**Outcome report**

* **Banks should share the outcome report with the IRT via IRIS no later than one month after the conclusion of the test, unless otherwise agreed with the IRT, as a .docx file.**
* **Banks should share all relevant material prepared for and used during the testing exercise with IRTs either as 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: | *[Remote (application used)/Hybrid (application used)/Physical]* |
| Testing method: | *[Banks should state the test method used during the test following the multi-annual testing programme and agreed internal resolvability testing plan.]* |
| Testing area(s) and subarea(s): | *[Banks should identify the testing areas and subareas as well as corresponding principles and capabilities following the multi-annual testing programme and agreed internal resolvability testing plan.]* |
| Entities (identifier) and scope of the test for each entity: | *[Banks should outline the name of each entity, its LEI code and the scope of the test for each entity.]* |
| Observations from prior testing that required actions: | *[Banks should outline observations from prior tests that were taken into account and reassessed during this test.]* |
| Reference document(s): | *[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].]* |
| Number of sessions: | *[Banks should state the number of sessions conducted during the test.]* |
| Any deviation(s) from the multi-annual testing programme and agreed internal resolvability testing plan? If so, provide the justification: | *[Banks should report any deviations from the multi-annual testing programme and agreed internal resolvability testing plan (including any additional expectations communicated by the IRT) and should provide the justification for such deviations. Banks should also note whether the IRT has been contacted in this regard and whether it has approved the deviation(s).]* |
| Independent observer(s) and facilitator(s): | *[Banks should indicate the name, role within the bank, and department, of any independent observer or facilitator. If the independent observer/facilitator is an external consultant, this should be clearly noted, mentioning the relevant (consultancy) firm.]* |

# Sessions

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date/time of the session: | *[Banks should identify when the session started and when it ended, including the date and time.]* | |
| Documentation used: | *[Banks should identify what documentation was used during the session.]* | |
| Activities carried out during the session and deliverables: | *[Banks should break down each session and identify which activities were covered during that session. Any documents that were prepared/finalised during the session should be specified.]* | |
| Staff involved: | *[Banks should outline the staff involved including their relevant role. The name, function and department of staff involved during the session should be reported.]* | |
| Any deviations from the multi annual testing programme and agreed internal resolvability testing plan: | *[Banks should identify any deviation from the multi-annual testing programme and agreed internal resolvability testing plan template and provide a justification.]*  *[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 can be reviewed accordingly. Banks should identify any deviation from the testing exercise template during the test and the justification for the deviation.]* | |
| Any observations occurring as obstacles (e.g., operational, legal and technical obstacles) identified: | **Obstacle** | **How it was overcome and/or outstanding remediation measures** |
| *[Banks should identify the obstacle faced during the test.]* | *[Banks should identify how the obstacle was overcome, or if it was not overcome. If the latter is the case, banks should report the observation and briefly describe planned remediation measures if applicable.]* |

# Overall assessment of the testing exercise

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall assessment of the testing exercise: | *[Banks should conduct an overall assessment of the test, highlighting key positive and negative outcomes.]* |

# Validation/approval process

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

# Action plan

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Testing area | Testing sub-area | Session(s) | Related observation(s) | Action plan to address observation(s) |
| *[Banks should identify the testing area.]* | *[Banks should identify the testing sub-area.]* | *[Banks should identify the session(s) when the observation occurred.]* | *[Banks should describe their observations in detail.]* | *[Banks should outline the action plan to address any observations that need follow up, including timelines and milestones.]* |

# Annex I – Bail-in specific fields *(to be deleted when not relevant)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Time required to produce and provide the relevant data (hours): | *[Banks should reflect the time needed to provide and produce the data, in hours. The timeline for the two phases (production and provision) should be provided separately.]* |
| Assessment of compliance with the validation rules included in the MBDT guidance: | *[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 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.]* |
| Description of any additional quality checks performed by the bank on top of the validation rules included in the MBDT guidance: | *[The report should explain the checks performed and the outcome of the data quality assessment in a consistent manner, to allow comparison with potential future exercises and to keep track of the progress made by the institution in terms of data quality.*  *The description should be grouped in the following categories, when applicable:*   1. *Additional integrity checks;* 2. *Additional internal consistency checks;* 3. *Reconciliation checks (static information);* 4. *Plausibility checks (when possible, for dynamic fields).*   *Change logs may also be useful to allow the authorities to understand which changes were made before final delivery, by whom and to what data point.]* |
| Correct identification of the scope of bail-in/WDC: | *[Banks should outline any obstacles they faced regarding the identification of mandatory excluded liabilities and distinguish them from those potentially subject to bail-in, and how/if the obstacles were overcome.]* |
| Description of equity composition (reserves, etc.): | *[For the category “Other equity items” [B01;c0030], when reporting field [B01;c0050], banks should provide more details on the equity items considered, any proxy used for their determination and elaborate on their ability to contribute or not to loss-absorption in line with the assessment performed according to paragraph 34b of the Operational Guidance on Bail-in Playbooks.]* |
| Correct filling of data field “Relevant amount for bail-in” [B02;c0130]: | *[Banks should elaborate, when applicable, on the quality assurance process to ensure the correct filling in of this data field and its interplay with the following fields:*   1. *Accrued interest [B02;c0100];* 2. *Portion of instrument or liability held by the reporting entity [B02;c0090];* 3. *Amount of pledge, lien or collateral [B02;c0320];* 4. *Deduction of other components considered mandatorily excluded. For example, covered portion of eligible deposits [B02;c0300], portion of liabilities subscribed to by intragroup counterparties, when considered mandatorily excluded;* 5. *the need to revert to any national law transposing BRRD when applicable (please refer to the guidance for data field [B02;c0130]);* 6. *the need to include any proxy of the value in insolvency (please refer to the guidance of [B02;c0130]);* 7. *any specific consideration related to ZCBs (as identified by field [B02;c0240]).]* |
| Description of the main differences between the outstanding and the carrying amount reported in the MBDT report [B02; c0120 and c0610/c0630], grouped by insolvency ranking: | *[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 example, identifying:*   1. *Amortisation of issuance costs or other components;* 2. *Fair value hedges adjustments (e.g., IAS 39, paragraphs 89, 89a or IFRS 9, paragraphs 6.5.8 – 6.5.11);* 3. *Liabilities measured at FVPL or FVOCI;* 4. *Other (please provide a general overview of the different items causing a discrepancy included in this category).]* |
| Country specific annex: | *[Banks should check compliance with any applicable MBDT country annex. Please refer to the MBDT guidance document, section 1.3.]* |
| Liabilities that arise from debt instruments with embedded derivatives (structured products): | *[Banks should explain the main assumptions to ensure the proper reporting of data field [B02;c0270], when such liabilities are in the scope of the test.]* |
| Close out and early termination amounts: | *[Banks should explain the main assumptions for the filling in of data fields related to close out amounts [B03; c0100] and [B04; c0070],**when such liabilities are in the scope of 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 hedges left open, in accordance with EBA RTS 2015/11 and Delegated Regulation EU 2016/1401.]* |
| Covered portion of eligible deposits: | *[Banks should explain the main rules and methodology adopted to ensure compliance with the reporting of field [B02;c0300], when deposits are in the scope of the test.* |
| Data for Non-Resolution entities (ILTRM): | *The MBDT data can be requested at Non-Resolution entity level, mainly for the application of WDC powers in line with the scope of Article 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 should also be considered for the entities in scope, where applicable. Please note that, for the purpose of MBDT, also host cases (third-country and Non-BU) are considered as Non-Resolution entities.* |

# 

# Annex II – Liquidity specific fields *(to be deleted when not relevant)*

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