



Notification template for Article 131 of the Capital Requirements Directive (CRD) – Other Systemically Important Institutions (O-SIIs)

Template for notifying the European Central Bank (ECB) and the European Systemic Risk Board (ESRB) of the setting or resetting of an O-SII buffer under Article 131(7) CRD and of the identity of O-SIIs under Article 131(12) CRD

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.

The ESRB will forward this notification to the European Commission, to the European Banking Authority (EBA) and to the competent and designated authorities of the Member States concerned without delay and will publicly disclose the names of the O-SIIs on its website. This notification will be made public by the ESRB once 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 send 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	Federal Financial Supervisory Authority (Bundesanstalt für Finanzdienstleistungsaufsicht - BaFin)							
1.2 Country of the notifying authority	Germany							
2. Description of the measure								
2.1a Institution or group of institutions concerned	On which institution(s) is the measure applied (name and Legal Entity Identifier (LEI) code)?							
	Is the measure applied at:							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The highest level of consolidation? - A sub-consolidated level? - An individual level? 							
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of institution</th> <th>LEI</th> <th>Consolidation level</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Deutsche Bank AG</td> <td>7LTFWZYICNSX8D621 K86</td> <td>Highest Level</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of institution	LEI	Consolidation level	Deutsche Bank AG	7LTFWZYICNSX8D621 K86	Highest Level	
Name of institution	LEI	Consolidation level						
Deutsche Bank AG	7LTFWZYICNSX8D621 K86	Highest Level						

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.

	Commerzbank AG	851WYG NLUQLFZBSY GB56	Highest Level																					
	DZ Bank AG, Zentral- Genossenschaftsbank	529900HNOAA1KXQJ UQ27	Highest Level																					
	Unicredit Bank AG	2ZCNRR8UK83OBTEK 2170	Highest Level																					
	J.P. Morgan AG	549300ZK53CNGEEI6 A29	Highest Level																					
	Landesbank Baden- Württemberg	B81CK4ESI35472RHJ6 06	Highest Level																					
	Landesbank Hessen- Thüringen Girozentrale	DIZES5CFO5K315R587 46	Highest Level																					
	Bayerische Landesbank	VDYMYTQGZZ6DU09 12C88	Highest Level																					
	ING DiBa AG	3KXUNHVVOFIJN6RH LO76	Highest Level																					
	NRW.Bank	52990002O5KK6XOGJ 020	Highest Level																					
	Norddeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale	DSNHHQ2B9X5N6OU J1236	Highest Level																					
	Goldman Sachs Bank Europe SE	8IBZUGJ7JPLH368JE3 46	Highest Level																					
	Landwirtschaftliche Rentenbank ³	529900Z3JON6S0F7CT 25	Highest Level																					
	DekaBank Deutsche Girozentrale	0W2PZJM8XOY22M4 GG883	Highest Level																					
2.1b Changes to the list of institutions concerned	Goldman Sachs Bank Europe SE was added to the list, because their overall score with 107 basis points rose above the threshold of 100 basis points.																							
2.2 Level of the buffer applied	At what level is the fully phased-in buffer (in %) applied to the institution(s)?																							
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of institution</th> <th>New O-SII buffer</th> <th>Previous O-SII buffer</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Deutsche Bank AG</td> <td>2.0%</td> <td>2.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commerzbank AG</td> <td>1.25%</td> <td>1.25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DZ Bank AG, Zentral- Genossenschaftsbank</td> <td>1.0%</td> <td>1.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unicredit Bank AG</td> <td>1.0%</td> <td>1.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>J.P. Morgan AG</td> <td>0.75%</td> <td>0.25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Landesbank Baden- Württemberg</td> <td>0.75%</td> <td>0.75%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Name of institution	New O-SII buffer	Previous O-SII buffer	Deutsche Bank AG	2.0%	2.0%	Commerzbank AG	1.25%	1.25%	DZ Bank AG, Zentral- Genossenschaftsbank	1.0%	1.0%	Unicredit Bank AG	1.0%	1.0%	J.P. Morgan AG	0.75%	0.25%	Landesbank Baden- Württemberg	0.75%	0.75%
Name of institution	New O-SII buffer	Previous O-SII buffer																						
Deutsche Bank AG	2.0%	2.0%																						
Commerzbank AG	1.25%	1.25%																						
DZ Bank AG, Zentral- Genossenschaftsbank	1.0%	1.0%																						
Unicredit Bank AG	1.0%	1.0%																						
J.P. Morgan AG	0.75%	0.25%																						
Landesbank Baden- Württemberg	0.75%	0.75%																						

³ The German administrative procedure for the designation of the listed institution as O-SII is still pending.

	Landesbank Hessen-Thüringen Girozentrale	0.5%	0.75%
	Bayerische Landesbank	0.5%	0.5%
	ING DiBa AG	0.25%	0.25%
	NRW.Bank	0.25%	0.25%
	Norddeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale	0.25%	0.25%
	Goldman Sachs Bank Europe SE	0.25%	Not applicable
	Landwirtschaftliche Rentenbank ⁴	0.25%	0.25%
	DekaBank Deutsche Girozentrale	0.25%	0.25%
2.3 Name of the ultimate EU parent institution	Please provide the name and LEI code of the ultimate EU parent institution of the group for each of the O-SIIs identified. If the ultimate EU parent institution is not the concerned institution itself.		
	Name of identified O-SII	Ultimate EU parent institution	LEI of ultimate parent institution
	UniCredit Bank AG	Unicredit S.p.A.	549300TRUWO2CD2G5692
	ING-Diba AG	ING Groep N.V	549300NYKK9MWM7GGW15
2.4 Names of subsidiaries	If any of the O-SIIs identified is a parent institution and the buffer is applied at a (sub)consolidated level, please name the subsidiaries of the institution that are notified as O-SIIs (please give names and LEI codes).		
	Name of parent O-SII identified	Name of O-SII subsidiary	LEI of O-SII subsidiary
	Commerzbank AG	mBank SA	259400DZXF7UJJK2AY35
3. Timing for the measure			
3.1 Timing for the decision	What is the date of the official decision? <u>For SSM countries when notifying the ECB</u> : provide the date on which the decision referred to in Article 5 of the Single Supervisory Mechanism Regulation (SSMR) will be taken. 25/10/2021		
3.2 Timing for publication	What is the date of publication of the notified measure? 01/12/2021		

⁴ The German administrative procedure for the designation of the listed institution as O-SII is still pending.

<p>3.3 Disclosure</p>	<p>Information about the strategy for if the communicating the notified measure to the market.</p> <p>The designated institutions and their respective O-SII capital buffer requirements will be published on the internet webpage of the BaFin.</p> <p>https://www.bafin.de/DE/Aufsicht/BankenFinanzdienstleister/Eigenmittelanforderungen/ASRI/asri_node.html</p>																																										
<p>3.4 Timing for application</p>	<p>What is the intended date of application of the measure?</p> <p>01/01/2022</p>																																										
<p>3.5 Phasing in</p>	<p>What is the intended timeline for the phase-in of the measure?</p> <p>→ not applicable</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="571 622 1441 734"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of institution</th> <th>Date1</th> <th>Date2</th> <th>Date3</th> <th>Date4</th> <th>Date5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of institution	Date1	Date2	Date3	Date4	Date5		%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%																								
Name of institution	Date1	Date2	Date3	Date4	Date5																																						
	%	%	%	%	%																																						
	%	%	%	%	%																																						
<p>3.6 Review of the measure</p>	<p>When will the measure be reviewed (Article 131, paragraphs (6) and (12), specify that the buffer, the identification of O-SIIs and their allocation to subcategories must be reviewed at least annually)?</p> <p>The necessity and level of O-SII buffers are reviewed annually.</p> <p>(Section 10g (3) of the German Banking Act; Article 131(6) of the Directive 2013/36/EU (CRD)).</p>																																										
<p>4. Reason for O-SII identification and activation of the O-SII buffer</p>																																											
<p>4.1 Scores of institutions or group of institutions concerned, as per EBA guidelines on the assessment of O-SIIs (Article 131.3 CRD)</p>	<p>Please list here the names, overall scores and category scores of the O-SIIs identified based on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. size; b. importance for the economy of the relevant Member State or the Union, capturing substitutability/financial institution infrastructure; c. complexity, including the additional complexities from cross-border activity; d. interconnectedness of the institution or (sub-)group with the financial system. <p>→ In step 1 of the identification process (EBA/GL/2014/10, Title II) automatically identified O-SIIs (score ≥ 350 bps):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="571 1532 1441 1888"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rank</th> <th>O-SII Institution</th> <th>Overall score</th> <th>Size</th> <th>Interconnectedness</th> <th>Complexity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td> <td>Deutsche Bank AG</td> <td>2,274.2</td> <td>1,540.9</td> <td>1,807.6</td> <td>4,015.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.</td> <td>Commerzbank AG</td> <td>721.6</td> <td>589.0</td> <td>463.4</td> <td>881.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.</td> <td>DZ Bank AG, Zentral-Genossenschaftsbank</td> <td>481.3</td> <td>556.5</td> <td>818.8</td> <td>271.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.</td> <td>UniCredit Bank AG</td> <td>446.8</td> <td>392.7</td> <td>433.1</td> <td>599.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.</td> <td>Landesbank Baden-Württemberg</td> <td>377.8</td> <td>317.8</td> <td>472.5</td> <td>461.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6.</td> <td>J.P. Morgan AG</td> <td>375.0</td> <td>284.3</td> <td>393.1</td> <td>711.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>→ In step 2 of the identification process (EBA/GL/2014/10, Title III: Supervisory Assessment) identified O-SIIs (score ≥ 100 bps and/or expert judgment):</p>	Rank	O-SII Institution	Overall score	Size	Interconnectedness	Complexity	1.	Deutsche Bank AG	2,274.2	1,540.9	1,807.6	4,015.5	2.	Commerzbank AG	721.6	589.0	463.4	881.4	3.	DZ Bank AG, Zentral-Genossenschaftsbank	481.3	556.5	818.8	271.7	4.	UniCredit Bank AG	446.8	392.7	433.1	599.7	5.	Landesbank Baden-Württemberg	377.8	317.8	472.5	461.2	6.	J.P. Morgan AG	375.0	284.3	393.1	711.9
Rank	O-SII Institution	Overall score	Size	Interconnectedness	Complexity																																						
1.	Deutsche Bank AG	2,274.2	1,540.9	1,807.6	4,015.5																																						
2.	Commerzbank AG	721.6	589.0	463.4	881.4																																						
3.	DZ Bank AG, Zentral-Genossenschaftsbank	481.3	556.5	818.8	271.7																																						
4.	UniCredit Bank AG	446.8	392.7	433.1	599.7																																						
5.	Landesbank Baden-Württemberg	377.8	317.8	472.5	461.2																																						
6.	J.P. Morgan AG	375.0	284.3	393.1	711.9																																						

	Name of institution	Size	Substitutability	Complexity	Interconnectedness	Overall Score
	Deutsche Bank AG	1,556	1,580	3,700	1,927	2,191
	Commerzbank AG	680	1,032	915	470	774
	DZ BANK AG, Zentral-Genossenschaftsbank	544	244	377	726	473
	UniCredit Bank AG	450	392	564	455	465
	J.P. Morgan AG	251	87	718	468	381
	Landesbank Baden-Württemberg	335	260	385	421	351
	Landesbank Hessen-Thüringen Girozentrale	251	349	198	345	286
	Bayerische Landesbank	314	312	154	328	277
	ING-DiBa AG	215	249	134	94	173
	NRW.BANK	174	19	58	314	141
	Norddeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale	148	93	82	202	131
	Goldman Sachs Bank Europe SE	58	1	212	158	107
	Landwirtschaftliche Rentenbank	94	0	37	276	102
	DekaBank Deutsche Girozentrale	95	18	108	184	101

Please provide other relevant information (indicator values, methodology, calculations and formulas, data sources, information set used for denominators) in a separate Excel file.

methodology:

→ We apply the methodology as described in EBA/GL/2014/10, Title II.

calculations and formulas:

→ see Annex 1 to the notification template

data sources:

→ The data used to calculate the scores has been obtained mainly from:

- FINREP (*primary source*)
- Bilanzstatistik (*optional*)
- Zahlungsverkehrsstatistik der Deutschen Bundesbank (*Payment Transactions Statistics*)
- Individual reporting of the individual institutions

information set used for denominators:

→ The denominators used to calculate the scores are calculated by summing up all values of all institutes in Germany of the respective indicator.

4.2 Methodology and indicators used for designation of the O-SII (Article 131.3)

Please provide information on:

a. whether you followed the EBA guidelines on the assessment of O-SIIs;

→ The identification of the O-SIIs is based on EBA/GL/2014/10.

b. which threshold score has been set to identify O-SIIs;

→ Scores in step 1 of the identification process (EBA/GL/2014/10 Title II “Scoring methodology for the assessment of the O-SIIs”): All institutions with a score of ≥ 350 bps applying EBA/GL/2014/10 Title II were automatically identified as O-SIIs.

	<p>→ Scores in step 2 of the identification process (EBA/GL/2014/10 Title III “Supervisory Assessment of O-SIIs”): All institutions which received a score of \geq 100 bps in the national scoring model within the assessment according to EBA/GL/2014/10 Title III were additionally identified as an O-SII by supervisory assessment. This calculation was corroborated by an expert judgment.</p> <p>c. whether relevant entities with relative total assets not in excess of 0.02% have been excluded from the identification process;</p> <p>→ No, the assessment covered all institutions in Germany.</p> <p>d. the names and scores of all relevant entities not excluded from the identification process (could be sent in a separate Excel file, see 4.1);</p> <p>→ see Annex 2 to the notification template</p> <p>e. whether non-bank institutions have been included in the calculations.</p> <p>→ The assessment contains only credit institutions and holdings of groups with credit institutions.</p>								
<p>4.3 Supervisory judgement</p>	<p>Have any of the institutions listed in 2.1 been identified by applying supervisory judgement as laid down in EBA guidelines on the assessment of O-SIIs? If yes, please list the respective institutions and provide information on:</p> <p>→ 8 institutions where identified applying supervisory judgement.</p> <p>Landesbank Hessen-Thüringen Girozentrale Bayerische Landesbank ING-DiBa AG NRW.BANK Norddeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale Goldman Sachs Bank Europe SE Landwirtschaftliche Rentenbank DekaBank Deutsche Girozentrale</p> <p>a. which of the optional indicators have been used to justify the supervisory assessment decisions, if any, and what the scores were;</p> <p>→ Indicators used for EBA/GL/2014/10, Title III:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="667 1624 1417 2022"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>Nationally expanded indicators</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Size</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total assets + contingent liabilities </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Economic importance (including substitutability / financial system infrastructure)</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value of domestic payment transactions processed for non-banks Number of domestic payment transactions processed for non-banks Private sector deposits in the EU Private sector loans in the EU </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cross-border activities (including complexity)</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims from foreign non-banks Liabilities to foreign non-banks Claims from foreign banks </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Category	Nationally expanded indicators	Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total assets + contingent liabilities 	Economic importance (including substitutability / financial system infrastructure)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value of domestic payment transactions processed for non-banks Number of domestic payment transactions processed for non-banks Private sector deposits in the EU Private sector loans in the EU 	Cross-border activities (including complexity)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims from foreign non-banks Liabilities to foreign non-banks Claims from foreign banks
Category	Nationally expanded indicators								
Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total assets + contingent liabilities 								
Economic importance (including substitutability / financial system infrastructure)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value of domestic payment transactions processed for non-banks Number of domestic payment transactions processed for non-banks Private sector deposits in the EU Private sector loans in the EU 								
Cross-border activities (including complexity)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims from foreign non-banks Liabilities to foreign non-banks Claims from foreign banks 								

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liabilities to foreign banks • Number of legally independent financial subsidiaries in Germany and abroad • Nominal value of OTC derivatives • Carrying amount of OTC derivatives <hr/> <p>Interconnectedness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liabilities to banks • Liabilities to insurers and other financial institutions • Claims from banks • Claims from insurers and other financial institutions • Debt securities outstanding <hr/> <p>b. why these optional indicators are relevant for the Member State;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In the category size, contingent liabilities have been added to the total assets indicator in order to include off-balance sheet risks. ○ In the category economic importance for the EEA and the Federal Republic of Germany (including substitutability / financial system infrastructure), the number of payment transactions processed has been added as an indicator, in addition to their volume. The number of transactions helps to determine whether an institution processes only small transactions, but a large number of these transactions. ○ In the category cross-border activity (including complexity), cross-jurisdictional claims and liabilities have been broken down into receivables from and liabilities to foreign banks and non-banks. This creates a more differentiated picture of the institutions' cross-border activities. The number of legally independent financial subsidiaries in Germany and abroad has been added as another indicator in order to reflect the complexity of institutions' organisational structure. In addition to the nominal value of the OTC derivatives, the carrying amount of the OTC derivatives is also included in the valuation. The carrying amount of a derivative is an additional meaningful indicator of complexity because it is based on the market value. The market value shows the price at which the derivative can be traded on the market. The carrying amount is thus especially then the relevant indicator, when the derivative would have to be sold in the event of a crisis situation. ○ In the category interconnectedness, intra-financial system assets and liabilities have been broken down into receivables from and liabilities to banks on the one hand and insurers and other financial institutions on the other hand. The distinction between banks and other financial intermediaries gives a more accurate picture of the various contagion channels within the financial system. <p>c. why the bank is systemically important in terms of those particular optional indicators.</p> <p>→ The logic of the scoring model according to EBA/GL/2014/10, Title II, is applied here: the relevance of the respective institution is expressed by the value of its respective indicator in the national, expanded scoring model as well. It is</p>
--	--

	<p>assumed that an institution is systemically important, if the overall score is above a predefined threshold.</p>																																							
<p>4.4 Calibrating the O-SII buffer</p>	<p>Please provide information on the criteria and indicators used to calibrate the level of the O-SII buffer requirement and the mapping to institution-specific buffer requirements.</p> <p>→ The identified institutions are allocated to one of the 12 capital buffer categories: 0.25% - 3.0% [CET1 per total risk exposure] using the following thresholds:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="571 674 1182 1115"> <thead> <tr> <th>Bucket</th> <th>Intervall of scores in bps</th> <th>O-SII buffer</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1</td><td>100 - 209</td><td>0.25%</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>210 - 299</td><td>0.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>300 - 429</td><td>0.75%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>430 - 619</td><td>1.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>620 - 889</td><td>1.25%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>890 - 1,279</td><td>1.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>1,280 - 1,839</td><td>1.75%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>1,840 - 2,589</td><td>2.00%</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>2,590 - 3,339</td><td>2.25%</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>3,340 - 4,089</td><td>2.50%</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>4,090 - 4,839</td><td>2.75%</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>≥ 4,840</td><td>3.00%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Bucket	Intervall of scores in bps	O-SII buffer	1	100 - 209	0.25%	2	210 - 299	0.50%	3	300 - 429	0.75%	4	430 - 619	1.00%	5	620 - 889	1.25%	6	890 - 1,279	1.50%	7	1,280 - 1,839	1.75%	8	1,840 - 2,589	2.00%	9	2,590 - 3,339	2.25%	10	3,340 - 4,089	2.50%	11	4,090 - 4,839	2.75%	12	≥ 4,840	3.00%
Bucket	Intervall of scores in bps	O-SII buffer																																						
1	100 - 209	0.25%																																						
2	210 - 299	0.50%																																						
3	300 - 429	0.75%																																						
4	430 - 619	1.00%																																						
5	620 - 889	1.25%																																						
6	890 - 1,279	1.50%																																						
7	1,280 - 1,839	1.75%																																						
8	1,840 - 2,589	2.00%																																						
9	2,590 - 3,339	2.25%																																						
10	3,340 - 4,089	2.50%																																						
11	4,090 - 4,839	2.75%																																						
12	≥ 4,840	3.00%																																						
<p>4.5 Effectiveness and proportionality of measure</p>	<p>Please provide a justification for why the O-SII buffer is considered likely to be effective and proportionate to mitigate the risk.</p> <p>→ Capital add-ons increase the institutions' total loss-absorbing capacity and so constitute an appropriate measure to strengthen the resilience of institutions and the financial system as a whole. In addition, capital add-ons rectify inappropriate incentives by introducing negative external effects to the decision-making process of systemically important institutions (e.g. profit maximising while neglecting the costs for the economy in the case of a default) and by withdrawing the implicit state guarantee (reduction of moral hazard).</p>																																							
<p>5. Sufficiency, consistency and non-overlap of the policy response</p>																																								
<p>5.1 Sufficiency of the policy response</p>	<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>→ Compared to the beginning of the exercise in 2015 the overall score of many institutions has declined.</p>																																							

<p>5.2 Consistency of application of the policy response</p>	<p>For a macroprudential policy to be ‘consistent’, the policy instruments meet their respective objectives, as outlined in ESRB/2013/1⁵, and 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>→ In order to ensure the stability and functioning of the financial system it is consistent to increase the resilience of systemically important institutions by a higher loss absorbency capacity through an additional capital requirement and by providing an incentive to reduce their relevance to the financial system.</p>
<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>→ According to section 12 of the German Banking Act (Kreditwesengesetz – KWG), O-SIIs are potential systemically important institutions (PSIs). In order to ensure the stability of the financial system and to protect the wider economy, institutions identified as PSIs have to fulfil additional and/or stricter supervisory requirements in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recovery planning (sections 19 and 20 of the SAG) ▪ Restrictions relating to other positions held by management board members (section 25c (2) sentence 2 of the KWG) ▪ Restrictions relating to other positions held by members of the administrative and supervisory bodies (section 25d (3) of the KWG) ▪ Specific requirements for remuneration systems, in particular relating to classification as a "major institution" (section 18 of the German Ordinance on the Supervisory Requirements for Institutions’ Remuneration Systems (Institutsvergütungsverordnung – InstitutsVergV)) ▪ Mandatory establishment of various committees (section 25d (8) KWG and section 25d (9) KWG)
<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/2015/2⁶)</p>	<p>Assessment of the cross-border effects of implementation of the measure.</p> <p>b. 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 Sector⁷ and the Framework to assess cross-border spillover effects of</p>

⁵ 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)

⁶ 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/2015/3) (OJ C 97, 12.3.2016, p. 9).

⁷ Available on the ESRB’s website at www.esrb.europa.eu.

	<p><u>macroprudential policies</u> of the ECB Task Force on cross-border spillover effects of macroprudential measures can be used.</p> <p>c. Assessment of the:</p> <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>→ An analysis concerning possible cross-border effects of the measure was carried out (see also section 10g German Banking Act (KWG)) by Deutsche Bundesbank, consistent with the guidelines set out in Chapter 11 of the ESRB handbook.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Leakages or regulatory arbitrage were not expected following the introduction of the O-SII buffer. o Based on an assessment of cross-border exposures and market shares of German institutions in other Member States, no material effects related to the introduction of the O-SII buffer on the common market have been found.
--	--

<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>→ Leakages or regulatory arbitrage are not expected.</p>
---	---

7. Combinations and interactions with other measures

<p>7.1 Combinations between G-SII and O-SII buffers (Article 131.14)</p>	<p>If both G-SII and O-SII criteria apply to the same institution at consolidated level, which of the two buffers is the highest?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="571 1308 1439 1451"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of institution</th> <th>O-SII buffer</th> <th>G-SII buffer</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Deutsche Bank AG</td> <td>2.0%</td> <td>1.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of institution	O-SII buffer	G-SII buffer	Deutsche Bank AG	2.0%	1.5%		%	%		%	%
Name of institution	O-SII buffer	G-SII buffer											
Deutsche Bank AG	2.0%	1.5%											
	%	%											
	%	%											

<p>7.2 Combinations with systemic risk buffers (SyRBs) (Article 131.15 CRD)</p>	<p>Are any of the institutions identified as O-SIIs subject to a systemic risk buffer?</p> <p>→ The systemic risk buffer has not been activated in Germany.</p> <p>If yes, please provide the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What is/are the systemic risk buffer rate(s)? b. At what level is/are the systemic risk buffer rate(s) applied (i.e. consolidation level and/or individual)? c. Is the sum of the systemic risk buffer rate(s) and the O-SII buffer rate (or the higher of the G-SII and O-SII buffer rates, if a group is subject to a G-SII buffer and to an O-SII buffer at consolidated level) to which the same institution is subject over 5%? <table border="1" data-bbox="571 1854 1423 2016"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of institution</th> <th>SyRB rate</th> <th>SyRB application level</th> <th>Sum of G-SII/O-SII and SyRB rates</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>%</td> <td></td> <td>%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>%</td> <td></td> <td>%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of institution	SyRB rate	SyRB application level	Sum of G-SII/O-SII and SyRB rates		%		%		%		%
Name of institution	SyRB rate	SyRB application level	Sum of G-SII/O-SII and SyRB rates										
	%		%										
	%		%										

		%		%												
		%		%												
		%		%												
		%		%												
		%		%												
		%		%												
		%		%												
7.3 O-SII requirement for a subsidiary (Article 131.8 CRD)	<p>If the O-SII is a subsidiary of an EU parent institution subject to a G-SII or O-SII buffer on a consolidated basis, what is the G-SII or O-SII buffer rate on a consolidated basis of the parent institution?</p> <p>Does the cap for the subsidiary prevent the implementation of a higher O-SII buffer based on the domestic buffer setting methodology?</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of O-SII subsidiary</th> <th>Name of the EU parent of the O-SII subsidiary</th> <th>Buffer applicable to O-SII EU parent</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>UniCredit Bank AG</td> <td>Unicredit Group</td> <td>1.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ING-DiBa AG</td> <td>ING Bank N.V.</td> <td>2.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Name of O-SII subsidiary	Name of the EU parent of the O-SII subsidiary	Buffer applicable to O-SII EU parent	UniCredit Bank AG	Unicredit Group	1.0%	ING-DiBa AG	ING Bank N.V.	2.5%			%
Name of O-SII subsidiary	Name of the EU parent of the O-SII subsidiary	Buffer applicable to O-SII EU parent														
UniCredit Bank AG	Unicredit Group	1.0%														
ING-DiBa AG	ING Bank N.V.	2.5%														
		%														
8. Miscellaneous																
8.1 Contact person(s)/mailbox at notifying authority	GSII-OSII@bafin.de															
8.2 Any other relevant information																
8.3 Date of the notification	Please provide the date on which this notification was uploaded/sent. 25/10/2021															