

Outcome report

- Banks should share the outcome report with the IRT via IRIS, no later than one month after the conclusion of the test, as a .docx file.
- Banks should share all materials prepared for and during the testing exercise with IRTs as either embedded files or as annexes to the outcome report.

Bank

[Group name]

[G-SII/O-SII/top tier bank/bank]

[SPE/MPE strategy]

[PoE for MPE BU resolution group, if applicable]

Test ID

Test [...] / [year [...]]

Basic outline of the test

Set-up:	<i>[Remote (application used)/Hybrid (application used)/Physical]</i>
Testing method:	<i>[Banks should identify the test method actually used during the test]</i>
Testing area(s) and subarea(s):	<i>[Banks should identify the testing areas and subareas]</i>
Entities (identifier) and scope of the test for each entity:	<i>[Banks should outline the name of each entity, its LEI code, and the scope of the test for each entity]</i>
Findings from prior testing that were reassessed:	<i>[Banks should outline findings from prior tests that were taken into account and reassessed during this test]</i>
Reference document(s):	<i>[Banks should identify the reference document(s) used during the test, including all relevant playbooks and other documents outlining the processes to be tested, with a reference to the version used – i.e. Playbook X, version [month/year]]</i>
Number of sessions	<i>[Banks should identify the number of sessions conducted during the test]</i>

Any deviation(s) on the above elements from the testing exercise template? If so, provide the justification and confirm if the IRT was contacted and agreed with the deviation(s) ex-ante	<i>[Banks should identify any deviation(s) from the testing exercise template during the test, and the justification for the deviation(s), including for any additional expectations from the IRT. Banks should also note whether the IRT has been contacted in this regard, and whether it has approved the deviation(s)]</i>
Additional field	Guidance
Scope of bail-inable instruments covered in the exercise	<i>[Relevant for resolution entities. This field should be consistent with the level of losses that will be defined in the outcome report]</i>
Scope of liabilities subject to WDC powers covered in the exercise (non-resolution entities)	<i>[Relevant for non-resolution entities. This field should be consistent with the level of losses that will be defined in the outcome report]</i>
FMI covered by the test	

Scenario

Reference date/period:	<i>[Banks should identify the reference date/period for data for the test, where applicable. In general, the reference date should be the day before the simulated resolution event unless the IRT provides different instructions. Otherwise, the bank should explain why this was not possible, and specify for which items (e.g. categories of instruments) different reference date(s) was/were used proposing a corrective action.]</i>
Level of losses and balance sheet depletion:	<i>[Banks should identify the level of losses and describe the balance depletion effect applicable for the test, where relevant]</i>
Nature of the crisis (fast-moving/slow-moving; liquidity/capital focus):	<i>[Banks should explain whether the crisis assumed as part of the scenario for the test was fast-moving or slow-moving, with a focus on liquidity, or capital, or both]</i>
Nature of the crisis (idiosyncratic/system-wide event):	<i>[Banks should explain whether the crisis assumed as part of the scenario for the test was idiosyncratic or system-wide event in nature]</i>
Assumptions about steps, staff and resource availability:	<i>[Banks should explain whether the bank used the assumptions about steps, staff and resource availability exactly as they are outlined in the reference document, or if it should use stressed assumptions; in the</i>

	<i>latter case, the IRT should outline the stressed assumptions, and/or mention that assumptions may be (further) stressed during the test]</i>
Narrative:	<i>[Banks should outline the narrative used for the test]</i>
Any deviation from the testing exercise template? If so, what is the justification?	<i>[Banks should identify any deviation from the testing exercise template during the test, and the justification for the deviation]</i>
Any deviation from the reference document(s) triggered by the IRT during the test?	<i>[Banks are expected to outline any deviation from the reference document(s) triggered by the IRT during the test]</i>
Any deviation from the reference document(s) triggered by the bank during the test? If so, what is the justification?	<i>[Banks are expected to outline any deviation from the reference document(s) triggered by the bank during the test, and provide a justification]</i>

Sessions

Session [...] (Please create a table for each session; sessions should be numbered – session 1, session 2, session 3, etc.)

Date/time for the session:	<i>[Banks should identify when the session started and when it ended, including the date and the time]</i>
Documents necessary to start the session:	<i>[Banks should identify which documents were used for the first activity that took place during the session]</i>
Output:	<i>[Banks should identify which documents were prepared and finalised during the session]</i>
Activities planned for the session (mapped to the relevant reference document(s) and broken down by time period):	<i>[Banks should break down each session and identify which activities were covered for each time period during that session]</i>
Staff involved in the session and respective role (name, function and department):	<i>[Banks should outline the name, function and department of staff involved during the session]</i>
Any deviation from the testing exercise template in terms of activities and staff involved conducted during each session and respective timeline of	<i>[Banks should identify any deviation from the testing exercise template and provide a justification]</i> <i>[The bank should conclude whether any relevant department/staff was missing in the exercise or if any department/staff did not perform any relevant action, so that the playbook/relevant document could be reviewed accordingly. Banks should identify any deviation from the</i>

actions? If so, what is the justification?	<i>testing exercise template during the test, and the justification for the deviation.]</i>	
Any obstacles (e.g. operational, legal and technical obstacles) identified during the session? How were they overcome?	Obstacle	How it was overcome
	<i>[Banks should identify the obstacle faced during the test]</i>	<i>[Banks should identify how the obstacle was overcome, or if the obstacle was not overcome.]</i>

Independent observer(s) and Facilitator(s)

Name(s), role(s) and department(s) of the independent observer(s):	<i>[Banks should indicate the name, role within the bank, and department, of any independent observers. If independent observers are external consultants, then they should be identified as external consultants and their consultancy firm, if any, should be identified]</i>
Name(s), role(s) and department(s) of the facilitator(s):	<i>[Banks should indicate the name, role within the bank, and department, of any facilitators. If facilitators are external consultants, then they should be identified as external consultants and their consultancy firm, if any, should be identified.]</i>
Any deviation from the testing exercise template in terms of staff involved in each session as independent observer or as facilitator? If so, what is the justification?	<i>[Banks should identify any deviation from the testing exercise template during the test, and the justification for the deviation]</i>

(NB: Facilitators may only be employed for desktop exercises and walkthroughs.)

Materials prepared for and during the testing exercise

List of materials prepared for testing exercise	<i>[Banks should outline all materials prepared ahead of the test, for use during the test]</i>
List of materials prepared during the testing exercise	<i>[Banks should outline all materials prepared during the test]</i>
Any deviation from the testing exercise template? If so, what is the justification?	<i>[Banks should identify any deviation from the testing exercise template during the test, and the justification for the deviation]</i>

Bail-in-specific fields (if not applicable, please fill in with N/A)

<p>Time required to produce and provide the relevant data (hours):</p>	<p><i>[Banks should reflect the time needed to provide and produce the data, in hours. The timeline for the two phased (production and provision) should be provided separately]</i></p>
<p>Assessment of the compliance with the validation rules included in the MBDT guidance:</p>	<p><i>[Annex IV of the MBDT guidance document includes a list of validation rules to ensure basic data quality of bail-in data produced by banks. Banks should verify the compliance with such rules and include in the outcome report the evidence of the results obtained (including errors identified during the test) and any justification of the errors identified. The justification is requested for breaches stemming from the rules identified as warning in the MBDT guidance, while in principle, no deviation should be allowed for blocking errors]</i></p>
<p>Description of any additional quality checks performed by the bank on top of the validation rules included in the MBDT guidance.</p>	<p><i>[The report should explain the checks performed and the outcome of the data quality assessment in consistent way, in order to allow the comparison with potential future exercise and keep track of the progress made by the institution in terms of data quality.</i></p> <p><i>The description should be grouped by the following categories, when applicable:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) Additional integrity checks;</i> <i>b) Additional internal consistency checks;</i> <i>c) Reconciliation checks (static information).</i> <i>d) Plausibility checks (when possible, for dynamic fields).</i> <p><i>Change logs might also be useful to allow the authorities to understand what changes were performed before the final delivery, and by whom, and to what data point]</i></p>
<p>Correct identification of the scope of bail-in/WDC</p>	<p><i>[Banks should outline any obstacles it faced regarding the identification of mandatory excluded liabilities and distinguish them from the ones potentially subject to bail-in, and how/if they were overcome.]</i></p>
<p>Description of equity composition (reserves, etc):</p>	<p><i>[For the category “Equity reserves” [B01;c0020] the reporting of field [B01;c0040] should be consistent with paragraph 34b of the operational guidance on bail-in]</i></p>
<p>Correct filling of data field “Relevant amount for bail-in” [B02;c0130].</p>	<p><i>[The bank should elaborate, when applicable, on the quality assurance process to ensure the correct filling of this data field and its interplay with the following fields:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) Accrued interest [B02;c0100].</i> <i>b) Portion of instrument or liability held by the reporting entity [B02;c0090].</i>

	<p>c) Amount of pledge, lien or collateral [B02;c0320].</p> <p>d) Deduction of other components considered mandatory excluded. For instance, Covered portion of eligible deposits [B02;c0300], portion of liabilities subscribed by intragroup counterparties, when considered mandatory excluded [B02;c0040].</p> <p>e) the need to revert to any national law transposing BRRD when applicable (please refer to the guidance for data field [B02;c0130]).</p> <p>f) the need to include any proxy of the value in insolvency (please refer to the guidance of [B02;c0130]).</p> <p>g) any specific consideration related to ZCBs (as identified by field [B02;c0240])]</p>
<p>Description of the main differences between the outstanding and the carrying amount reported in the MBDT report [B02; c0120 and c0640/c0660], grouped by insolvency ranking:</p>	<p>[Banks should describe the main differences between the carrying and outstanding amounts reported in the MBDT report, so that it is possible to understand the cause and the magnitude of such differences, for instance identifying:</p> <p>a) Amortisation of issuance costs or other components;</p> <p>b) Fair value hedges adjustments (e.g. IAS 39, paragraphs 89, 89a or IFRS 9, paragraphs 6.5.8 – 6.5.11);</p> <p>c) Liabilities measured at FVPL or FVOCI;</p> <p>d) Other (please provide a general overview of the different item causing a discrepancy included in this category)]</p>
<p>Country specific annex</p>	<p>[Banks should verify the compliance with any applicable MBDT country annex. Please refer to the MBDT guidance document, section 1.3]</p>
<p>Liabilities that arise from debt instruments with embedded derivatives (structured products)</p>	<p>[Banks should explain the main assumptions to ensure the proper reporting of data field [B02;c0270], when such liabilities are in scope for the test]</p>
<p>Close out and early termination amounts</p>	<p>[Banks should explain the main assumptions for the filling of data fields related to close out amounts [B03; c0100] and [B04; c0070], when such liabilities are in scope for the test. The explanation should include the methodology to determine replacement costs incurred by the counterparties and costs incurred by the bank itself to re-establish</p>

	<i>hedged left open, in accordance with the EBA RTS 2015/11 and the Delegated Regulation EU 2016/1401]</i>
Covered portion of eligible deposits	<i>[Banks should explain the main rules and methodology adopted to ensure the compliance with the reporting of field [B02;c0300], when deposits are in scope for the test.</i>
Data for Non-Resolution entities (ILTRM)	<i>The MBDT data can be requested at Non-Resolution entity level, mainly for the application of WDC powers in line with the scope of art. 21(7a) SRMR. Non-Resolution entities involved in the test should produce the relevant dataset according to the instructions included in annex 3 of the MBDT guidance document. To this extent, the above fields n. 1,2,4,5, 6, 7 and 10 should also be considered for the entities in scope, where applicable. Please note that for the MBDT purpose also host cases (third country and Non-BU) are considered as Non-Resolution entities.</i>

NB: Fields above should be considered also for non-resolution entities, where relevant and applicable for ILTRM purposes.

Liquidity-specific fields (if not applicable, please fill in as N/A

Assumptions estimation of liquidity needs:	<i>[Banks are expected to clearly specify the assumptions that, during the test, enter into the identification of liquidity drivers and the estimation of liquidity needs. Assumptions on a minimum the following should be explained: outflow rates, roll-over-rates, counterparty behaviour, effect of the PRS, haircuts.]</i>
Methodology estimation of liquidity needs:	<i>[Where there are deviations from the methodology as described by banks in the reference documents, banks are expected to provide an overview of the methodology that underlies their estimations. If there is no deviation, banks are expected to state so.]</i>
Analysis of the consistency and reliability of the outcome of the estimation of liquidity needs:	<i>[When describing the overall assessment of the testing exercise, banks are expected to provide an analysis of the consistency and reliability of the estimation of the liquidity needs in the relevant scenario by reference to previous experiences and/or past crisis cases.]</i>
Level of automation:	<i>[Banks are expected to explain the level of automation they have achieved in the production of the data and reporting.]</i>
Reference date of data used:	<i>[Bank are expected to explain if some datapoints used/ submitted are of a different reference date than the one mentioned in the basic outline of the test.]</i>
Validation/approval process and data quality checks	<i>[Banks are expected to explain the data quality and approval processes performed during the exercise.]</i>

performed during the exercise:	
---------------------------------------	--

Findings / action plan(s) to address them

Testing area	Testing sub-area	Session(s)	Finding	Action plan to address finding
<i>[Banks should identify the testing area]</i>	<i>[Banks should identify the testing sub-area]</i>	<i>[Banks should identify the session(s) when the finding occurred]</i>	<i>[Banks should describe the finding in detail]</i>	<i>[Banks should outline the action plan to address the finding, including timelines and milestones]</i>

Overall assessment of the testing exercise

Overall assessment of the testing exercise	<i>[Banks should conduct an overall assessment of the test, highlighting key positive and negative outcomes]</i>
---	--

Validation/approval process

Validation/approval process for the outcome report and other deliverables (if any)	
---	--