

## BANKING AND FINANCE

## DG Financial Stability, Financial Services and Capital Markets Union

Participating organisation(s) & representative(s)  Head of the PCS Secretariat - Prime Collateralised Securities (PCS) UK Limited (TRN: 225892115033-33)  Main issues discussed  and the securitisation team met from the Prime Collateralised Securities (PCS).  shared his views on the latest developments on the Securitisation field (he was just back from the Eurofi meetings in Amsterdam). He is concerned by the current situation in the EP. The current regulatory uncertainty is not helping and some large investment banks are closing their ABS desks (e.g. Nomura).  He highlighted two issues:  Syntheties:  considers the developments and inclusion of STS criteria for synthetics in the Regulation as premature. It could certainly be done but at a later stage. Regulators and market participants would need time to develop such framework.  He gave further background on the call from a Dutch Pension Fund (PGM) to develop STS framework for synthetics. This group is vocal but is in a very specific situation. This financial group has developed a sophistical business model whereby it invest only in synthetics instrucments. Therefore it is concerned that the implementation of a STS framework (limited to true sale) may limit the issuance of synthetics securitisation by banks (the prudential incentives will be limited).  Third country regime:  There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, underlined that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website
Main issues discussed  and the securitisation team met from the Prime Collateralised Securities (PCS) UK Limited (TRN: 225892115033-33)  shared his views on the latest developments on the Securitisation field (he was just back from the Eurofi meetings in Amsterdam). He is concerned by the current situation in the EP. The current regulatory uncertainty is not helping and some large investment banks are closing their ABS desks (e.g. Nomura).  He highlighted two issues:  Synthetics:  considers the developments and inclusion of STS criteria for synthetics in the Regulation as premature. It could certainly be done but at a later stage. Regulators and market participants would need time to develop such framework.  He gave further background on the call from a Dutch Pension Fund (PGM) to develop STS framework for synthetics. This group is vocal but is in a very specific situation. This financial group has developed a sophisticated business model whereby it invest only in synthetics instrucments. Therefore it is concerned that the implementation of a STS framework (limited to true sale) may limit the issuance of synthetics securitisation by banks (the prudential incentives will be limited).  Third country regime:  There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, and that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.
Main issues discussed  and the securitisation team met from the Prime Collateralised Securities (PCS) UK Limited (TRN: 225892115033-33)  shared his views on the latest developments on the Securitisation field (he was just back from the Eurofi meetings in Amsterdam). He is concerned by the current situation in the EP. The current regulatory uncertainty is not helping and some large investment banks are closing their ABS desks (e.g. Nomura).  He highlighted two issues:  Synthetics:  considers the developments and inclusion of STS criteria for synthetics in the Regulation as premature. It could certainly be done but at a later stage. Regulators and market participants would need time to develop such framework.  He gave further background on the call from a Dutch Pension Fund (PGM) to develop STS framework for synthetics. This group is vocal but is in a very specific situation. This financial group has developed a sophisticated business model whereby it invest only in synthetics instrucments. Therefore it is concerned that the implementation of a STS framework (limited to true sale) may limit the issuance of synthetics securitisation by banks (the prudential incentives will be limited).  Third country regime:  There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, and that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.
and the securitisation team met from the Prime Collateralised Securities (PCS).  shared his views on the latest developments on the Securitisation field (he was just back from the Eurofi meetings in Amsterdam). He is concerned by the current situation in the EP. The current regulatory uncertainty is not helping and some large investment banks are closing their ABS desks (e.g. Nomura).  He highlighted two issues:  Synthetics:  considers the developments and inclusion of STS criteria for synthetics in the Regulation as premature. It could certainly be done but at a later stage. Regulators and market participants would need time to develop such framework. He gave further background on the call from a Dutch Pension Fund (PGM) to develop STS framework for synthetics. This group is vocal but is in a very specific situation. This financial group has developed a sophisticated business model whereby it invest only in synthetics instruements. Therefore it is concerned that the implementation of a STS framework (limited to true sale) may limit the issuance of synthetics securitisation by banks (the prudential incentives will be limited).  Third country regime:  There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, underlined that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.
and the securitisation team met from the Prime Collateralised Securities (PCS).  shared his views on the latest developments on the Securitisation field (he was just back from the Eurofi meetings in Amsterdam). He is concerned by the current situation in the EP. The current regulatory uncertainty is not helping and some large investment banks are closing their ABS desks (e.g. Nomura).  He highlighted two issues:  Synthetics:  considers the developments and inclusion of STS criteria for synthetics in the Regulation as premature. It could certainly be done but at a later stage. Regulators and market participants would need time to develop such framework. He gave further background on the call from a Dutch Pension Fund (PGM) to develop STS framework for synthetics. This group is vocal but is in a very specific situation. This financial group has developed a sophisticated business model whereby it invest only in synthetics instrucments. Therefore it is concerned that the implementation of a STS framework (limited to true sale) may limit the issuance of synthetics securitisation by banks (the prudential incentives will be limited).  Third country regime:  There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, underlined that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.
shared his views on the latest developments on the Securitisation field (he was just back from the Eurofi meetings in Amsterdam). He is concerned by the current situation in the EP. The current regulatory uncertainty is not helping and some large investment banks are closing their ABS desks (e.g. Nomura).  He highlighted two issues:  Synthetics:  considers the developments and inclusion of STS criteria for synthetics in the Regulation as premature. It could certainly be done but at a later stage. Regulators and market participants would need time to develop such framework. He gave further background on the call from a Dutch Pension Fund (PGM) to develop STS framework for synthetics. This group is vocal but is in a very specific situation. This financial group has developed a sophisticated business model whereby it invest only in synthetics instrucments. Therefore it is concerned that the implementation of a STS framework (limited to true sale) may limit the issuance of synthetics securitisation by banks (the prudential incentives will be limited).  Third country regime:  There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, underlined that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.
Amsterdam). He is concerned by the current situation in the EP. The current regulatory uncertainty is not helping and some large investment banks are closing their ABS desks (e.g. Nomura).  He highlighted two issues:  Synthetics:  considers the developments and inclusion of STS criteria for synthetics in the Regulation as premature. It could certainly be done but at a later stage. Regulators and market participants would need time to develop such framework. He gave further background on the call from a Dutch Pension Fund (PGM) to develop STS framework for synthetics. This group is vocal but is in a very specific situation. This financial group has developed a sophisticated business model whereby it invest only in synthetics instrucements. Therefore it is concerned that the implementation of a STS framework (limited to true sale) may limit the issuance of synthetics securitisation by banks (the prudential incentives will be limited).  Third country regime:  There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, and underlined that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.
Synthetics:  considers the developments and inclusion of STS criteria for synthetics in the Regulation as premature. It could certainly be done but at a later stage. Regulators and market participants would need time to develop such framework.  He gave further background on the call from a Dutch Pension Fund (PGM) to develop STS framework for synthetics. This group is vocal but is in a very specific situation. This financial group has developed a sophisticated business model whereby it invest only in synthetics instruements. Therefore it is concerned that the implementation of a STS framework (limited to true sale) may limit the issuance of synthetics securitisation by banks (the prudential incentives will be limited).  Third country regime:  There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, and underlined that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.
considers the developments and inclusion of STS criteria for synthetics in the Regulation as premature. It could certainly be done but at a later stage. Regulators and market participants would need time to develop such framework.  He gave further background on the call from a Dutch Pension Fund (PGM) to develop STS framework for synthetics. This group is vocal but is in a very specific situation. This financial group has developed a sophisticated business model whereby it invest only in synthetics instrucments. Therefore it is concerned that the implementation of a STS framework (limited to true sale) may limit the issuance of synthetics securitisation by banks (the prudential incentives will be limited).  Third country regime:  There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, underlined that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.
certainly be done but at a later stage. Regulators and market participants would need time to develop such framework.  He gave further background on the call from a Dutch Pension Fund (PGM) to develop STS framework for synthetics. This group is vocal but is in a very specific situation. This financial group has developed a sophisticated business model whereby it invest only in synthetics instructed. Therefore it is concerned that the implementation of a STS framework (limited to true sale) may limit the issuance of synthetics securitisation by banks (the prudential incentives will be limited).  Third country regime:  There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, underlined that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.
is vocal but is in a very specific situation. This financial group has developed a sophisticated business model whereby it invest only in synthetics instrucments. Therefore it is concerned that the implementation of a STS framework (limited to true sale) may limit the issuance of synthetics securitisation by banks (the prudential incentives will be limited).  Third country regime:  There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, underlined that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.
There is no urgent need for a third country equivalence regime in the Securisation proposal. It should be developed at a later stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, underlined that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.  Directorate or unit
stage taking into account developments in non-EU countries. Enforcement and supervision aspects of the STS framework are essential to overcome the stigma. These aspects would be difficult to address if US authorities do not implement their own legislative/regulatory framework. In addition, underlined that US originators are only selling a very tiny part of US deals to EU investors. The absence of third-country equivalence provision would not distort the market.  COM mentioned the reply from the Commissioner to the EP questionnaire which was posted on the FISMA website.  Directorate or unit
Directorate or unit
FISMA 01
Author of minutes
Validator and validation date
validated the minutes on 02/05/2016