



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:

- <u>macropru.notifications@ecb.europa.eu</u> when notifying the ECB (under Article 5 of the Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM) Regulation¹);
- DARWIN/ASTRA 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	Finnish Financial Supervisory Authority, FIN-FSA			
1.2 Country of the notifying authority	Finland			
2. Description of the measure				
	On which institution(s) is the measure applied (name and Legal Entity Identifier (LEI) code)? Is the measure applied at:			
	- The highest level of consolidation?			
2.1a Institution or group of institutions concerned	A sub-consolidated level?An individual level?			
	Name of institution	LEI	Consolidation level	
	Nordea Bank Abp	5299000DI3047E2LIV03	Highest level of consolidation	
	OP Cooperative	7437003B5WFBOIEFY714	Highest level of consolidation	
	Municipality Finance Plc	529900HEKOENJHPNN480	Highest level of consolidation	

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authority, it may be agreed with the Head of the ESRB Secretariat that this notification, or a part thereof, should not be published for reasons of confidentiality or financial stability.

2.1b Changes to the list of institutions concerned	There were no changes notification.	s in the list of Finnish O-SIIs c	ompared to the last		
	At what level is the fully	v phased-in buffer (in %) appli	ed to the institution(s)?		
	Name of institution	New O-SII buffer	Previous O-SII buffer		
	Nordea Bank Abp	2.5%	2.0%		
2.2 Level of the buffer	OP Cooperative	1.5%	1.0%		
applied	Municipality Finance Plc	0.5%	0.5%		
		0.070	0.070		
	Please provide the nam	e and LEI code of the ultimat	e FU parent institution of the		
	group for each of the O the concerned institutio	-SIIs identified. if the ultimate	EU parent institution is not		
	themselves.				
2.3 Name of the ultimate EU parent institution	Name of identified O-SI	I Ultimate EU parent institutio	on LEI of ultimate parent institution		
	(sub)consolidated level notified as O-SIIs (pleas Not relevant, no subsid	ntified is a parent institution ar , please name the subsidiarie se give names and LEI codes iaries have been identified as est level of consolidation.	s of the institution that are).		
2.4 Names of subsidiaries	Name of parent O-SII identified	Name of O-SII subsidiary	LEI of O-SII subsidiary		
3. Timing for the measu	re				
3.1 Timing for the decision	What is the date of the official decision? For SSM countries when notifying the <u>ECB</u> : provide the date on which the decision referred to in Article 5 of the Single Supervisory Mechanism Regulation (SSMR) will be taken.				
	27/06/2022				
	2110012022				

3.2 Timing for publication	What is the date of publication of the notified measure? 28/06/2022					
	Information about the strategy for if the communicating the notified measure to the market. <i>The decision by the FIN-FSA Board as well as more detailed principles for determining O-SIIs and setting O-SII buffers will be published on the <u>FIN-FSA</u></i>					
3.3 Disclosure	website on 28 June 20 Prior to the final decision	22. on of the Fl	N-FSA Boar	d, the Finni	ish O-SIIs will	be
	provided an opportunit Administrative Procedu		s their opinio	ns on the r	natter accordi	ng to the
3.4 Timing for application	What is the intended d 01/01/2023	ate of applie	cation of the	measure?		
	What is the intended ti		-			
3.5 Phasing in	There will be no phase January 2023.	-in perioas	i.e. the buffe	rs enter int	o torce in tull	on 1
o.o	Name of institution	D	ate1 Dat		e3 Date4	Date5
			% %			%
			% %	%	%	%
	Please list here the nami	mes, overal	l scores and	category s	cores of the C)-SIIs
	a. size; b. importance fo capturing sub		•			he Union,
	 complexity, including the additional complexities from cross-border activity; 					
4.1 Scores of institutions or	d. interconnecte system.	dness of the	e institution o	or (sub-)gro	oup with the fir	nancial
group of institutions concerned, as per EBA	Name of institution	Size	Substitut- ability	Com- plexity	Intercon- nectedness	Overall Score
guidelines on the	Nordea Bank Abp	58.41%	46.78%	88.66%	62.59%	64.11%
assessment of O-SIIs	OP Cooperative	17.51%	16.54%	2.99%	9.94%	11.75%
(Article 131.3 CRD)	Municipality Finance Plc	5.33%	1.12%	1.73%	8.17%	4.09%
	Please provide other re calculations and formu in a separate Excel file	las, data so	•		-	-

	Please see the Excel file attached.		
	FIN-FSA O-SII		
	information Q4 2021		
	Please provide information on:		
	a. whether you followed the EBA guidelines on the assessment of O-SIIs; Yes, we have applied the EBA guidelines in the identification of O-SIIs.		
	 b. which threshold score has been set to identify O-SIIs; A 2.75% threshold score has been applied. An institution is automatically identified as an O-SII institution if the total scores as per EBA GL exceed the threshold of 2.75%. 		
4.2 Methodology and indicators used for designation of the O-SII	c. whether relevant entities with relative total assets not in excess of 0.02% have been excluded from the identification process; <i>No, all entities are included</i>		
(Article 131.3)	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); <i>Please see the Excel file attached in 4.1 (all credit institutions included in the assessment process listed, branches of foreign banking groups operating in Finland have been included in calculation of denominators but not listed in the file as they cannot be identified as O-SIIs)</i>		
	e. whether non-bank institutions have been included in the calculations. No, all Finnish credit institutions and branches of foreign banking groups operating in Finland are included in the calculations		
	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:		
	 which of the optional indicators have been used to justify the supervisory assessment decisions, if any, and what the scores were; NA 		
4.3 Supervisory judgement	b. why these optional indicators are relevant for the Member State; NA		
	c. why the bank is systemically important in terms of those particular optional indicators. <i>NA</i>		
	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.		
4.4 Calibrating the O-SII buffer	According to the national implementation of the CRD V revisions concerning macroprudential buffers (Act on Credit Institutions, Chapter 10), the FIN-FSA shall divide the credit institutions into seven classes with capital add-ons ranging from 0 % (Class 1, non-OSIIs) to 3 % (Class 7) and increasing with increments of 0.5 % of the total risk exposure amount. In practice, the calibration of the O-SII buffers is based on the assessment of the systemic importance of the identified		

O-SII institutions. The systemic importance is assessed using the O-SII scores as per EBA GL.

The FIN-FSA assesses the appropriate level of O-SII buffers by using two different versions of the bucketing approach in which the identified O-SII institutions are divided into seven buckets based on their systemic importance. In both methodologies the systemic importance is measured by the O-SII score calculated according to the EBA guidelines. Pursuant to the first methodology (linear scale), equal bucket range increments are applied, consistent with the systemic importance threshold (2.75%).

According to the second methodology, bucket ranges are calibrated in line with the Equal Expected Impact (EEI) approach. The EEI approach has been applied e.g. in calibrating the additional capital requirements for global systemically important institutions (G-SIIs). Under the EEI approach, the additional capital requirements of systemically important institutions (SIIs) are calibrated so that the expected social costs from the default of an SII equal those from the default of a non-SII. The parameters of the EEI approach applied by the FIN-FSA are based on ECB analyses.

Bucket	O-SII score, %	O-SII score, %	Buffer guidenee
	(linear scale)	(EEU scale)	Buffer guidance
1	0–2.75	0–2.75	0.0%
2	2.75–5.50	2.75–6.00	0.5%
3	5.50-8.25	6.00–10.00	1.0%
4	8.25–11.00	10.00–17.00	1.5%
5	11.00–13.75	17.00–28.00	2.0%
6	13.75–16.50	28.00–48.00	2.5%
7	16.50–	48.00-	3.0%

The table below illustrates the bucket ranges according to both the linear and the EEI methodologies and the buffer guidance applied to each individual bucket.

The recommended buffer rates under the different calibration approaches suggest that the current O-SII buffer of 0.5% for Municipality Finance is proportionate to the systemic importance of the institution. However, the recommended rates support an increase in the O-SII buffer of OP Group from 1.0% to 1.5% or 2.0%. Raising the O-SII buffer rate for OP Group would also be justified by the fact the systemic importance of OP Group has remained broadly unchanged during recent years. The O-SII buffer of OP Group was decreased from 2.0% to 1.0% in spring 2020 in connection with the other macroprudential decisions taken to alleviate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the case of Nordea, the buffer requirements under the bucketing approaches suggest that it is justified to increase the O-SII buffer of Nordea from 2.0% to the allowed regulatory upper limit of 3.0%. Setting the highest possible O-SII buffer for Nordea would also be supported by the fact that Nordea is the most significant O-SII in the whole euro area both as measured by the O-SII score and relative to the national financial system. Raising the O-SII buffer rate for Nordea would also be justified by the fact that the systemic importance of Nordea has remained broadly unchanged during recent years. Risks related to the systemic importance of Nordea were partially covered by a higher systemic risk buffer requirement of 3% prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. In spring 2020, the systemic risk buffer requirements for all Finnish credit institutions were removed to alleviate the

	effects of the pandemic. Following the changes in the Act on Credit Institutions reflecting the new Capital Requirements Directive (CRD V), O-SII and systemic risk buffers are now applied cumulatively, as they must cover different systemic risks. As the O-SII buffer should exclusively address risks related to the systemic footprint of individual institutions, it is justified that O-SII buffer rates reflect the differences in the individual systemic importance of Finnish credit institutions.
	Raising the O-SII buffer rate for Nordea and OP Group by 0.5 of a percentage point instead of 1.0 percentage point is justified based on a holistic assessment of buffer requirements. More moderate increases in the O-SII buffer requirements would leave more space within the assessed sufficient aggregate level of macroprudential buffers to increase buffer requirements that are meant to be released in times of crisis (e.g. the countercyclical capital buffer). Increasing the share of releasable buffers would, in turn, improve the ability to support financial intermediation via macroprudential policy in the event of severe systemic shocks to the real economy or disruptions to the financial system.
	The establishment of the first and second pillars of the European Banking Union, namely the Single Supervisory Mechanism and Single Resolution Mechanism, has reduced the probability and the associated social costs of the default or distress of systemically important institutions headquartered within the Banking Union. This also supports the application of more moderate O-SII buffer requirements.
	Moreover, in the calibration of O-SII buffers, the FIN-FSA has considered the current economic situation and the potential impact of an increase in buffer rates on the lending capacity of credit institutions. The prevailing degree of uncertainty surrounding the macroeconomic outlook as well as the estimated effects of increasing capital requirements on credit institutions' lending capacity speak in favour of moderate increases in macroprudential buffer requirements at this point.
	Based on the analysis above, the FIN-FSA perceives that, in the current situation, it is justified to increase the O-SII buffer from 2.0% to 2.5% for Nordea and from 1.0% to 1.5% for OP Group. The O-SII buffer for Municipality Finance will remain unchanged at 0.5%.
	Please provide a justification for why the O-SII buffer is considered likely to be effective and proportionate to mitigate the risk.
4.5 Effectiveness and	The levels of the O-SII buffers are benchmarked against the different versions of the ECB floor methodology to ensure the level playing field and sufficient mitigation of systemic risks within the Banking Union. The applicable O-SII buffer rates for the Finnish O-SII institutions exceed the minimum requirements given by the ECB floor methodologies as well as average level of O-SII buffers in EU, which is supported by the higher-than-average level of concentration of the Finnish banking sector and the large size of the most significant institutions relative to the economy.
proportionality of measure	The war in Ukraine and the related economic sanctions have weakened the economic outlook both globally and in Finland, heightening uncertainty in financial markets. The consequences of the war for Finnish banks' loan loss risks still remain unclear in many respects and are above all dependent on the duration and extent of the war and on the speed at which the economies adjust to changes in e.g. foreign trade and use of energy following in the wake of the war. The banks' lending capacity could weaken substantially if the economic shock induced by the war would result in major loan losses and if banks' capital requirements were tightened considerably at the same time. Hence, the heightened uncertainty surrounding the current cyclical conditions supports a

	moderate and gradual tightening of buffer requirements when moving towards macroprudential policy in the 'new normal'.
5. Sufficiency, consisten	cy and non-overlap of the policy response
5.1 Sufficiency of the policy	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.
response	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.
	Please provide any additional information that the ESRB should consider in assessing the sufficiency of the policy response.
	In the light of the analysis presented in 4.4 and 4.5, the updated O-SII buffers are assessed to sufficiently mitigate risks related to the systemic footprint of the largest Finnish credit institutions (while providing incentives for all O-SIIs to avoid an increase in their systemic importance). The measure is not expected to have any material unintended consequences for the general economy.
	For a macroprudential policy to be 'consistent', the policy instruments meet their respective objectives, as outlined in ESRB/2013/1 ³ , and must be implemented in accordance with the common principles set out in the relevant legal texts.
5.2 Consistency of application of the policy response	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.
	Please provide any additional information that the ESRB should consider in assessing the consistency of the policy response.
	The application of O-SII buffers is consistent with the changes in the Act on Credit Institutions following the new Capital Requirements Directive (CRD V). The applied O-SII buffer rates reflect the differences in the systemic importance of Finnish credit institutions as O-SII buffers should exclusively address the risks related to the systemic footprint of individual institutions.
5.3 Non-overlap of the policy	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.
response	- Are other policy instruments used to address the <u>same</u> systemic risk? No. As per the changes in Act on Credit Institutions (and corresponding provisions in CRD V), all macroprudential buffer requirements must address different systemic risks.
	 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. NA
6. Cross-border and cros	ss-sector impact of the measure

³Recommendation 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)

	Assessment of the second second	-ff-st-stimest tit	f 41		
	Assessment of the cross-border effects of implementation of the measure.				
	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				
	Sector ⁵ 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:				
6.1 Assessment of cross-	 cross-border effects of implementation of the measure in your own 				
border effects and the likely impact on the Internal Market	jurisdiction (inward spillovers);				
(Recommendation	 cross-border effect 	s on other Member States	and on the Single		
ESRB/2015/2 ⁴)	Market of the meas	sure (outward spillovers);			
	\circ overall impact on the second sec	ne Single Market of implem	entation of the		
	measure.				
	The cross-border effects as well	as the impact on the intern	al market are		
	estimated to be limited. The buffer rates applicable for Finnish banks are				
	increased to the levels that are n				
	other EU O-SIIs with similar syst	-	-		
	States have recently started to in	icrease / activate capital m	easures to build		
	resilience.				
6.2 Assessment of leakages	Referring to your Member State's specific characteristics, what is the scope for				
and regulatory arbitrage	"leakages and regulatory arbitrage" in your own jurisdiction (i.e. circumvention of				
within the notifying Member	the measure/leakages to other parts of the financial sector)?				
State	Is there scope for "leakages and regulatory arbitrage" in other jurisdictions?				
	The scope for leakages and regu		ish financial sector		
	and in other jurisdictions is considered limited.				
7. Combinations and inte	eractions with other measures				
	If both G-SII and O-SII criteria ap		at consolidated level,		
	which of the two buffers is the high	ghest?			
7.1 Combinations between G-	No G-SII buffers applied to Finni	sh credit institutions.			
SII and O-SII buffers	Name of institution	O-SII buffer	G-SII buffer		
(Article 131.14)		%	%		
		%	%		
		%	%		
	Are any of the institutions identifi	ed as O-SIIs subject to a s	stemic risk buffer?		
	If yes, please provide the following information:				
7.2 Combinations with					
systemic risk buffers		U Har DUILEI I ALES(2)!			
(SyRBs)	NA				
(Article 131.15 CRD)	b. At what level is/are the systemic risk buffer rate(s) applied (i.e.				
		or individual)?			
	consolidation level and/ NA	or mulvidual)?			

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/2015/3) (OJ C 97, 12.3.2016, p. 9). ⁵ Available on the ESRB's website at www.esrb.europa.eu.

	c. Is the sum of the sy the higher of the G- SII buffer and to an institution is subject	SII and O-SII buffer O-SII buffer at con	rates, if a grou	p is subject to a G-
	NA Name of institution	SyRB rate	SyRB application	Sum of G-SII/O- SII and SyRB
		0/	level	rates
		%		%
		%		%
		%		%
		%		%
		%		%
		%		%
		%		%
7.3 O-SII requirement for a subsidiary (Article 131.8 CRD)	buffer based on the domestic NA Name of O-SII subsidiary	c buffer setting methodology? Name of the EU parent of the O-SII subsidiary		Buffer applicable to O- SII EU parent % %
8. Miscellaneous				
8.1 Contact person(s)/mailbox at notifying authority	Contact person(s) (name, phone number and e-mail address) and mailbox for further inquiries. Arttu Kiviniemi +358 9 183 5237, arttu.kiviniemi@fiva.fi			
8.2 Any other relevant information	The preliminary decision by the FIN-FSA Board will be made on 6 June 2022. The final decision will be made on 27 June 2022. The FIN-FSA will notify the ECB ten working days prior to the final decision as per the Article 5 of the SSM Regulation.			
8.3 Date of the notification	Please provide the date on which this notification was uploaded/sent. 27/05/2022			