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Purpose and approach

Ernst & Young conducted a bank regulatory reporting benchmark survey of many of the largest US banks, foreign banks and bank holding companies (BHCs). The population of respondents consisted of 20 banking organizations including the US operations of 4 foreign banks and 6 companies that converted to bank holding companies since 2008. Thirty percent of firms surveyed reported assets of more than $500 billion, 40% had assets of $100–$500 billion and the remaining 30% had assets of less than $100 billion at 30 September 2011.¹

The survey was designed to gather industry information across multiple institutions related to regulatory reporting practices. The survey focused on the efficiency and effectiveness of organizational and process functions within the banks’ and BHCs’ regulatory reporting departments (RRDs).

The survey consisted of more than 60 questions aimed at benchmarking current practices of RRDs against plans extending through 2015. The survey was intended to draw out industry-leading practices that institutions can use as benchmarks for their programs. A selection of questions from the survey is included in this report. The responses to some questions were excluded due to insufficient or incomplete responses.

Ernst & Young would like to extend our thanks to all the participants in the survey. We appreciate your time and thoughtful responses.

² New US BHCs are bank holding companies that were established post September 2008.
The changes in the global regulatory reform agenda (i.e., Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Basel III) have added new challenges for chief financial officers (CFOs) and controllers, expanding the scope of their current roles. CFOs and controllers are taking the opportunity to redesign their finance functions to remain competitive and to enhance the integrity and quality of financial information. As regulatory reporting processes are inextricably linked to these transformations, foresight and consideration are being given to regulatory reporting as changes to RRD processes and systems are implemented.

Banking institutions are facing significant challenges in collecting and analyzing information required for Federal Reserve regulatory reporting. Federal Reserve reporting requires more granular data and additional information than US generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) reporting. Consequently, financial institutions spend significant time and resources preparing the Federal Reserve reports.

According to the survey results, institutions are rethinking the role of the RRD. Typically, the RRD is part of the finance function and reports to the CFO or controller.

In addition to overall changes within the finance department, the survey revealed that financial institutions are facing some key regulatory reporting challenges:

- Organizational structure: determining the appropriate size and organizational model
- Report preparation: addressing the quality and strength of processes currently in place in order to move toward a better defined and sustainable reporting process
- Adjustments: addressing data quality and data integrity issues

(i.e., ability to obtain the transactional, product and customer reference data granularity)

- Controls: addressing control effectiveness to gain comfort over reporting data accuracy and completeness
- Data and automation: reducing reliance on manual processes when preparing reports by leveraging data warehouses or vendor reporting tools
- Governance: implementing or improving governance structures (i.e., assigning appropriate accountability for report preparation and data collection) to enhance monitoring and oversight for regulatory reporting

In this report, survey questions, responses and analysis comments have been grouped by these six areas of focus.
Key themes
Organizational structure

Ninety-five percent of the survey respondents indicated that bank regulatory reporting resides within a separate group other than financial/SEC reporting. However, RRD organizational structures and report ownership vary from one banking institution to another. Some RRDs are centralized (one group handles many of the key financial-related Federal Reserve reports and FFIEC reports), while others are more decentralized. More recently, large banking institutions have begun offshoring parts of the regulatory reporting function to become more cost effective. Regardless of centralized, decentralized or a combination of mixed reporting structures, it is clear many groups contribute data to the process. The final review and sign-off of key Federal Reserve reports remains with the CFO or controller, with the main RRD group based in the US.

Question: How many full-time employees reside within the Bank Regulatory Reporting Department/Group? (see Figure 1)

When asked about the size of the RRD, 65% responded that there were less than 20 full-time equivalents (FTEs) dedicated to bank regulatory reporting. However, there is a correlation of total FTE count to a firm’s asset size.

Question: Are certain reports (e.g., FR Y-6, FR Y-10) handled by other departments/groups? (see Figure 2)

In addition to filing the consolidated BHC/Call reports (i.e., FR Y-9C, FFIEC 031/041, FFIEC 002 and Country Exposure reports) and legal entity reports, 20% of respondents confirmed that the responsibility for Federal Reserve legal entity structure reports (i.e., FR Y-6, FR Y-10, FR Y-7) resides with the RRD. The majority of respondents indicated that Legal, Compliance, Office of the Secretary or a combination of these groups are primarily responsible for filing the legal entity structure reports.
Report preparation

Assessment against the Capability Maturity Model (CMM)

Banks have made strides over the past few years automating manual regulatory reporting processes and developing comprehensive policies and procedures to document how to compile bank reports. To provide a common framework for gauging whether institutions have robust processes, survey respondents were asked to refer to the CMM and select the level that best describes the control environment for their organization related to regulatory reporting.

**Question:** How would you describe the control environment around the bank regulatory reporting processes under the Capability Maturity Model? (see Figure 3)

Ninety percent of survey respondents assessed their regulatory reporting processes or RRD at a Level 3 or Level 4 of the CMM.

The CMM continuum, by level of sophistication:

- **Level 1** - Initial: the new and undocumented process is often chaotic and ad hoc, uncontrolled and reactive.
- **Level 2** - Repeatable: the process is sufficiently documented, repeating the process may generate same results.
- **Level 3** - Defined: the process is defined, documented and is confirmed as a standard business process in place.
- **Level 4** - Managed: the process is quantitatively managed and controlled in accordance with agreed-upon metrics.
- **Level 5** - Optimizing: the process includes a focus on continuous process optimization/process performance improvement through incremental and innovative improvements to supporting technology.

---

CMM level and automation

To provide additional insight and observations, Ernst & Young compared survey respondents’ CMM self-assessments with responses to questions related to automation of the regulatory reporting environment.

Question: How would you describe the bank regulatory reporting process? Fully automated, mostly automated, partially automated or manual. (see Figure 4)

Twenty-five percent of banks stated that bank regulatory reporting was “mostly automated”, with 75% indicating a “manual” or “partially automated” reporting environment.

We compared respondents’ self-assessed CMM level with the level of automation. The level of automation generally increases with the level of sophistication, moving from 20% at Level 3 to 25% at Level 4 to 100% at Level 5. However, based on responses, firms indicating a Level 4 noted greater manual processes than firms who responded at Level 3. (see Figure 5)

It was noted the level of automation at an institution varied according to the type of report being prepared. While firms provided an overall response, many indicated individual reports may be at different stages of automation within an organization.
Question: What percentage of time is spent preparing bank regulatory reports and how much time is involved in conducting analytics/reviews and sign-offs? (see Figure 6)

Overall, 65% of participants stated that they divide their time equally between report preparation and analytics/reviews and sign-offs, while the remaining 35% spend even more of their time (80%) on preparation.

Ideally, all firms would spend more time on analytics/reviews. As part of the analysis of the survey findings, we evaluated the time spent on report preparation and analytics/reviews considering the level of automation for bank regulatory reporting. Thirty-six percent of survey respondents that were “partially automated” spend 80% of their time on report preparation and 20% on analytics/reviews and sign-offs. (see Figure 7)

Even respondents who reported that they were “mostly automated” spend at least 50% of their time on report preparation, rather than the Federal Reserve’s recommended 20%.

The Federal Reserve has suggested that 20% of a firm’s time should be spent on report preparation and 80% on analytics and reviews.
Current challenges

As noted in Figure 6, no respondents were able to state that their RRD spends 80% of the time for bank regulatory reporting on analytics/reviews and 20% on preparation as suggested by the Federal Reserve. To further understand where time is allocated, respondents were surveyed about key challenges.

**Question:** What particular challenges exist with respect to completing bank regulatory reports (check all that apply)? (see Figures 8 and 9)

Eighty percent of respondents listed system limitations as the most common data challenge. Data integrity and resource limitations were the next most cited issues.

Additional analysis of the challenges to organizations when completing reports compared with the level of automation revealed that respondents with “partially automated” regulatory reporting processes were more likely to have reporting challenges.
Data integrity

**Question:** How would you describe the sufficiency of the current level of data granularity available for bank regulatory reporting (e.g., required data attributes and/or transactional level are readily available)? (see Figure 10)

Sixty-five percent of respondents are looking for a more granular level of transactional data. Thirty-five percent of respondents feel that the current level of data granularity is at a sufficient level to prepare regulatory reports.

**Question:** Does the Regulatory Reporting Department/Group obtain report information from other departments/groups that is not available from automated systems? (see Figure 11)

All survey respondents stated that the RRD obtains data from other functional areas, including front office, operations, risk and other groups in finance. One of the key challenges in preparing bank reports is the need to rely on other groups to provide information to support the regulatory reporting process. In turn, banking organizations need to clarify roles and responsibilities for data providers and to consider additional measures to strengthen reporting processes through automation.
The Federal Reserve requires information that is much more granular than the level required to support financial reporting and disclosures to the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA) or the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Bank regulators expect banking institutions to have requisite data attributes and/or transaction-level information readily available. Our survey results demonstrate that most financial institutions are still grappling with data quality and integrity issues. In the last several years alone, the Federal Reserve has shortened the time to file regulatory reports, and the information required has more than doubled. This has created a variety of challenges, including the need for data enrichment and adjustment processes downstream.

Institutions are making adjustments downstream, in response to the Federal Reserve reporting requirements, to improve data quality. As institutions spend more time making adjustments, they increase the time required to compile bank regulatory reports.

**Question: How would you describe the quality of the data available for bank regulatory reporting? (see Figure 12)**

Sixty percent of respondents indicate they make moderate to significant adjustments to post-close data prior to report filings.

While new BHCs and foreign banks reported making only minimal to moderate numbers of adjustments, legacy\(^4\) banks responded that they make minimal, moderate and significant adjustments to their post-close regulatory reporting data (see Figure 13). This is attributed to many factors, including the number of legal entity filings and the complexity of products offered.

\(^4\)Legacy banks are defined as US domestic banks that existed prior to September 2008.
Types of adjustments

Question: What types of manual adjustments are made (check all that apply)? (see Figure 14)

The most common types of adjustments identified by respondents are reclassification and post-close adjustments. Seventy-five percent of those surveyed make reclassification adjustments, and 65% make post-close adjustments. A large majority of respondents manually post the adjustments directly into the regulatory reporting tool or through spreadsheets, instead of correcting the data in source systems.

Question: How complex are the adjustments? (see Figure 15)

Respondents were equally divided on the complexity of adjustments made to the bank regulatory reports.

Question: What plans are in place to automate manual adjustments? (see Figure 16)

Currently, 75% of respondents have developed either high-level plans or detailed plans to automate recurring adjustments within the next 12 months.
Reconciliations

Regulatory reports are often compiled with data from multiple sources. Reconciliations provide management comfort that the data is complete. Analytics help validate that the fluctuation in data is reasonable and highlight unexpected anomalies requiring further investigation. These controls are important to help identify, escalate and resolve issues.

**Question:** What major reconciliations are performed as part of the bank regulatory reporting processes (check all that apply)? (see Figure 17)

Seventy percent of respondents perform reconciliations between bank regulatory reporting (i.e., FR Y-9C, bank call reports) and financial reporting (i.e., 10-Ks, 10-Qs). This is a major reconciliation performed within the bank RRD and is often performed manually.

**Figure 17. Major reconciliations currently performed (Multiple responses)**

Question: Does the Bank Regulatory Reporting Department/Group rely on reconciliations performed by other departments/groups? (see Figure 18)

Ninety-five percent of survey respondents indicated that the RRD group relies on the reconciliations performed by other groups outside of the RRD’s immediate control.

**Figure 18. RRDs’ reliance on other groups to perform reconciliations**

The Federal Reserve expects that data providers and data owners should understand their roles and responsibilities in the reporting process. The data provider’s and report preparer’s roles and responsibilities and accountability over the data provided should be evidenced and documented.
Analytics

Question: What analytical procedures are performed to ensure completeness and accuracy of bank regulatory reports (check all that apply)? (see Figure 19)

While 100% of respondents use analytical procedures with variance analysis, respondents also routinely employ other techniques, such as spot checking.

Forty-five percent of respondents performed just one analytical procedure to ensure completeness, accuracy and reasonableness of report results. Only 5% of respondents perform four or more levels of analytical procedures. (see Figure 20)

Question: How many FTEs are dedicated to analytics/reviews? (see Figure 21)

Fifty percent of respondents have less than five FTEs* dedicated to performing analytical reviews. Thirty-five percent of respondents have between 6 and 20 FTEs, and 15% of respondents have more than 20 FTEs for review.

*FTEs: Institutions use different approaches when assigning resources to analytics and review. One FTE is defined as 100% of one person’s time or time spent by multiple persons that, when combined, equals 100%.
Data and automation

In recent years, the Federal Reserve has required institutions to collect and maintain considerably more granular data for regulatory reporting. To meet the Federal Reserve's expectations for detailed reports, institutions will need greater automation and controls for data sourcing and report generation. These are key elements of focus during the Federal Reserve's examinations of RRDs. Increasingly, institutions are looking to automation as one of the ways to help alleviate some of the reporting burden and to increase response and turnaround times needed to meet new requirements, while minimizing manual errors.

Components of automation:

• Automated linkages between source systems, static reference data, and a common repository or data warehouse

• Linkages from the data warehouse to a regulatory reporting tool (if used)

• Automated reconciliations among various systems with the ability to perform analytics

• Availability of transactional level detail

Question: Does the bank use some form of data warehouse in the regulatory reporting process to extract required data for regulatory reports? (see Figure 22)

Fifty-five percent of survey respondents do not have central repositories or a single-purpose data warehouse dedicated for bank regulatory reporting. Although many institutions have data warehouses, they may not be managed by the RRD. Furthermore, the attributes and/or requisite level of detailed data may not be available to the RRD. As a result, firms source data from multiple systems to obtain the relevant attributes to report transactions. In Ernst & Young’s experience, these multiple pulls of data, in turn, lead to increased manual intervention.

One of the Federal Reserve’s recommended best practices is to reduce manual intervention and enhance automation to allow for regulatory reporting process optimization.
Vendor tools

The Federal Reserve has placed greater emphasis on implementing automated regulatory reporting tools that can provide drill-down capabilities into every transaction reported. Banking institutions have turned to external vendors for regulatory reporting tools to help automate the reporting processes.

Question: What system/vendor package do you use for bank regulatory reporting purposes? (see Figure 23)

Forty-five percent of survey respondents use Fidelity or Jack Henry for submission, while the other 55% use reporting tools that allow for additional drill down capabilities, workflow tools and/or analytic functions.

Question: Outside of the system architecture, what additional processes exist that support the bank regulatory reporting process? (check all that apply) (see Figure 24)

Seventy-five percent of survey respondents utilize spreadsheets, while 60% manually append the data with additional information into the reporting tool. These manual processes are necessary for survey respondents to properly and accurately complete the Federal Reserve regulatory reports.

Banks that employ a regulatory reporting tool are still enhancing the data outside of such a tool.

Figure 23. Vendors used for regulatory reporting

Figure 24. Additional reporting processes used (Multiple responses)

---

In December 2011, SOFGEN sold REG-Reporter to Lombard Risk.
Governance

Key components of governance

In order to adequately support and respond to the Federal Reserve’s reporting requirements, the role of the RRD has evolved. There is a greater expectation that the regulatory reporting group stays informed of rules and requirements changes, participates in new product meetings and is involved in the change control process that impacts downstream regulatory reporting.

Key governance components include:

- Accountability
- Independent quality assurance
- Training
- Monitoring and oversight

Accountability

Question: Please indicate whether the Bank Regulatory Reporting Department/Group has any of the following: policy manuals, desktop manuals and/or procedures manuals. (see Figure 25)

Ninety percent of survey respondents reported that they have policy and procedures manuals to support regulatory reporting function, but only 35% of respondents have detailed and comprehensive desktop manuals.

Question: How up to date are the Bank Reporting Department/Group’s policy, operating and procedures manuals? (see Figure 26)

Seventy-five percent of survey respondents have indicated that the policy and procedures manuals are current (defined as reviewed within the past 12 months).

Respondents acknowledge the existence of further documentation within data provider groups that support regulatory reporting, but were unable to comment on its level of detail or the frequency with which it is updated.
Independent quality assurance

**Question:** Is there a separate quality assurance (QA) team responsible for data quality checks? (see Figure 27)

Only 30% of survey respondents have a separate QA team responsible for quality checks and transaction back-testing.

Some institutions have enhanced or are in the process of considering enhancements to the regulatory reporting process that may include periodic independent quality assurance testing of regulatory reporting data and reports. Institutions with established QA teams either align them within the RRD group or in other monitoring and oversight groups. Some institutions extend the role of the internal audit function to accomplish this activity.

In an environment where processes are decentralized and manually intensive, the need for a stronger governance framework around the regulatory reporting function becomes even more important.

Regardless of whether a formal QA group is established, the Federal Reserve expects independent transaction testing and quality assurance over the data integrity and the reporting processes.

**Figure 27.** Separate QA team responsible for data quality checks?
### Training

**Question: Does the Bank Regulatory Reporting Department/Group provide appropriate training (relating to regulatory requirements) to business groups that provide data and information for the regulatory reports? (see Figure 28)**

All survey respondents indicated that training is now provided to individuals – front office, middle office, operations, product controller, data providers – who are responsible for delivering regulatory reporting information, however the extent and depth of the training programs vary.

A few institutions have established a formal training program with both general regulatory reporting training by report/schedules and specific training modules around key issues for targeted audiences. Attendance is tracked at these institutions.

Most banking institutions surveyed have formalized policies mandating the RRD’s review and approval of new product or customer onboarding processes. They focus on the key attributes necessary for accurate regulatory reporting. The RRD is also responsible for providing guidance to various lines of business on identified issues, as well as classification requirements for various product categories.

**Question: Who makes product classification decisions? (check all that apply) (see Figure 29)**

More than 70% of survey respondents indicated that the RRD has a clear role at new product and account discussions.

**Question: What is the level of involvement of the Bank Regulatory Reporting Department/Group with respect to new products/processes or modifications of products/processes? (see Figure 30)**

Fifty percent of respondents have a high level of involvement with new products or modifications.
Monitoring and oversight

Question: Does a committee exist to provide monitoring and oversight over bank regulatory reporting? (see Figure 31)

Seventy-five percent of the survey respondents do not have a formal oversight committee established, although the majority of these institutions have adopted other measures to assume the separate regulatory reporting oversight function.

Other measures may include multiple levels of management sign-offs and reviews prior to filing, attestations from data providers similar to Sarbanes-Oxley and oversight by other monitoring committees not solely dedicated to bank regulatory reporting.

By comparison, those banking institutions with established regulatory reporting oversight committees commented that the committees added additional firm-wide guidance, developed and enforced policy and procedures and provided a forum to escalate and implement corrective actions.

Question: Are conversations initiated with regulators by the Bank Regulatory Reporting Department/Group related to treatment of complex reporting requirements/questions? (see Figure 32)

Seventy-five percent of the survey respondents indicated regular (monthly, quarterly) conversations with the Federal Reserve, while 25% of the respondents indicated that interactions with the Federal Reserve are limited to occasions when there are interpretational questions.

There is an increase in frequency of conversation with the Federal Reserve, especially regarding classification treatment topics.
Rapidly changing regulatory requirements and the rapid pace of evolving rules have placed additional burdens on financial institutions. Additional requirements, such as variable interest entity (VIE) reporting in Q1 2011, increased reporting granularity for non-performing loans and the new FDIC assessment calculation requirements in Q2 2011 are examples of these changes. In addition, the Federal Reserve continues to focus on regulatory reporting during regular examinations, thereby increasing the burden on RRDs at most institutions.

Banks and BHCs need to enhance their flexibility and effectiveness to be able to keep pace with regulators’ expectations. Going forward, banking institutions need to carefully consider:

- Enhancing accountability and the quality of referential and transactional data reporting
- Automating regulatory reporting processes to minimize manual processes and adjustments
- Improving regulatory reporting rule interpretation and personnel training
- Optimizing the governance structure and control environment around regulatory reporting

Many banking institutions grapple with an inadequate governance structure and control environment within the regulatory reporting function. As evidenced by the survey results, comprehensive policy and procedures documents highlighting detailed steps towards the compilation of error-free reports are not widely implemented. Development of detailed policies and procedures may alleviate some of the burden on senior management during the report reviews prior to filing.

Monitoring and oversight functions should be developed to support the overarching governance around the regulatory reporting and filing processes for completeness and accuracy.

Automation of processes is not pervasive as evidenced in the survey results. For the banking institutions to move towards an “optimizing” or CMM Level 5, continual focus is needed to further improve process performance through both incremental and innovative technological enhancements.

Banking institutions are under additional pressure – reduced time frames between the financial close and bank regulatory reporting filing dates, requests for more granular data by regulators, the vast amount of data needed for one bank regulatory reporting filing and an increasing number of questions about reported amounts. The Federal Reserve expects organizations to have ready access to reliable data and to be able to respond to requests for information in a timely manner.

As borne out in the survey results, the need to automate is a logical next step for institutions. The evolution from manual processes is especially important as banking institutions face more product-specific challenges associated with deposit and loan operations and derivatives transactions.

Automation, along with enhancements to business processes and the overall control environment, will help banking institutions keep pace with the changes as the broader regulatory environment continues to evolve.
Survey highlights

Organizational structure

- Ninety-five percent of the respondents indicated that bank regulatory reporting resides with a separate group other than financial/SEC reporting.
- Sixty-five percent of respondents have less than 20 FTEs in the RRD.
- Twenty percent of respondents confirmed that the responsibility for Federal Reserve legal entity structure reports (i.e., FR Y-6, FR Y-10, FR Y-7) resides with the RRD.

Report preparation

- Ninety percent of respondents assessed their regulatory reporting processes or RRD at a Level 3 or Level 4 of the CMM.
- Twenty-five percent of banks stated that bank regulatory reporting was “mostly automated”, with 75% percent indicating a “manual” or “partially automated” reporting environment.
- Overall, 65% of participants stated that they divide their time equally between report preparation and analytics/reviews and sign-offs, while the remaining 35% spends even more of their time (80%) on preparation.
- Thirty-six percent of respondents that were “partially automated” spend 80% of their time on report preparation and 20% on analytics/reviews and sign-offs.
- Eighty percent of respondents listed system limitations as the most common data challenge.
- Sixty-five percent of respondents are looking for a more granular level of transaction data.
- All respondents stated that the RRD obtains data from other functional areas, including front office, operations, risk and other groups in finance.

Adjustments

- Sixty percent of respondents indicate they make moderate to significant adjustments to data prior to report filings.
- Seventy-five percent of those surveyed make reclassification adjustments, and 65% make post-close adjustments.
- Respondents were equally divided on the complexity of adjustments made to the bank regulatory reports.
- Currently, 75% of respondents have either high-level plans or detailed plans to automate recurring adjustments within the next 12 months.

Controls

- Seventy percent of respondents performed reconciliations between bank regulatory reporting and financial reporting.
- Ninety-five percent of respondents indicated that the RRD group relies on the reconciliations performed by other groups outside of the RRD’s immediate control.
- Forty-five percent of respondents performed just one analytical procedure to ensure completeness, accuracy and reasonableness of report results.
- Thirty-five percent of respondents have between 6 and 20 FTEs, and 15% of respondents have more than 20 FTEs for review.

Data and automation

- Fifty-five percent of respondents do not have central repositories or a single-purpose data warehouse dedicated for bank regulatory reporting.
- Forty-five percent of respondents use Fidelity or Jack Henry for submission, while the other 55% use reporting tools that allow for additional drill down capabilities, workflow tools and/or analytic functions.
- Seventy-five percent of respondents utilize spreadsheets, while 60% manually append the data with additional information into the reporting tool.

Governance

- Ninety percent of respondents reported that they have policy and procedures manuals to support regulatory reporting function, but only 35% of respondents have detailed and comprehensive desktop manuals.
- Only 30% of respondents have a separate QA team responsible for quality checks and transaction back testing.
- All respondents indicated that training is now provided to individuals/data providers who are responsible for delivering regulatory reporting information.
- Seventy-five percent of the respondents do not have a formal oversight committee established.
- Seventy-five percent of the respondents indicated regular (monthly, quarterly) conversations with the Federal Reserve, while 25% of the respondents indicated that interactions with the Federal Reserve are limited to occasions when there are interpretational questions.
How Ernst & Young can help

Ernst & Young has developed service areas that address governance framework, business processes, data quality, data governance and the technology architecture to support the regulatory reporting processes. We understand the short-and long-term priorities, and our proven methodologies to address the regulatory reporting requirements for these needs. Short-term priorities include the centralization of regulatory reporting data, centralization and standardization of mappings/business rules to improve traceability and change control, establishment of reporting integrity controls, auditability and transactional testing to verify data integrity. Long-term priorities include the migration to strategic data sourcing, minimization of adjustments performed within the regulatory reporting application, standardization of regulatory reporting workflows and the automation of reconciliations within regulatory reporting systems’ architecture.

To learn more about how the changing regulatory reporting environment might affect your organization and how Ernst & Young can help, please contact one of our professionals.
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