



ECB consultation on the Amendments to the ECB Regulation on supervisory fees – April 2019

EACB Comment Paper

<u>ID</u>	Article of Regulation	Page	A Amendment D Deletion C Clarification	Detailed comment	Explanation
1	General		A	<p>We welcome the aim of the ECB to simplify the fee calculation process and reduce the bureaucratic burden for banks. In particular, we also appreciate the move to an ex-post approach to determining annual fees.</p> <p>With regard to smaller institutions we welcome the approach to make the fee notices available in all official languages of the European Union. However, the threshold of total assets below €500 million for the reduction of the minimum fee for LSIs is too low.</p>	
2	General		A	<p>We must remark the negative feedback of the ECB with respect to certain suggestions of institutions and associations to establish a committee or</p>	

oversight board for the monitoring of SSM fees, budget and expenses. Such oversight structures are market standard at the level of most NCAs. We understand the need to preserve the principle of independence of the supervisor, however we believe it should be avoided a situation where no oversight is warranted for the raising and efficient use supervisory fees. Indeed, it can be observed an exponential growth of the ECB budget and levies from institutions since the SSM launch in November 2014. Some of the ECB explanations in this regard remain questionable. In the Decision of the ECB of 18 April 2019 on the total amount of annual supervisory fees for 2019, the increase in the cost estimate is inter alia justified with the current comprehensive assessment of six Bulgarian banks with a view to conducting negotiations on close cooperation with Bulgaria. We think that such costs should not be socialised to all other banks under supervision of the ECB. Against this background we also support the European Court of Auditors' latest requests to address deficiencies in the accountability and audit arrangements for EU banking supervision (cf. ECA's letter of 14 January 2019 to the European Parliament).

In principle we appreciate the introduction of a halved minimum fee component for less significant banks (LSI) with total assets below €500 million.

				<p>oversight board for the monitoring of SSM fees, budget and expenses. Such oversight structures are market standard at the level of most NCAs. We understand the need to preserve the principle of independence of the supervisor, however we believe it should be avoided a situation where no oversight is warranted for the raising and efficient use supervisory fees. Indeed, it can be observed an exponential growth of the ECB budget and levies from institutions since the SSM launch in November 2014. Some of the ECB explanations in this regard remain questionable. In the Decision of the ECB of 18 April 2019 on the total amount of annual supervisory fees for 2019, the increase in the cost estimate is inter alia justified with the current comprehensive assessment of six Bulgarian banks with a view to conducting negotiations on close cooperation with Bulgaria. We think that such costs should not be socialised to all other banks under supervision of the ECB. Against this background we also support the European Court of Auditors' latest requests to address deficiencies in the accountability and audit arrangements for EU banking supervision (cf. ECA's letter of 14 January 2019 to the European Parliament).</p>	
3	Art. 10(6)	34	A	<p>In principle we appreciate the introduction of a halved minimum fee component for less significant banks (LSI) with total assets below €500 million.</p>	

				<p>However, the aforementioned threshold is too low. According to our opinion for all less significant institutions the minimum fee component should be halved. Less significant institutions are supervised – despite the overall responsibility of the ECB – primarily by the NCAs. In addition it is very unfortunate that numerous different regulatory and supervisory thresholds for smaller institutions exist. If a halving of the minimum fee component for all less significant institutions would not be an option it would make sense to make use of existing thresholds like the €5 billion threshold for small and non-complex banks under CRR II, or the €3 billion threshold in the ECB’s supervisory reporting framework, or at minima the €1 billion threshold for the definition of small institutions in the context of contributions to the single resolution fund. We therefore propose to reassess the very limited threshold below €500 million.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Contact:

For further information or questions on this paper, please contact:

- Mr. Volker Heegemann, Head of Department (v.heegemann@eacb.coop)
- Mr. Marco Mancino, Deputy head of Department, Banking Regulation (m.mancino@eacb.coop)