular risk weights for exposures secured by real estate. Based on these adjustments and following the Liechtenstein Financial Stability Committee's (FSC) recommendation dated 30 September 2024, the option to apply the alternative risk weights is no longer exercised. The overall impact of these changes will be monitored on a regular basis.</p>
<p>3. Timing for the measure</p>	

3.1 Timing for the decision	What is the date of the official decision? <u>For SSM countries when notifying the ECB: provide the date on which the decision referred to in Article 5 of the Single Supervisory Mechanism Regulation (SSMR) will be taken.</u> 30/09/2024
3.2 Timing for publication	What is the date of publication for the notified measure? 21/03/2025
3.3 Disclosure	Information about the strategy for communicating the notified measure to the market. Please provide a link to the public announcement, if any. https://www.fma-li.li/de/aufsicht-regulierung/finanzstabilitaet-und-makroprudenzielle-aufsicht/ausschuss-fuer-finanzmarktstabilitaet/risikohinweise-und-empfehlungen
3.4 Timing for application	What is the intended date for application of the measure? 01/04/2025
3.5 Frequency/review	Does your decision to set higher risk weights have an expiry date? When will the decision be reviewed? n/a
4. Reason for setting higher risk weights or stricter criteria than those set out in Articles 125(2) or 126(2) CRR	
4.1 Regulatory context	What are the current risk weights applied to exposures secured by mortgages on residential property and on commercial immovable property?
4.2 Risk weights versus actual risks	Specify the reasons why the risk weights for exposures to one or more property segments fully secured by mortgages on residential property or on commercial immovable property located in one or more parts of your Member State territory do not reflect the actual risks of these exposures and put your answers in perspective vis-à-vis the real estate markets of other European Member States.
4.3 Motivation	<p><u>a) Loss experience</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide details about the loss experience in the real estate market of your Member State that has led you to conclude that higher risk weights must be set or stricter criteria applied than those set out in Articles 125(2) and 126(2) CRR. - Which of the data referred to in Article 430a CRR were considered in your assessment? - Provide any other indicators and other relevant information on the basis of which the assessment was made. If possible, please provide the data (preferably in an Excel file). <p><u>b) Forward-looking real-estate market developments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Describe the forward-looking real-estate market developments that led you to conclude that higher risk weights should be set or stricter criteria applied than those set out in Articles 125(2) and 126(2) CRR. - Provide the indicators and any other relevant information on the basis of which the assessment was made. If possible, please provide the corresponding data (preferably in an Excel file).

	<p>c) Financial stability considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the financial stability considerations that were taken into account? - Please include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o the factors that could 'adversely affect current or future financial stability' as referred to in Article 124(2)(2) CRR; and, o the indicative benchmarks that you took into account in determining the higher risk weights. - Provide the indicators and any other relevant information on the basis of which the assessment was made. If possible, please provide the data (preferably in an Excel file).
5. Sufficiency, consistency and non-overlap of the policy response	
5.1 Sufficiency of the policy response	<p>For a macroprudential policy to be 'sufficient', the policy responses must be deemed to significantly mitigate, or reduce the build-up of, risks over an appropriate time horizon with a limited unintended impact on the general economy.</p> <p>Note that the ESRB will use the assessment of the macroprudential stance as relevant input in assessing the sufficiency of the macroprudential policy in the Member State.</p> <p>Please provide any additional information that the ESRB should consider in assessing the sufficiency of the policy response.</p> <p>If competent authorities in a country consider that the inadequacy of the risk weights could adversely affect current or future financial stability, it may increase risk weights and/or lower the percentages of the relevant property value according to Article 124 of the CRR. The FSC has recently recommended that risk weights for mortgage loans should not be further tightened, as the available data suggests that the risk weights for such exposures are already expected to increase under the CRR III framework. Consequently, maintaining the current stance is deemed sufficient without further adjustment. However, the complete impact of these changes will only become evident next year and will be considered in the re-calibration of the systemic risk buffer accordingly.</p>
5.2 Consistency of application of the policy response	<p>For a macroprudential policy to be 'consistent', the policy instruments must be deemed to meet their respective objectives, as outlined in ESRB/2013/1³, and they must be implemented in accordance with the common principles set out in the relevant legal texts.</p> <p>Note that the ESRB assessment of consistency will consider whether the same systemic risks are addressed in a similar way across and within the Member States over time.</p> <p>Please provide any additional information that the ESRB should consider in assessing the consistency of the policy response.</p> <p>Yes. The proposed regulation is implemented in accordance with the applicable legal principles.</p>

³ Recommendation of the European Systemic Risk Board of 4 April 2013 on intermediate objectives and instruments of macro-prudential policy (ESRB/2013/1) (OJ C 170, 15.6.2013, p. 1).

<p>5.3 Non-overlap of the policy response</p>	<p>For a policy instrument to be 'non-overlapping', it should aim to address a systemic risk that either differs from a risk addressed by other active tools in the same Member State, or be complementary to another tool in that Member State which addresses the same systemic risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are other policy instruments used to address the <u>same</u> systemic risk? - If yes, please explain the need for more than one instrument to address the same systemic risk and how the different instruments interact with each other. <p>n/a</p>
<p>6. Cross-border and cross-sector impact of the measure</p>	
<p>6.1 Assessment of cross-border effects and the likely impact on the Internal Market (Recommendation ESRB/2015/2⁴)</p>	<p>Assessment of the cross-border effects of implementation of the measure.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Assessment of the spillover channels operating via risk adjustment and regulatory arbitrage. The relevant indicators provided in Chapter 11 of the ESRB Handbook on Operationalising Macroprudential Policy in the Banking Sector⁵ and the Framework to assess cross-border spillover effects of macroprudential policies of the ECB Task Force on cross-border spillover effects of macroprudential measures can be used. b. Assessment of the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o cross-border effects of implementation of the measure in your own jurisdiction (inward spillovers); o cross-border effects on other Member States and on the Single Market of the measure (outward spillovers); o overall impact on the Single Market of implementation of the measure <p>n/a.</p>
<p>6.2 Assessment of leakages and regulatory arbitrage within the notifying Member State</p>	<p>Referring to your Member State's specific characteristics, what is the scope for "leakages and regulatory arbitrage" in your own jurisdiction (i.e. circumvention of the measure/leakages to other parts of the financial sector)?</p> <p>Is there scope for "leakages and regulatory arbitrage" in other jurisdictions?</p> <p>n/a</p>
<p>7. Miscellaneous</p>	
<p>7.1 Contact person(s)/mailbox at notifying authority</p>	<p>Contact person(s) (name, phone number and e-mail address) and mailbox for further inquiries.</p> <p>Sophia Döme +4232367493 sophia.doeme@fma-li.li</p> <p>Elias Hasler +4232367556 elias.hasler@fma-li.li</p>

⁴ Recommendation of the European Systemic Risk Board of 15 December 2015 on the assessment of cross-border effects of and voluntary reciprocity for macroprudential policy measures (ESRB/2015/2) (OJ C 97, 12.3.2016, p. 9).

⁵ Available on the ESRB's website at www.esrb.europa.eu.

7.2 Any other relevant information	
7.3 Date of the notification	<p>Please provide the date on which this notification was uploaded/sent. 16/04/2025</p>