Access to the activity of credit institutions and the prudential supervision of credit institutions and investment firms. Capital Requirements Directive (CRDIV)

2011/0203(COD) - 08/12/2016 - Follow-up document

The Commission presented a report on the benchmarking of diversity practices in connection with Directive 2013/36/EU, the Capital Requirements Directive (CRD).

To recap, the CRD Directive introduced a requirement for the **diversity of the management bodies of credit institutions**. This is to ensure that the composition of management bodies is sufficiently diversified.

Under the CRD, Member States must require institutions to take into account a wide range of qualifications and competences when recruiting members of their governing bodies. In addition, institutions of 'significant importance' must establish a nomination committee to set a target for the representation of the under-represented gender in the governing body.

The **European Banking Authority (EBA**) analysed the diversity practices of a representative sample of institutions covered by the CRD for which the competent national authorities had collected data.

Key findings: a review of the results of the benchmarking exercise shows that significant improvements can still be made in terms of diversity policies as well as strengthening the diversity of the governing bodies of institutions.

The majority of sampled institutions do not currently meet the requirement for diversity-friendly policies in the governing bodies.

On the basis of the data collected in 2015, the EBA found that only about 35% of the sampled establishments had adopted a diversity policy. Denmark was the only Member State in which all the sampled establishments had adopted such a policy. The percentage was 93.3% in Sweden and was over 60% in only three other Member States: Spain, Ireland and Latvia.

The EBA analysed the diversity practices of a representative sample of institutions concerned by the CRD and for which the competent national authorities had collected data.

Key findings: a review of the results of the benchmarking exercise shows that **significant improvements can still be made in terms of diversity policies** as well as strengthening the diversity of the governing bodies of institutions.

The majority of sampled institutions **do not currently meet the requirement** for diversity-friendly policies in the governing bodies.

On the basis of the data collected in 2015, EBA found that only about **35%** of the sampled establishments had adopted a diversity policy. Denmark was the only Member State in which all the sampled establishments had adopted such a policy. The percentage was 93.3% in Sweden and was over 60% in only three other Member States: Spain, Ireland and Latvia.

It has not been possible to assess the extent to which institutions of “significant importance” have met the requirement to set a target for gender representation.

However, comparative analysis has shown that **most institutions that have set a gender goal have not yet achieved this goal** and/or have not set a target date for achieving this goal.

The data show that there is insufficient gender diversity in the governing bodies, with only **13.63%** of executive functions performed by women in the institutions sampled. As regards the supervisory function, the percentage of women performing non-executive functions in governing bodies is 18.90%, and in 39.18% of the institutions sampled, no woman exercises a non-executive function.

As regards **age and geographical origin**, numerical targets for diversity are currently being met in fewer than one third of the cases in which they have been set. In terms of the **educational and vocational background**, the targets were met in approximately 42% and 52% of the cases respectively.

These results demonstrate the need for institutions and supervisory authorities to **intensify their efforts** to ensure that the required diversity policies are put in place properly.

Points for improvement: the Commission considers that the comparative analysis and the presentation of the results should enable a better understanding of the extent to which institutions of "significant importance" meet the requirement of setting a target for the **representation of women**. It should also cover the aspect of staff representation and be carried out at regular intervals, and at least every three years.

However, the comparative analysis of diversity practices is considered **a useful tool** for assessing the impact and effectiveness over time of CRD diversity requirements. Regular benchmarking exercises should monitor compliance with the relevant provisions and observe future trends in the area of diversity.

The Commission does not therefore consider it desirable at this time to consider submitting a legislative proposal to amend these provisions.