



The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.

PILLAR 3
DISCLOSURES

For the period ended June 30, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Index of Tables	1
Introduction	2
Regulatory Capital	5
Capital Structure	6
Risk-Weighted Assets	8
Credit Risk	8
Equity Exposures in the Banking Book	15
Securitized Exposures in the Banking Book	18
Market Risk	22
Operational Risk	28
Model Risk Management	30
Interest Rate Sensitivity	31
Supplementary Leverage Ratio	32
Cautionary Note on Forward-Looking Statements	33
Glossary of Risk Terms	34
Index of References	37

INDEX OF TABLES

	Page No.
Table 1 Regulatory Capital Ratios	5
Table 2 Minimum Regulatory Capital Ratios	5
Table 3 Capital Structure	6
Table 4 Risk-Weighted Assets by Exposure Category	8
Table 5 Credit Risk Wholesale Exposures by PD Band	11
Table 6 Credit Risk Retail Exposures by PD Band	12
Table 7 Equity Exposures in the Banking Book	17
Table 8 Securitization Exposures and Related RWAs by Exposure Type	21
Table 9 Securitization Exposures and Related RWAs by Regulatory Capital Approach	21
Table 10 Securitization Activity - Banking Book	22
Table 11 Regulatory VaR	24
Table 12 Stressed VaR	24
Table 13 Incremental Risk	24
Table 14 Comprehensive Risk	25
Table 15 Daily Regulatory VaR	26
Table 16 Specific Risk	26
Table 17 Trading Book Securitization Exposures	27

Introduction

Overview

The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. (Group Inc. or parent company), a Delaware corporation, together with its consolidated subsidiaries (collectively, the firm), is a leading global investment banking, securities and investment management firm that provides a wide range of financial services to a substantial and diversified client base that includes corporations, financial institutions, governments and individuals. When we use the terms “the firm,” “we,” “us” and “our,” we mean Group Inc. and its consolidated subsidiaries.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Federal Reserve Board) is the primary regulator of Group Inc., a bank holding company under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 and a financial holding company under amendments to this Act. As a bank holding company, we are subject to consolidated regulatory capital requirements which are calculated in accordance with the revised risk-based capital and leverage regulations of the Federal Reserve Board, subject to certain transitional provisions (Revised Capital Framework).

The risk-based capital requirements are expressed as capital ratios that compare measures of regulatory capital to risk-weighted assets (RWAs). Failure to comply with these capital requirements could result in restrictions being imposed by our regulators. Our capital levels are also subject to qualitative judgments by the regulators about components of capital, risk weightings and other factors.

The Revised Capital Framework, as described below, requires disclosures based on the third pillar of Basel III (Pillar 3). The purpose of Pillar 3 disclosures is to provide information on banking institutions’ risk management practices and regulatory capital ratios. This document is designed to satisfy these requirements and should be read in conjunction with our most recent Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q and most recent Annual Report on Form 10-K as well as our most recent FFIEC 101 Report, “Regulatory Capital Reporting for Institutions Subject to the Advanced Capital Adequacy Framework.” References to our “Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q” are to our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2017 and references to our “2016 Form 10-K” are to our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2016. All references to June 2017 and December 2016 refer to the periods ended, or the dates, as the context requires, June 30, 2017 and December 31, 2016, respectively. References to our FFIEC 101 Report refer to our report filed for the period ended June 30, 2017, available on the National Information Center’s website located at www.ffiec.gov.

Capital Framework

The regulations under the Revised Capital Framework are largely based on the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision’s (Basel Committee) capital framework for strengthening international capital standards (Basel III) and also implement certain provisions of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Dodd-Frank Act). Under the Revised Capital Framework, we are an “Advanced approach” banking organization.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

We calculate our Common Equity Tier 1 (CET1), Tier 1 capital and Total capital ratios in accordance with (i) the Standardized approach and market risk rules set out in the Revised Capital Framework (together, the Standardized Capital Rules) and (ii) the Advanced approach and market risk rules set out in the Revised Capital Framework (together, the Basel III Advanced Rules). The lower of each ratio calculated in (i) and (ii) is the ratio against which our compliance with minimum ratio requirements is assessed. Each of the ratios calculated in accordance with the Basel III Advanced Rules was lower than that calculated in accordance with the Standardized Capital Rules and therefore the Basel III Advanced ratios were the ratios that applied to us as of June 2017 and December 2016. The capital ratios that apply to us can change in future reporting periods as a result of these regulatory requirements.

The Standardized CET1, Tier 1 capital and Total capital ratios were 13.9%, 15.9% and 18.8%, respectively, as of June 2017. These ratios reflect the applicable transitional provisions. For additional information about our Standardized capital ratios with transitional provisions, see “Note 20. Regulation and Capital Adequacy” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

The Basel III Advanced Rules require an Advanced approach bank holding company to meet a series of qualification requirements on an ongoing basis. They also require notification to supervisors of any change to a model that results in a material change in its RWAs, or of any significant change to its modeling assumptions. These qualification requirements address the following areas: the bank’s governance processes and systems for maintaining adequate capital commensurate with its risk profile; its internal systems for segmenting exposures and applying risk weights; its quantification of risk parameters used including its model-based estimates of exposures; its operational risk management processes, data management and quantification systems; the data management systems that are designed to support the timely and accurate reporting of risk-based capital requirements; and the control, oversight and validation mechanisms exercised by senior management and by the Board of Directors of Group Inc. (Board).

The information presented in this document is calculated in accordance with the Revised Capital Framework with RWAs calculated in accordance with the Basel III Advanced Rules, unless otherwise specified.

Definition of Risk-Weighted Assets. As of June 2017, RWAs were calculated in accordance with both the Basel III Advanced Rules and the Standardized Capital Rules.

For additional information about the Revised Capital Framework, including the transitional provisions related to deductions from CET1 and other components of capital, and the requirement to calculate RWAs in accordance with both the Basel III Advanced Rules and the Standardized Capital Rules, see “Note 20. Regulation and Capital Adequacy” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. Also see “Regulation” in Part I, Item 1 “Business” in our 2016 Form 10-K for additional information about our regulatory capital requirements.

Fair Value

The inventory reflected in our condensed consolidated statements of financial condition as “Financial instruments owned” and “Financial instruments sold, but not yet purchased” as well as certain other financial assets and financial liabilities, are accounted for at fair value (i.e., marked-to-market), with related gains or losses generally recognized in our condensed consolidated statements of earnings and, therefore, in capital. The fair value of a financial instrument is the amount that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date. The use of fair value to measure financial instruments is fundamental to our risk management practices and is our most critical accounting policy. The daily discipline of marking substantially all of our inventory to current market levels is an effective tool for assessing and managing risk and provides transparent and realistic insight into our financial exposures. The use of fair value is an important aspect to consider when evaluating our capital base and our capital ratios as changes in the fair value of our positions are reflected in the current period’s shareholders’ equity, and accordingly, regulatory capital; it is also a factor used to determine the classification of positions into the banking book and trading book, as discussed further below.

For additional information regarding the determination of fair value under accounting principles generally accepted in the United States (U.S. GAAP) and controls over valuation of inventory, see “Note 3. Significant Accounting Policies” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” and “Critical Accounting Policies – Fair Value” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Pillar 3 Disclosures**Banking Book/Trading Book Classification**

In order to determine the appropriate regulatory capital treatment for our exposures, positions must be first classified into either “banking book” or “trading book.” Positions are classified as banking book unless they qualify to be classified as trading book.

Banking book positions may be accounted for at amortized cost, fair value or in accordance with the equity method; they are not generally held “for the purpose of short-term resale or with the intent of benefiting from actual or expected short-term price movements or to lock in arbitrage profits¹.” Banking book positions are subject to credit risk regulatory capital requirements. Credit risk represents the potential for loss due to the default or deterioration in credit quality of a counterparty (e.g., an OTC derivatives counterparty or a borrower) or an issuer of securities or other instruments we hold. See “Credit Risk” for additional details.

Trading book positions generally meet the following criteria: they are assets or liabilities that are accounted for at fair value; they are risk managed using a Value-at-Risk (VaR) internal model; and they are positions that we hold, generally as part of our market-making and underwriting businesses, “for the purpose of short-term resale or with the intent of benefiting from actual or expected short-term price movements or to lock in arbitrage profits¹.” In accordance with the Revised Capital Framework, trading book positions are generally considered “covered” positions; foreign exchange and commodity positions are typically considered covered positions, whether or not they meet the other criteria for classification as trading book positions. Covered positions are subject to market risk regulatory capital requirements which are designed to cover the risk of loss in value of these positions due to changes in market conditions. See “Market Risk” for further details. Some trading book positions, such as derivatives, are also subject to counterparty credit risk regulatory capital requirements.

Basis of Consolidation

The Pillar 3 disclosures and the firm’s regulatory capital ratio calculations are prepared at the consolidated Group Inc. level. Our condensed consolidated financial statements are prepared in accordance with U.S. GAAP and include the accounts of Group Inc. and all other entities in which we have a controlling financial interest. Intercompany transactions and balances have been eliminated. The scope of consolidation for regulatory capital purposes is substantially consistent with the U.S. GAAP consolidation.

For further information about the basis of presentation of our financial statements and accounting consolidation policies, see “Note 2. Basis of Presentation” and “Note 3. Significant Accounting Policies” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Restrictions on the Transfer of Funds or Regulatory Capital within the Firm

Group Inc. is a holding company and, therefore, utilizes dividends, distributions and other payments from its subsidiaries to fund dividend payments and other payments on its obligations, including debt obligations. Regulatory capital requirements as well as other provisions of applicable law and regulations restrict Group Inc.’s ability to withdraw capital from its regulated subsidiaries.

For information about restrictions on the transfer of funds within Group Inc. and its subsidiaries, see “Note 20. Regulation and Capital Adequacy” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” and “Risk Management – Liquidity Risk Management” and “Equity Capital Management and Regulatory Capital” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Compliance with Capital Requirements

As of June 2017, none of Group Inc.’s consolidated subsidiaries that are subject to minimum regulatory capital requirements in a local jurisdiction had capital levels less than such requirements.

GS Bank USA, an FDIC-insured, New York State-chartered bank and a member of the Federal Reserve System, is supervised and regulated by the Federal Reserve Board, the FDIC, the New York State Department of Financial Services and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. GS Bank USA is an Advanced approach banking organization under the Revised Capital Framework.

¹ See definition of “Trading position” in 12 CFR 217.202.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

For information about GS Bank USA's regulatory capital ratios and for further information about other regulated subsidiaries, see "Note 20. Regulation and Capital Adequacy" in Part I, Item 1 "Financial Statements" and "Equity Capital Management and Regulatory Capital – Subsidiary Capital Requirements" in Part I, Item 2 "Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. See "Equity Capital Management and Regulatory Capital – Subsidiary Capital Requirements" in Part I, Item 2 "Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for information about GS Bank USA's supplementary leverage ratio.

Other Items

For a detailed description of our equity capital and additional information regarding our capital planning and stress testing process, including the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review, the Dodd-Frank Act Stress Tests, our internally designed stress tests, our internal risk-based capital assessment, our attribution of capital and contingency capital plan, see "Equity Capital Management and Regulatory Capital" in Part I, Item 2 "Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

For an overview of our risk management framework, including Board governance, processes and committee structure, see "Risk Management – Overview and Structure of Risk Management" in Part I, Item 2 "Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Measures of exposures and other metrics disclosed in this report and the FFIEC 101 Report may not be based on U.S. GAAP, may not be directly comparable to measures reported in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q or 2016 Form 10-K, and may not all be comparable to similar measures used by other companies. These disclosures are not required to be, and have not been, audited by our independent auditors. Our historical filings with the SEC and previous Pillar 3 and Regulatory Capital Disclosure documents are located at: www.gs.com/shareholders.

Regulatory Capital

The table below summarizes our regulatory capital ratios, calculated in accordance with the Basel III Advanced Rules (incorporating transitional provisions).

Table 1: Regulatory Capital Ratios

<i>\$ in millions</i>	As of	
	June 2017	December 2016
Common Equity Tier 1	\$ 72,168	\$ 72,046
Tier 1 capital	83,001	82,440
Tier 2 capital	14,122	15,352
Total capital	\$ 97,123	\$ 97,792
Basel III Advanced		
RWAs	\$ 575,762	\$ 549,650
CET1 ratio	12.5%	13.1%
Tier 1 capital ratio	14.4%	15.0%
Total capital ratio	16.9%	17.8%
Total average adjusted assets		
	\$ 895,541	\$ 879,117
Tier 1 leverage ratio	9.3%	9.4%

The CET1 ratio is defined as CET1 divided by RWAs, the Tier 1 capital ratio is defined as Tier 1 capital divided by RWAs, and the Total capital ratio is defined as Total capital divided by RWAs.

The Tier 1 leverage ratio is defined as Tier 1 capital divided by quarterly average adjusted total assets (which includes adjustments for goodwill and identifiable intangible assets, and certain investments in nonconsolidated financial institutions).

The table below presents our minimum required ratios.

Table 2: Minimum Regulatory Capital Ratios

	As of	
	June 2017	December 2016
CET1 ratio	7.000%	5.875%
Tier 1 capital ratio	8.500%	7.375%
Total capital ratio	10.500%	9.375%
Tier 1 leverage ratio	4.000%	4.000%

In the table above:

- The minimum capital ratios as of June 2017 reflect (i) the 50% phase-in of the capital conservation buffer of 2.5%, (ii) the 50% phase-in of the Global Systemically Important Bank (G-SIB) buffer of 2.5% (based on 2015 financial data), and (iii) the countercyclical capital buffer of zero percent, each described below.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

- The minimum capital ratios as of December 2016 reflect (i) the 25% phase-in of the capital conservation buffer of 2.5%, (ii) the 25% phase-in of the G-SIB buffer of 3% (based on 2014 financial data), and (iii) the countercyclical capital buffer of zero percent, each described below.

Certain aspects of the Revised Capital Framework's requirements phase in over time (transitional provisions). These include capital buffers and certain deductions from regulatory capital (such as investments in nonconsolidated financial institutions). These deductions from regulatory capital are required to be phased in ratably per year from 2014 to 2018, with residual amounts not deducted during the transitional period subject to risk weighting. In addition, junior subordinated debt issued to trusts is being phased out of regulatory capital. The minimum CET1, Tier 1 and Total capital ratios that apply to us will increase as the capital buffers are phased in.

The capital conservation buffer, which consists entirely of capital that qualifies as CET1, began to phase in on January 1, 2016 and will continue to do so in increments of 0.625% per year until it reaches 2.5% of RWAs on January 1, 2019.

The G-SIB buffer, which is an extension of the capital conservation buffer, phases in ratably, beginning on January 1, 2016, becoming fully effective on January 1, 2019, and must consist entirely of capital that qualifies as CET1. The buffer must be calculated using two methodologies, the higher of which is reflected in our minimum risk-based capital ratios. The first calculation is based upon the Basel Committee's methodology which, among other factors, relies upon measures of the size, activity and complexity of each G-SIB. The second calculation uses similar inputs, but it includes a measure of reliance on short-term wholesale funding. Our G-SIB buffer will be updated annually based on financial data from the prior year, and will be generally applicable for the following year.

The Revised Capital Framework also provides for a countercyclical capital buffer, which is an extension of the capital conservation buffer, of up to 2.5% (consisting entirely of CET1) intended to counteract systemic vulnerabilities. As of June 2017, the Federal Reserve Board has set the countercyclical capital buffer at zero percent.

Failure to meet the capital levels inclusive of the buffers could limit our ability to distribute capital, including share repurchases and dividend payments, and to make certain discretionary compensation payments.

For a detailed description of regulatory capital reforms that impact us, including capital buffers and fully phased-in Basel III Advanced and Standardized capital ratios, see "Equity Capital Management and Regulatory Capital" in Part I, Item 2 "Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Capital Structure

The table below presents information on the components of regulatory capital in accordance with the Basel III Advanced Rules (incorporating transitional provisions).

Table 3: Capital Structure

<i>\$ in millions</i>	As of	
	June 2017	December 2016
Common stock	\$ 9	\$ 9
Share-based awards	3,308	3,914
Additional paid-in capital	53,187	52,638
Retained earnings	92,225	89,039
Accumulated other comprehensive income/(loss)	(1,615)	(1,216)
Stock held in treasury, at cost	(71,642)	(68,694)
Common Shareholders' Equity	\$ 75,472	\$ 75,690
Deductions for goodwill and identifiable intangible assets, net of deferred tax liabilities	(2,943)	(2,874)
Deductions for investments in nonconsolidated financial institutions	-	(424)
Other adjustments	(361)	(346)
Common Equity Tier 1	\$ 72,168	\$ 72,046
Preferred stock	11,203	11,203
Deduction for investments in covered funds	(242)	(445)
Other adjustments	(128)	(364)
Tier 1 capital	\$ 83,001	\$ 82,440
Qualifying subordinated debt	13,514	14,566
Junior subordinated debt issued to trusts	635	792
Other adjustments	(27)	(6)
Tier 2 capital	14,122	15,352
Total capital	\$ 97,123	\$ 97,792

Pillar 3 Disclosures

In the table above:

- Deductions for goodwill and identifiable intangible assets, net of deferred tax liabilities, includes goodwill of \$3.67 billion as of both June 2017 and December 2016, and identifiable intangible assets of \$330 million (80% of \$412 million) and \$257 million (60% of \$429 million) as of June 2017 and December 2016, respectively, net of associated deferred tax liabilities of \$1.06 billion and \$1.05 billion as of June 2017 and December 2016, respectively. Goodwill is fully deducted from CET1, while the deduction for identifiable intangible assets is required to be phased into CET1 ratably over five years from 2014 to 2018. The balance that is not deducted during the transitional period is risk weighted.
 - Deductions for investments in nonconsolidated financial institutions represents the amount by which our investments in the capital of nonconsolidated financial institutions exceed certain prescribed thresholds. The deduction for such investments is required to be phased into CET1 ratably over five years from 2014 to 2018. As of June 2017 and December 2016, CET1 reflects 80% and 60% of the deduction, respectively. The balance that is not deducted during the transitional period is risk weighted. See “Equity Exposures in the Banking Book” for further details.
 - Deductions for investments in covered funds represents our aggregate investments in applicable covered funds, as permitted by the Volcker Rule of the Dodd-Frank Act, that were purchased after December 2013. Substantially all of these investments in covered funds were purchased in connection with the firm’s market-making activities. This deduction was not subject to a transition period. For additional information about the Volcker Rule, see “Note 6. Cash Instruments” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.
 - Other adjustments within CET1 and Tier 1 capital primarily includes accumulated other comprehensive loss, credit valuation adjustments on derivative liabilities, the overfunded portion of our defined benefit pension plan obligation net of associated deferred tax liabilities, disallowed deferred tax assets and other required credit risk-based deductions. The deductions for such items are generally required to be phased into CET1 ratably over five years from 2014 to 2018. As of June 2017 and December 2016, CET1 reflects 80% and 60% of such deductions, respectively. The balance that is not deducted from CET1 during the transitional period is generally deducted from Tier 1 capital within other adjustments.
 - As of June 2017, junior subordinated debt issued to trusts was fully phased out of Tier 1 capital, with 50% included in Tier 2 capital and 50% fully phased out of regulatory capital. As of December 2016, junior subordinated debt issued to trusts was fully phased out of Tier 1 capital, with 60% included in Tier 2 capital and 40% fully phased out of regulatory capital. Junior subordinated debt issued to trusts is reduced by the amount of trust preferred securities we purchased and will be fully phased out of Tier 2 capital by 2022 at a rate of 10% per year. See “Note 16. Long-Term Borrowings” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, for additional information about our junior subordinated debt issued to trusts and trust preferred securities we purchased.
 - Qualifying subordinated debt is subordinated debt issued by Group Inc. with an original maturity of five years or greater. The outstanding amount of subordinated debt qualifying for Tier 2 capital is reduced upon reaching a remaining maturity of five years. For additional information about our subordinated debt, see “Note 16. Long-Term Borrowings” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.
- For further information on the terms and conditions of our common stock, perpetual non-cumulative preferred stock, junior subordinated debt issued to trusts and qualifying subordinated debt, see “Note 16. Long-Term Borrowings” and “Note 19. Shareholders’ Equity” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.
- For additional information on the firm’s capital, see “Equity Capital Management and Regulatory Capital” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, and the following footnotes to the condensed consolidated financial statements in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q:
- “Note 13. Other Assets” for a discussion on our goodwill and identifiable intangible assets;
 - “Note 16. Long-Term Borrowings” for a discussion on our subordinated borrowings and junior subordinated debt issued to trusts; and
 - “Note 19. Shareholders’ Equity” for detail on common equity, preferred equity and accumulated other comprehensive income/(loss).

Pillar 3 Disclosures**Risk-Weighted Assets**

The table below presents a summary of the components of RWAs calculated in accordance with the Basel III Advanced Rules. More details on each of the material components, including a description of the methodologies used, can be found in the remainder of this document, under the section headings indicated below.

Table 4: Risk-Weighted Assets by Exposure Category

\$ in millions	As of		Section Reference
	June 2017	December 2016	
Credit Risk-Weighted Assets			
Wholesale Exposures	\$ 224,983	\$ 197,129	Credit Risk
Retail Exposures	10,144	12,831	Credit Risk
Cleared Exposures	2,511	2,933	Credit Risk
Other Assets	26,398	26,074	Credit Risk
Equity Exposures	45,289	41,599	Equity Exposures in the Banking Book
Securitization Exposures	9,541	8,213	Securitized in the Banking Book
Subtotal: Credit Risk-Weighted Assets subject to the 6% add-on	318,866	288,779	
6% add-on ¹	19,132	17,327	
Credit Valuation Adjustment	38,850	43,981	Credit Risk
Total Credit Risk-Weighted Assets	376,848	350,087	
Market Risk-Weighted Assets			
Regulatory VaR	7,650	9,750	Market Risk
Stressed VaR	24,888	22,475	Market Risk
Incremental Risk	9,825	7,875	Market Risk
Comprehensive Risk ²	3,475	4,550	Market Risk
Specific Risk	37,826	39,825	Market Risk
Total Market Risk-Weighted Assets	83,664	84,475	
Operational Risk-Weighted Assets	115,250	115,088	Operational Risk
Total Risk-Weighted Assets	\$ 575,762	\$ 549,650	

1. The Federal Reserve Board's regulations require that a 6% add-on be applied to all components of our Credit RWAs other than the Credit Valuation Adjustment (CVA) component.

2. Includes standardized surcharge of 8%. See "Market Risk – Market Risk-Weighted Assets – Comprehensive Risk" for further details.

Basel III Advanced Credit RWAs as of June 2017 increased by \$26.76 billion compared with December 2016, primarily reflecting an increase in commitments, guarantees and loans, principally due to increased lending activity. Basel III Advanced Market RWAs as of June 2017 decreased by \$811 million compared with December 2016, primarily reflecting a decrease in regulatory VaR, and specific risk as a result of changes in risk exposures, partially offset by an increase in stressed VaR. Basel III Advanced Operational RWAs as of June 2017 were essentially unchanged compared with December 2016.

Credit Risk**Overview**

Credit risk represents the potential for loss due to the default or deterioration in credit quality of a counterparty (e.g., an OTC derivatives counterparty or a borrower) or an issuer of securities or other instruments we hold. Our exposure to credit risk comes mostly from client transactions in OTC derivatives and loans and lending commitments. Credit risk also comes from cash placed with banks, securities financing transactions (i.e., resale and repurchase agreements and securities borrowing and lending activities) and receivables from brokers, dealers, clearing organizations, customers and counterparties.

Credit Risk Management, which is independent of the revenue-producing units and reports to our chief risk officer, has primary responsibility for assessing, monitoring and managing credit risk. The Credit Policy Committee and the Firmwide Risk Committee establish and review credit policies and parameters. In addition, we hold other positions that give rise to credit risk (e.g., bonds held in our inventory and secondary bank loans). These credit risks are captured as a component of market risk measures, which are monitored and managed by Market Risk Management, consistent with other inventory positions. We also enter into derivatives to manage market risk exposures. Such derivatives also give rise to credit risk, which is monitored and managed by Credit Risk Management.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

Credit Risk Management Process

Effective management of credit risk requires accurate and timely information, a high level of communication and knowledge of customers, countries, industries and products. Our process for managing credit risk includes:

- Approving transactions and setting and communicating credit exposure limits;
- Establishing or approving underwriting standards;
- Monitoring compliance with established credit exposure limits;
- Assessing the likelihood that a counterparty will default on its payment obligations;
- Measuring our current and potential credit exposure and losses resulting from counterparty default;
- Reporting of credit exposures to senior management, the Board and regulators;
- Using credit risk mitigants, including collateral and hedging; and
- Communicating and collaborating with other independent control and support functions such as operations, legal and compliance.

As part of the risk assessment process, Credit Risk Management performs credit reviews, which include initial and ongoing analyses of our counterparties. For substantially all of our credit exposures, the core of our process is an annual counterparty credit review. A credit review is an independent analysis of the capacity and willingness of a counterparty to meet its financial obligations, resulting in an internal credit rating. The determination of internal credit ratings also incorporates assumptions with respect to the nature of and outlook for the counterparty's industry, and the economic environment. Senior personnel within Credit Risk Management, with expertise in specific industries, inspect and approve credit reviews and internal credit ratings.

Our risk assessment process may also include, where applicable, reviewing certain key metrics, such as delinquency status, collateral values, credit scores and other risk factors.

Our global credit risk management systems capture credit exposure to individual counterparties and on an aggregate basis to counterparties and their subsidiaries (economic groups). These systems also provide management with comprehensive information on our aggregate credit risk by product, internal credit rating, industry, country and region.

Credit Risk Measures and Limits

We measure our credit risk based on the potential loss in the event of non-payment by a counterparty using current and potential exposure. For derivatives and securities financing transactions, current exposure represents the amount presently owed to us after taking into account applicable netting and collateral arrangements while potential exposure represents our estimate of the future exposure that could arise over the life of a transaction based on market movements within a specified confidence level. Potential exposure also takes into account netting and collateral arrangements. For loans and lending commitments, the primary measure is a function of the notional amount of the position.

We use credit limits at various levels (e.g., counterparty, economic group, industry and country) as well as underwriting standards to control the size and nature of our credit exposures. Limits for counterparties and economic groups are reviewed regularly and revised to reflect changing risk appetites for a given counterparty or group of counterparties. Limits for industries and countries are based on our risk tolerance and are designed to allow for regular monitoring, review, escalation and management of credit risk concentrations. The Risk Committee of the Board and the Risk Governance Committee (through delegated authority from the Firmwide Risk Committee) approve credit risk limits at firmwide, business and product levels. Credit Risk Management (through delegated authority from the Risk Governance Committee) sets credit limits for individual counterparties, economic groups, industries and countries. Policies authorized by the Firmwide Risk Committee, the Risk Governance Committee and the Credit Policy Committee prescribe the level of formal approval required for us to assume credit exposure to a counterparty across all product areas, taking into account any applicable netting provisions, collateral or other credit risk mitigants.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

Credit Exposures

For information on our credit exposures, including the gross fair value, netting benefits and current exposure of our derivative exposures and our securities financing transactions, see “Note 7. Derivatives and Hedging Activities” and “Note 10. Collateralized Agreements and Financings” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” and “Credit Risk Management” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Allowance for Losses on Loans and Lending Commitments

For information on our impaired loans and loans on non-accrual status, and allowance for losses on loans and lending commitments, see “Note 9. Loans Receivable” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Credit Risk: Risk-Weighted Assets

Credit RWAs are calculated based upon measures of credit exposure, which are then risk weighted. Below is a description of the methodology used to calculate RWAs for Wholesale and Retail exposures. Wholesale exposures generally include credit exposures to corporates, sovereigns or government entities (other than Securitization, Retail or Equity exposures). Retail exposures are composed of residential mortgage exposures, qualifying revolving exposures, or other retail exposures, that are managed as part of a segment with homogeneous risk characteristics, not on an individual exposure basis. Certain loans to individuals, including some loans backed by residential real estate, are categorized as Wholesale, rather than Retail, exposures under the Revised Capital Framework as the associated credit risk is assessed on an individual basis and not as part of a portfolio of exposures. We have been given permission by our regulators to compute risk weights for certain exposures in accordance with the Advanced Internal Ratings-Based (AIRB) approach, which utilizes internal assessments of each counterparty’s creditworthiness.

We utilize internal models to measure exposure for certain products. The Revised Capital Framework requires that a bank holding company obtain prior written agreement from its regulators before using the Internal Models Methodology (IMM).

Exposure at Default (EAD). For on-balance-sheet Wholesale exposures, such as receivables and cash, the EAD is generally based on the carrying value. For the calculation of EAD for off-balance-sheet exposures, including commitments and guarantees, a credit equivalent exposure amount is calculated based on the notional amount of each transaction multiplied by a credit conversion factor designed to estimate the net additions to funded exposures that would be likely to occur over a one-year horizon, assuming the obligor were to default. Historical studies and empirical data are generally used to estimate the credit conversion factor.

For on-balance-sheet Retail exposures, the EAD is generally based on the carrying value. For off-balance-sheet Retail exposures, EAD is our best estimate of net additions to funded exposures that would be likely to occur over a one-year horizon assuming the Retail exposures in the segment were to default.

For substantially all of the counterparty credit risk arising from OTC derivatives, exchange-traded derivatives and securities financing transactions, we use internal models to calculate the distribution of exposure upon which the EAD calculation is based, in accordance with the IMM. The models estimate Expected Exposures (EE) at various points in the future using risk factor simulations. The model parameters are derived from historical and implied market data using the most recent three-year period as well as a stressed three-year period. The models also estimate the Effective Expected Positive Exposure (EEPE) over the first year of the portfolio, which is the time-weighted average of non-declining positive credit exposure over the EE simulation. In accordance with the Basel III Advanced Rules, we calculate two EEPEs: one based on stressed conditions and one based on unstressed conditions. For the stressed EEPE calculation, the model is re-calibrated using historical market parameters from a period of stress as identified by elevated credit spreads for our counterparties. Both stressed and unstressed EAD are calculated by multiplying the EEPE by a standard regulatory factor of 1.4. Our RWAs calculated in accordance with the IMM are the greater of the RWAs based on the stressed or unstressed EEPE.

Our implementation of the IMM incorporates the impact of netting and collateral into calculations of exposure. The EAD detailed in Table 5 below represents the exposures used in computing capital requirements and is not directly comparable to amounts presented in our condensed consolidated statements of financial condition in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, due to differences in measurement methodology, counterparty netting and collateral offsets used.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

Advanced Internal Ratings-Based Approach. RWAs are calculated by multiplying EAD by the counterparty's risk-weight. In accordance with the AIRB approach, risk-weights are a function of the counterparty's Probability of Default (PD), Loss Given Default (LGD) and the effective maturity of the trade or portfolio of trades.

Wholesale Credit Risk Parameters

Wholesale exposures are internally risk rated and assigned PDs and LGDs.

- PD is an estimate of the probability that an obligor will default over a one-year horizon. For the majority of our Wholesale exposure, the PD is assigned using an approach where quantitative factors are combined with a qualitative assessment to determine internal credit rating grades. For each internal credit rating grade, over 5 years of historical empirical data is used to calculate a long run average annual PD which is assigned to each counterparty with that credit rating grade.

Our internal credit rating grades each have external public rating agency equivalents. The scale that we employ for internal credit ratings corresponds to those used by the major rating agencies and our internal credit ratings, while arrived at independently of public ratings, are assigned using definitions of each internal credit rating grade that are consistent with the definitions used by the major rating agencies for their equivalent credit rating grades. As a result, we are able to map default data published by the major rating agencies for obligors with public ratings to our counterparties with equivalent internal credit ratings for quantification and validation of risk parameters.

- LGD is an estimate of the economic loss rate if a default occurs during economic downturn conditions. For Wholesale exposures, the LGD is determined using recognized vendor models, but exposure-specific estimates of LGD are employed where the recovery prospects of an exposure are more accurately captured by an analysis incorporating information about the specific collateral, structure or type of client.

- The definition of effective maturity depends on the nature of the exposure. For OTC derivatives, effective maturity is an average time measure weighted by credit exposure (based on EE and EEPE). For securities financing transactions, effective maturity represents the notional weighted average number of days to maturity. For other products, the effective maturity is based on the contractual maturity. Effective maturity is floored at one year and capped at five years except where the Basel III Advanced Rules allow a maturity of less than one year to be used as long as certain criteria are met.

The table below presents a distribution of EAD, Weighted Average LGD, Weighted Average PD, and Weighted Average Risk-Weight by PD band for Wholesale exposures (excluding cleared transactions). The table also shows the notional amount of undrawn commitments and guarantees that are included in the Total EAD.

Table 5: Credit Risk Wholesale Exposures by PD Band

\$ in millions		As of June 2017					
PD Band Range	Total EAD ^{1,2}	Exposure Weighted Average LGD	Exposure Weighted Average PD	RWAs	Exposure Weighted Average Risk Weight	Undrawn Commitments & Guarantees ³	Undrawn Commitments & Guarantees EAD
0 to <0.05%	\$ 171,561	55.71%	0.02%	\$ 11,562	6.74%	\$ 8,667	\$ 6,495
0.05% to <0.25%	156,348	57.19%	0.10%	44,738	28.61%	41,759	31,017
0.25% to <0.75%	42,383	49.85%	0.49%	31,743	74.90%	18,921	11,280
0.75% to <5.0%	24,385	48.92%	1.83%	32,430	132.99%	10,357	5,025
5.0% to <20%	32,352	49.00%	7.09%	65,744	203.21%	19,716	9,278
20% to <100%	11,409	55.10%	23.78%	35,774	313.56%	2,204	1,518
100% (default)	2,992	66.53%	100.00%	2,992	100.00%	313	290
Total⁴	\$ 441,430			\$ 224,983		\$ 101,937	\$ 64,903

1. Includes Counterparty Credit Risk EAD of \$161.31 billion.

2. Collateral is generally factored into the EAD for OTC derivatives and securities financing transactions using the IMM.

3. Excludes \$30.01 billion of unfunded commitments and guarantees that are treated for regulatory capital purposes as securitizations. See "Securitizations in the Banking Book."

4. Excludes \$0.26 billion of EAD and \$0.60 billion of RWAs associated with OTC derivatives where the counterparty is a securitization special purpose entity, and which are treated for regulatory capital purposes as securitizations. See "Securitizations in the Banking Book."

Pillar 3 Disclosures**Retail Credit Risk Parameters**

For Retail exposures, statistical techniques are used to devise risk segmentation that results in homogeneous risk segments that are heterogeneous from each other. Segmentation uses borrower-related and exposure-related characteristics that reliably and consistently, over time, differentiate a segment's risk from that of other segments. Risk drivers considered for segmentation are generally consistent with the predominant risk characteristics used for internal credit risk measurement and management.

- Retail PD is our empirically based best estimate of the long-run average one-year default rate for the exposures in the segment, capturing the average default experience for exposures in the segment over a mix of economic conditions, including economic downturn conditions.

- Retail LGD is our empirically based best estimate of the economic loss or long-run default-weighted average economic loss, per dollar of EAD, we would expect to incur if the exposures in the segment were to default within a one-year horizon over a mix of economic conditions, including economic downturn conditions.

The table below presents a distribution of EAD, Weighted Average LGD, Weighted Average PD, and Weighted Average Risk-Weight by PD band for Retail exposures. The table also shows the notional amount of undrawn commitments that are included in the Total EAD. The Retail exposures include purchased performing and distressed loans backed by residential real estate and consumer loans.

Table 6: Credit Risk Retail Exposures by PD Band

\$ in millions		As of June 2017					
PD Band Range	Total EAD ¹	Exposure Weighted Average LGD	Exposure Weighted Average PD	RWAs	Exposure Weighted Average Risk Weight	Undrawn Commitments	Undrawn Commitments EAD
0 to <0.05%	\$ 945	50.04%	0.04%	\$ 60	6.35%	\$ 294	\$ 17
0.05% to <0.25%	2,547	53.74%	0.16%	485	19.04%	318	300
0.25% to <0.75%	1,236	56.43%	0.40%	456	36.89%	26	18
0.75% to <5.0%	2,011	74.76%	1.94%	2,062	102.54%	53	41
5.0% to <20%	1,421	78.86%	10.84%	2,901	204.15%	64	46
20% to <100%	384	54.37%	54.03%	751	195.57%	-	-
100% (default) ²	3,429	61.21%	100.00%	3,429	100.00%	-	-
Total	\$ 11,973			\$ 10,144		\$ 755	\$ 422

1. Includes residential mortgage EAD of \$9.86 billion and other retail EAD of \$2.11 billion.

2. The majority of exposures within this PD band are purchased distressed loans.

Pillar 3 Disclosures**Governance and Validation of Risk Parameters**

Committees within Credit Risk Management that ultimately report to the chief credit risk officer or the Credit Policy Committee oversee the approaches and methodologies for quantifying PD, LGD, and EAD.

To assess the performance of the PD parameters used, on an annual basis we perform a benchmarking exercise which includes comparisons of realized annual default rates to the expected annual default rates for each credit rating band and comparisons of the internal realized long-term average default rates to the empirical long-term average default rates assigned to each credit rating band. For the year ended December 2016, as well as in previous annual periods, the PDs used for regulatory capital calculations were higher (i.e., more conservative) than our actual internal realized default rate.

During the six months ended June 2017, the total number of counterparty defaults remained low, representing less than 0.5% of all counterparties, and such defaults occurred within loans and lending commitments. Estimated losses associated with counterparty defaults were lower compared with the same prior year period and were not material.

To assess the performance of LGD parameters used, on an annual basis we compare recovery rates following counterparty defaults to the recovery rates based on LGD parameters assigned to the corresponding exposures prior to default. While the actual realized recovery on each defaulted exposure varies due to transaction and other situation-specific factors, on average, recovery rates remain higher than those implied by the LGD parameters used in our regulatory capital calculations.

The performance of each IMM model used to quantify EAD is assessed quarterly via backtesting procedures, performed by comparing the predicted and realized exposure of a set of representative trades and portfolios at certain horizons. Our models are monitored and enhanced in response to backtesting.

Models used for regulatory capital are subject to independent review and validation by Model Risk Management. For further information, see “Model Risk Management.”

Credit Risk Mitigation

To reduce our credit exposures on derivatives and securities financing transactions, we may enter into master netting agreements or similar arrangements (collectively, netting agreements) with counterparties that permit us to offset receivables and payables with such counterparties. A netting agreement is a contract with a counterparty that permits net settlement of multiple transactions with that counterparty, including upon the exercise of termination rights by a non-defaulting party. Upon exercise of such termination rights, all transactions governed by the netting agreement are terminated and a net settlement amount is calculated.

We may also reduce credit risk with counterparties by entering into agreements that enable us to receive and post cash and securities collateral with respect to our derivatives and securities financing transactions, subject to the terms of the related credit support agreements or similar arrangements (collectively, credit support agreements). An enforceable credit support agreement grants the non-defaulting party exercising termination provisions the right to liquidate collateral and apply the proceeds to any amounts owed. In order to assess enforceability of our right to setoff under netting and credit support agreements, we evaluate various factors, including applicable bankruptcy laws, local statutes and regulatory provisions in the jurisdiction of the parties to the agreement. Securities collateral obtained primarily includes U.S. government and agency obligations and non-U.S. government and agency obligations.

Our collateral is managed by an independent control function within the Operations Division. This function is responsible for reviewing exposure calculations, making margin calls with relevant counterparties, and ensuring subsequent settlement of collateral movements. We monitor the fair value of the collateral on a daily basis to ensure that our credit exposures are appropriately collateralized.

For additional information about our derivatives (including collateral and the impact of the amount of collateral we would have to provide in the event of a ratings downgrade), see “Note 7. Derivatives and Hedging Activities” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. See “Note 10. Collateralized Agreements and Financings” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for further information about our collateralized agreements and financings.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

For loans and lending commitments, depending on the credit quality of the borrower and other characteristics of the transaction, we employ a variety of potential risk mitigants. Risk mitigants include collateral provisions, guarantees, covenants, structural seniority of the bank loan claims and, for certain lending commitments, provisions in the legal documentation that allow us to adjust loan amounts, pricing, structure and other terms as market conditions change. The type and structure of risk mitigants employed can significantly influence the degree of credit risk involved in a loan or lending commitment.

When we do not have sufficient visibility into a counterparty's financial strength or when we believe a counterparty requires support from its parent, we may obtain third-party guarantees of the counterparty's obligations. We may also mitigate our credit risk using credit derivatives or participation agreements.

Credit Derivatives

We enter into credit derivative transactions primarily to facilitate client activity and to manage the credit risk associated with market-making, including to hedge counterparty exposures arising from OTC derivatives (intermediation activities).

We also use credit derivatives to hedge counterparty exposure associated with investing and lending activities. Some of these hedges qualify as credit risk mitigants for regulatory capital purposes. For these transactions, the substitution approach is applied, where the PD and/or LGD associated with the credit derivative counterparty replaces the PD and/or LGD of the loan obligors for capital calculations. Where the aggregate notional of credit derivatives hedging exposure to a loan obligor is less than the notional loan exposure, the substitution approach is only employed for the percentage of loan exposure covered by eligible credit derivatives. As of June 2017, our purchased credit default swaps that were used to hedge counterparty exposure associated with investing and lending activities had a notional amount of \$5.20 billion, of which \$2.11 billion were deemed to be eligible hedges for regulatory capital purposes.

For further information regarding our credit derivative transactions, see "Note 7. Derivatives and Hedging Activities" in Part I, Item 1 "Financial Statements" in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

For information regarding credit risk concentrations, see "Note 26. Credit Concentrations" in Part I, Item 1 "Financial Statements" in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Wrong-way Risk

We seek to minimize risk where there is a significant positive correlation between the probability of default of a counterparty and our exposure to that counterparty (net of the market value of any collateral we receive), which is known as "wrong-way risk." Wrong-way risk is commonly categorized into two types: specific wrong-way risk and general wrong-way risk. We categorize exposure as specific wrong-way risk when our counterparty and the issuer of the reference asset of the transaction are the same entity or are affiliates, or if the collateral supporting a transaction is issued by the counterparty or its affiliates. General wrong-way risk arises when there is a significant positive correlation between the probability of default of a counterparty and general market risk factors affecting the exposure to that counterparty. We have procedures in place to actively identify, monitor and control specific and general wrong-way risk, beginning at the inception of a transaction and continuing through its life, including assessing the level of risk through stress tests. We ensure that material wrong-way risk is mitigated using collateral agreements or increases to initial margin, where appropriate.

Credit Valuation Adjustment Risk-Weighted Assets

RWAs for CVA address the risk of losses related to changes in counterparty credit risk arising from OTC derivatives. We calculate RWAs for CVA primarily using the Advanced CVA approach set out in the Revised Capital Framework, which permits the use of regulator approved VaR models. Consistent with our Regulatory VaR calculation (see "Market Risk" for further details), the CVA RWAs are calculated at a 99% confidence level over a 10-day time horizon. The CVA RWAs also include a stressed CVA component, which is also calculated at a 99% confidence level over a 10-day horizon using both a stressed VaR period and stressed EEs. The CVA VaR model estimates the impact on our credit valuation adjustments of changes to our counterparties' credit spreads. It reflects eligible CVA hedges (as defined in the Revised Capital Framework), but it excludes those hedges that, although used for risk-management purposes, are ineligible for inclusion in the regulatory CVA VaR model. Examples of such hedges are interest rate hedges, or those that do not reference the specific exposures they are intended to mitigate, but are nevertheless highly correlated to the underlying credit risk.

Pillar 3 Disclosures**Other Credit Risk-Weighted Assets**

Credit RWAs (as summarized in Table 4 above) also include the following components:

Cleared Transactions. RWAs for cleared transactions and default fund contributions (defined as payments made by clearing members to central clearing agencies pursuant to mutualized loss arrangements) are calculated based on specific rules within the Revised Capital Framework. A majority of our exposures on centrally cleared transactions are to counterparties that are considered to be Qualifying Central Counterparties in accordance with the Revised Capital Framework. Such exposures arise from the following cleared products: OTC derivatives, exchange-traded derivatives, and securities financing transactions. These exposures are required to be risk weighted at either 2% or 4% based on the specified criteria.

Other Assets. Other assets primarily include property, leasehold improvements and equipment, deferred tax assets, and assets for which there is no defined capital methodology or that are not material. RWAs for other assets are generally based on the carrying value plus a percentage of the notional amount of off-balance-sheet exposures, and are typically risk weighted at 100%.

Equity Exposures in the Banking Book**Overview**

We make direct investments in public and private equity securities. We also make investments, through funds that we manage (some of which are consolidated), in debt securities and loans, public and private equity securities and real estate entities. These investments are typically longer-term in nature and are primarily held for capital appreciation purposes; they are therefore classified for regulatory capital purposes as banking book equity investments. We also make commitments to invest, primarily in private equity, real estate and other assets. Such commitments are made both directly and primarily through funds that we raise and manage.

For further information on our equity investments and investment commitments, see “Note 6. Cash Instruments” and “Note 13. Other Assets” for information about investments accounted for as equity method investments; “Note 18. Commitments, Contingencies and Guarantees” for information on our equity investment commitments; and “Note 22. Transactions with Affiliated Funds” for a description of transactions with affiliated funds, in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Risk Management

Our equity investments and investment commitments are subject to comprehensive risk management processes through which we assess investment opportunities, and monitor, evaluate and manage the risks associated with such investments.

Risk management governance starts with the Board, which plays an important role in reviewing and approving risk management policies and practices, both directly and through its committees.

Prior to making an investment, or entering into an investment commitment, opportunities are subject to rigorous due diligence, review and, where appropriate, approval by the relevant investment, capital and/or risk committee. Such committees are either specific to the relevant division of the firm or they are firmwide committees such as the Firmwide Investment Policy Committee. The committees consider, among other matters, the risks and rewards of the opportunity, as well as factors such as balance sheet usage and risk measures such as stress tests.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

On an ongoing basis, our equity exposures are reviewed by senior management, including the Firmwide Risk Committee and Finance Committee.

Other critical components of our risk management processes and procedures include setting limits (such as balance sheet limits) and our discipline of marking substantially all of our equity investments to current market levels, verified by our independent control and support functions.

Our equity exposures are included in the scope of our stress tests, which are conducted on a regular basis as part of our routine risk management process and on an ad hoc basis in response to market events or concerns. We use stress tests to examine the risks of specific equity investments as well as the potential impact of significant risk exposures across the firm. We use a variety of scenarios to calculate the potential loss from a wide range of market moves on our equity investments.

Valuation and Accounting Policies

Substantially all of our equity investments are included in “Financial instruments owned” on our condensed consolidated statements of financial condition.

For further information on our accounting and valuation policies applicable to equity investments, see the following sections in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

- “Note 3. Significant Accounting Policies” for a discussion of our policies on consolidation, equity-method investments and investment funds;
- “Note 4. Financial Instruments Owned and Financial Instruments Sold, But Not Yet Purchased” for a description of our policies for recognizing gains and losses through earnings; and
- “Note 6. Cash Instruments” for a description of the types of cash instruments included in each level of the fair value hierarchy and the valuation techniques and significant inputs used to determine their fair values, including for private equity investments and investments in real estate entities.

Regulatory Capital Measurement

Many of our equity exposures are investments in funds that are required to be treated as “financial institutions” for the purposes of the deduction from capital for investments in the capital of nonconsolidated financial institutions. If an equity investment in a nonconsolidated financial institution is 10% or more of that institution’s common equity (or equivalent), then it is regarded as “significant.” We are required to deduct from our CET1 any excess of the aggregate of our significant investments in the common stock of nonconsolidated financial institutions that exceeds 10% of our CET1, subject to certain adjustments, and all non-common significant investments must be deducted from Tier 1 or Tier 2 capital using the corresponding deduction approach. In accordance with the transitional provisions, as of June 2017, we must deduct 80% of this excess (the percentage of the excess that must be deducted will increase in the future) and the remainder of the aggregate of our significant investments is risk weighted at 100%. Balances that are deducted from capital are not included in Table 7 below.

The computation of RWAs for banking book equity investments that are not deducted from capital is based upon either the Simple Modified Look-Through Approach (SMLTA) or the Simple Risk Weight Approach (SRWA).

Equity exposures in investment funds that do not have material leverage are risk weighted based upon the SMLTA, where risk-weights are determined based on the highest risk weights that would apply to the types of investments that the fund is permitted to hold under the terms of its prospectus. An equity investment in an investment fund is considered applicable for treatment in accordance with the look-through approach if the investment fund has no material liabilities and the assets of the fund are substantially all “financial assets.”

Pillar 3 Disclosures

Direct equity investments and equity investments in leveraged investment funds are risk weighted in accordance with the SRWA in accordance with the table below.

Risk Weight Investment Category

20%	An equity exposure to a Public Sector Entity (PSE), Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLB) or Farmer Mac
100%	Community development equity exposures Significant common stock investments in financial institutions which are not deducted from capital under transitional provisions (risk-weight will increase to 250% once transitional provisions expire in 2018) Non-significant equity exposures to the extent that the aggregate adjusted carrying value of the exposures does not exceed 10% of our Tier 1 capital plus Tier 2 capital
300%	A publicly traded equity exposure (other than an equity exposure that receives a 600% risk weight)
400%	A private equity exposure (other than an equity exposure that receives a 600% risk weight)
600%	An equity exposure to an investment firm that (i) would meet the definition of a traditional securitization but for the fact that the investment firm can exercise control over the size and composition of their assets, liabilities, and off-balance-sheet exposures, and (ii) has greater than immaterial leverage

Risk weights are applied to the “adjusted carrying value” of the equity exposure. For on-balance-sheet positions, the adjusted carrying value is the same as the balance sheet carrying value. For our unfunded equity investment commitments, the adjusted carrying value is a percentage of the notional amount, based upon the estimated funding of the commitment during economic downturn conditions.

Although the SRWA assigns specific risk weights to different types of equity exposures as set out above, the regulations allow for “non-significant equity exposures” to be risk weighted at 100% to the extent they do not exceed in the aggregate 10% of our Tier 1 plus Tier 2 capital, with the remaining portion then risk weighted as appropriate in accordance with the SRWA. Generally, those equity exposures that would attract the lowest risk weights under SRWA are required to be treated as non-significant equity exposures, before inclusion of any equity exposures that would otherwise attract higher risk weights under SRWA.

The table below presents the adjusted carrying values and RWAs for our equity exposures in the banking book.

Table 7: Equity Exposures in the Banking Book

<i>\$ in millions</i>	As of June 2017		
	Adjusted Carrying Value ^{1,4}	Risk Weight %	RWAs
Simple Risk Weight Approach (SRWA)			
Equity exposures to a PSE, FHLB or Farmer Mac	\$ 118	20%	24
Community development equity exposures	\$ 1,973	100%	\$ 1,973
Significant investments in the common stock of nonconsolidated financial institutions (transitional provisions) ²	6,938	100%	6,938
Non-significant equity exposures	9,712	100%	9,712
Publicly traded equity exposures ³	-	300%	-
Private equity exposures ³	5,894	400%	23,576
Equity exposures in leveraged investment funds	236	600%	1,416
Total SRWA	\$ 24,871		\$ 43,639
Simple Modified Look-Through Approach (SMLTA)			
Equity Exposures to Investment Funds	550		1,650
Total SMLTA	\$ 550		\$ 1,650
Total	\$ 25,421		\$ 45,289

1. The adjusted carrying value of the equity exposures includes \$2.59 billion representing a percentage of our unfunded commitment exposure.
2. Represents significant equity investments that are subject to risk-weighting, and excludes the items deducted from capital.
3. Our publicly traded and a portion of our private equity exposures are being risk weighted under the non-significant equity exposures risk-weight.
4. Adjusted carrying value consists of \$2.48 billion of publicly traded and \$22.94 billion of private equity exposures.

Securitizations in the Banking Book

Overview

The Revised Capital Framework defines certain activities as securitization transactions which attract capital requirements in accordance with the “Securitization Framework.” A portion of our positions that meet the regulatory definition of a securitization are in our trading book and capital requirements for those positions are calculated in accordance with the market risk capital rules (see “Market Risk - Specific Risk - Securitization Positions”). However, we also have certain banking book positions that meet the regulatory definition of a securitization.

In accordance with the Revised Capital Framework, the regulatory definition of a securitization includes the following criteria:

- All or a portion of the credit risk of one or more underlying exposures is transferred to one or more third parties;
- The credit risk associated with the underlying exposures has been separated into at least two tranches reflecting different levels of seniority;
- Performance of the securitization exposures depends upon the performance of the underlying exposures; and
- All or substantially all of the underlying exposures are financial exposures.

The regulations also distinguish between traditional and synthetic securitizations, the primary difference being that a traditional securitization involves the transfer of assets from a bank’s balance sheet into a securitization vehicle, whereas a synthetic securitization involves the transfer of credit risk through credit derivatives or guarantees.

There are also specific rules for resecuritization exposures (a resecuritization exposure is one which involves the securitization of assets, one or more of which has already been securitized). As of June 2017, we did not have any material banking book securitization exposures that met the definition of a resecuritization.

We have described below our banking book activities that meet the regulatory definition of a securitization. It is important to note that the scope of banking book securitizations for regulatory purposes is not comparable to the securitization activity reported in “Note 11. Securitization Activities” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Credit Protection (Synthetic Securitizations). Some of the credit protection that we have purchased meets the definition of a “synthetic securitization” in accordance with the Revised Capital Framework. The positions on which we have purchased protection are therefore treated for regulatory capital purposes in accordance with the Securitization Framework. In the most material of these synthetic securitization transactions, our hedge counterparty provides us with credit loss protection on certain approved loan commitments (primarily investment-grade commercial lending commitments). The notional amount of such loan commitments was \$26.75 billion as of June 2017. The credit loss protection on loan commitments provided by our hedge counterparty is generally limited to 95% of the first loss we realize on such commitments, up to a maximum of approximately \$950 million. In addition, subject to the satisfaction of certain conditions, upon the firm’s request, our hedge counterparty will provide protection for 70% of additional losses on such commitments, up to a maximum of \$1.13 billion, of which \$768 million of protection had been provided as of June 2017. This protection has been fully cash collateralized by our hedge counterparty.

Warehouse Financing and Lending. We provide financing to clients who warehouse financial assets. These arrangements are secured by the warehoused assets, primarily consisting of corporate loans and asset-backed and other loans. We also provide financing to non-operating companies on an over-collateralized basis.

OTC Derivatives facing Securitization Special Purpose Entities (SSPEs). We have OTC derivatives (primarily credit derivatives) with counterparties that meet the definition of an SSPE. An SSPE is an entity organized for the specific purpose of holding the assets underlying a securitization, whose activities are limited to holding such assets, and whose structure is intended to isolate the underlying assets from the credit risk of the seller who originally sold them to the SSPE. An OTC derivative with an SSPE counterparty attracts counterparty credit risk capital requirements in accordance with the Securitization Framework. All of our derivatives that fall into this category are considered to be covered positions in accordance with the Federal Reserve Board’s final rules, and as such they are also subject to market risk regulatory capital requirements (see “Market Risk”).

Other. We have certain other banking book securitization activities such as holding securities issued by securitization vehicles.

Pillar 3 Disclosures**Risk Management**

By engaging in the banking book securitization activities noted above, we are primarily exposed to credit risk and to the performance of the underlying assets. We mitigate the credit risk arising on our banking book securitization activities primarily through the purchase of credit protection and through obtaining collateral, predominantly in the form of cash, securities or loans. These positions are incorporated into our overall risk management of financial instruments.

Accounting/Valuation Policies

For information on accounting and valuation policies applicable to these positions, see “Note 3. Significant Accounting Policies” and related footnotes in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Calculation of Risk-Weighted Assets

RWAs for banking book securitization exposures (including counterparty credit risk exposures that arise from trading book derivative positions) are calculated through application of a hierarchy of approaches described below.

Deduction. A bank is required to deduct from CET1 any after-tax gain on sale resulting from the sale of loans for the purpose of a traditional securitization, unless the banking organization’s equity capital has increased as a consequence of having received cash in connection with the securitization. As of June 2017, we did not have any deductions of this nature.

Supervisory Formula Approach (SFA). If a bank is in a position to obtain or calculate, on an on-going basis, (using data no more than 91 days old) all of the parameters needed to perform the SFA calculation, then it must use this methodology to calculate the capital requirements for a securitization position. In accordance with the SFA, RWAs are based on the capital requirements that would apply to the underlying assets if they were held directly on our balance sheet; this is then adjusted to take account of the degree of subordination (i.e., loss absorbance by junior tranches) of a given tranche. The capital requirements that would apply in accordance with the Basel III Advanced Rules to the underlying assets must be calculated separately for each asset, unless the underlying assets are a homogenous pool of retail exposures, in which case the calculation can be done for the overall pool. The parameters required in order to calculate RWAs in accordance with the SFA are set out below:

Amount of underlying exposure (UE)	The EAD of all underlying exposures within the pool
Tranche Percentage (TP)	Ratio of the amount of the bank’s securitization exposure to the amount of the tranche that contains the securitization exposure
Capital requirement on underlying exposures (Kirb)	The AIRB capital requirement if the underlying exposures were held directly on balance sheet. This requires an assignment of PD and LGD to the underlying exposures. It is calculated as the ratio of i) the sum of the risk-based capital requirements for the underlying exposures plus the expected credit losses of the underlying exposures; to ii) UE
Credit Enhancement Level (L)	Ratio of the amount of all securitization exposure subordinated to the tranche that contains the bank’s securitization exposure to UE
Thickness of Tranche (T)	Ratio of the amount of the tranche that contains the bank’s securitization exposure to UE
N	Effective number of exposures in the underlying pool
EWALGD	Exposure weighted average loss given default of the underlying pool

Based on the above inputs, the SFA uses a prescribed regulatory formula to calculate the capital requirement. It results in a 1,250% risk weight for portions of the tranche with a subordination level below the Kirb threshold (see definition in the table above) and applies progressively lower RWAs to more senior tranches above the Kirb threshold, subject to a minimum risk-weight of 20%.

Pillar 3 Disclosures**Simplified Supervisory Formula Approach (SSFA).**

The SSFA is allowed only if the information needed to perform the SFA is not available, and only if the data used in the calculation is no more than 91 calendar days old.

Consistent with the SFA, the SSFA is based on the capital requirements that would apply to the underlying pool of assets if they were held directly on the balance sheet; this is then adjusted to take account of the degree of subordination of a given tranche, and the level of delinquent exposures in the pool. A key difference, however, is that the capital requirements applicable to the assets in the securitization pool are calculated using the Standardized Capital Rules, rather than the Basel III Advanced Rules. The SSFA also mirrors the SFA in that the capital requirements are lower for senior securitization exposures and higher for more junior ones.

The parameters required in order to calculate RWAs in accordance with the SSFA are set out below:

Weighted average capital requirement on underlying exposures (Kg)	Weighted average capital requirement of the underlying pool based on the Standardized Capital Rules
Severe delinquency and non-performance (W)	Ratio of delinquent exposures in the underlying pool
Attachment point (A)	Represents the threshold at which credit losses will first be allocated to the exposure
Detachment point (D)	Represents the threshold at which credit losses of principal allocated to the exposure would result in a total loss of principal
Securitization Surcharge (P)	Supervisory calibration parameter (0.5 for securitizations and 1.5 for resecuritizations). This parameter results in a capital requirement that would be 50% or 150% higher than assets held directly on balance sheet

Similar to the SFA, the SSFA results in a 1,250% risk-weight for portions of the tranche with a subordination level below the Kg threshold, and applies progressively lower RWAs to more senior tranches above the Kg threshold, subject to a minimum risk-weight of 20%.

1,250% Risk Weight. If the securitization is neither deducted from regulatory capital, nor qualifies for either SFA or SSFA, a 1,250% risk-weight is applied.

An exception to the hierarchy of approaches described above is for securitizations that are non-credit OTC derivatives that have a first priority claim on the cash flows from the underlying exposures. Subject to supervisory approval, the RWAs for such securitizations may be equal to the exposure amount.

Exposure Amount

The definition of “exposure amount” that is used for regulatory purposes for banking book securitizations is set out below.

Exposure Amount by product - Banking Book

On-Balance-Sheet	Loans and Securities: carrying value (either fair value or cost)
Off-Balance-Sheet	Unfunded commitments: the notional amount for unfunded commitments adjusted by the appropriate credit conversion factor
	Credit derivatives: the notional amount for credit derivatives adjusted for applicable collateral after applying the appropriate haircuts
	Other derivatives: model-based EEPE is used for OTC derivative contracts (except for credit derivatives)

Pillar 3 Disclosures

The table below presents the exposure amount and related RWAs of our banking book securitizations, including on-balance-sheet (retained or purchased) and off-balance-sheet exposures, broken out between traditional and synthetic securitizations, by underlying exposure type.

Exposure amounts below represent the associated EAD as calculated and defined by the regulatory rules, and are not comparable to securitization measures reported in “Note 11. Securitization Activities” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Table 8: Securitization Exposures and Related RWAs by Exposure Type

\$ in millions

As of June 2017

	Exposure Amount (EAD)				RWAs
	On-balance-sheet EAD	Off-balance-sheet EAD		Total EAD	
	Traditional EAD	Traditional EAD	Synthetic EAD		
Residential mortgages	\$ 1,207	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,207	\$ 1,363
Commercial mortgages	1,638	76	-	1,714	452
Corporates	1,480	1,628	16,930	20,038	4,980
Asset-backed and other	3,558	2,554	-	6,112	2,143
OTC Derivatives facing SSPEs ¹	-	-	259	259	603
Total	\$ 7,883	\$ 4,258	\$ 17,189	\$ 29,330	\$ 9,541

1. Represents counterparty credit risk charges on trading book OTC derivative transactions that face securitization SPEs. See “Market Risk – Specific Risk – Securitization Positions” for further information on our trading book exposures.

The table below presents the aggregate amount of our banking book securitization exposures further categorized by risk-based capital approach and risk-weight bands.

Exposure amounts below represent the associated EAD, as calculated and defined by the regulatory rules.

Table 9: Securitization Exposures and Related RWAs by Regulatory Capital Approach

\$ in millions

As of June 2017

	SFA		SSFA		1,250 percent risk-weight		Total	
	EAD	RWAs	EAD	RWAs	EAD	RWAs	EAD	RWAs
0% - 25%	\$ 17,104	\$ 3,421	\$ 10,136	\$ 2,029	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,240	\$ 5,450
26% - 100%	90	77	1,092	579	-	-	1,182	656
101% - 250%	198	346	116	185	-	-	314	531
251% - 650%	114	344	357	1,197	-	-	471	1,541
651% - 1,250%	58	632	65	731	-	-	123	1,363
Total	\$ 17,564	\$ 4,820	\$ 11,766	\$ 4,721	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29,330	\$ 9,541

Pillar 3 Disclosures

We account for a securitization as a sale when we have relinquished control over the transferred financial assets. Prior to securitization, we account for assets pending transfer at fair value and therefore do not typically recognize significant gains or losses upon the transfer of assets. As of June 2017, total assets held with the intent to securitize were \$2.25 billion.

The table below provides the principal amount of positions that we held in our banking book that have been securitized in the current year, whether or not we have retained a position. There has been no material new activity in relation to our synthetic securitization hedge transactions for the six months ended June 2017.

The principal amount is presented for the purpose of providing information about the size of our banking book securitization activities. This amount is not representative of our risk of loss.

Table 10: Securitization Activity – Banking Book

<i>\$ in millions</i>	Six Months Ended June 2017	
Residential mortgages	\$	3,188
Commercial mortgages		5,519
Asset-backed and other		13
Total Activity	\$	8,720

Market Risk**Overview**

Market risk is the risk of loss in the value of our inventory, as well as certain other financial assets and financial liabilities, due to changes in market conditions. Categories of market risk include the following:

- Interest rate risk: results from exposures to changes in the level, slope and curvature of yield curves, the volatilities of interest rates, prepayment speeds and credit spreads;
- Equity price risk: results from exposures to changes in prices and volatilities of individual equities, baskets of equities and equity indices;
- Currency rate risk: results from exposures to changes in spot prices, forward prices and volatilities of currency rates; and
- Commodity price risk: results from exposures to changes in spot prices, forward prices and volatilities of commodities, such as crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, electricity, and precious and base metals.

Market Risk Management, which is independent of the revenue-producing units and reports to our chief risk officer, has primary responsibility for assessing, monitoring and managing our market risk. We monitor and control risks through strong firmwide oversight and independent control and support functions across our global businesses.

Managers in revenue-producing units and Market Risk Management discuss market information, positions and estimated risk and loss scenarios on an ongoing basis. Managers in revenue-producing units are accountable for managing risk within prescribed limits. These managers have in-depth knowledge of their positions, markets and the instruments available to hedge their exposures.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

Market Risk Management Process

We manage our market risk by diversifying exposures, controlling position sizes and establishing economic hedges in related securities or derivatives. This process includes:

- Accurate and timely exposure information incorporating multiple risk metrics;
- A dynamic limit setting framework; and
- Constant communication among revenue-producing units, risk managers and senior management.

Market Risk Management produces risk measures and monitors them against established market risk limits. These measures reflect an extensive range of scenarios and the results are aggregated at product, business and firmwide levels. For additional information regarding our market risk measures and risk limits, see “Risk Management – Market Risk Management” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Market Risk-Weighted Assets

Our covered positions are subject to market risk capital requirements which are designed to cover the risk of loss in value of these positions due to changes in market conditions. These capital requirements are determined either by applying prescribed risk weighting factors, or they are based on internal models which are subject to various qualitative and quantitative parameters. The market risk regulatory capital rules require that a bank holding company obtain prior written agreement from its regulators before using any internal model to calculate its risk-based capital requirement for covered positions.

RWAs for market risk under the market risk regulatory capital rules are calculated using the following internal models: Value-at-Risk (VaR), Stressed VaR (SVaR), Incremental risk and Comprehensive risk (which also includes a surcharge). In addition, the Specific risk measure is also used to calculate RWAs for market risk, under the standardized measurement method, for certain securitized and non-securitized covered positions by applying risk-weighting factors predetermined by regulators, to positions after applicable netting is performed. As defined in the Federal Reserve Board’s regulations, RWAs for market risk are the sum of each of these measures multiplied by 12.5. An overview of each of these measures is provided below.

Regulatory VaR. VaR is the potential loss in value of inventory positions, as well as certain other financial assets and financial liabilities, due to adverse market movements over a defined time horizon with a specified confidence level. The VaR model captures risks including interest rates, equity prices, currency rates and commodity prices. As such, VaR facilitates comparison across portfolios of different risk characteristics. VaR also captures the diversification of aggregated risk at the firmwide level.

For both risk management purposes (positions subject to VaR limits) and regulatory capital calculations (for covered positions) we use a single VaR model. However, VaR used for regulatory capital requirements (Regulatory VaR) differs from risk management VaR due to different time horizons and confidence levels (10-day and 99% for Regulatory VaR vs. one-day and 95% for risk management VaR), as well as differences in the scope of positions on which VaR is calculated. In addition, the daily net revenues used to determine risk management VaR exceptions (i.e., comparing the daily net revenues to the VaR measure calculated as of the end of the prior business day) include intraday activity, whereas the Federal Reserve Board’s regulatory capital rules require that intraday activity be excluded from daily net revenues when calculating Regulatory VaR exceptions. Intraday activity includes bid/offer net revenues, which are more likely than not to be positive by their nature. As a result, there may be differences in the number of VaR exceptions and the amount of daily net revenues calculated for Regulatory VaR compared to the amounts calculated for risk management VaR.

In accordance with the market risk regulatory capital requirements, we evaluate the accuracy of our VaR model through daily backtesting. The results of the backtesting determine the size of the VaR multiplier used to compute RWAs.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

The table below presents by risk category our period-end, high, low and mean of the average daily Regulatory VaR for the period-end VaR as of June 2017. Average, per the market risk regulatory capital requirements, is determined based on the average daily Regulatory VaR over the preceding 60 business days.

Table 11: Regulatory VaR

<i>\$ in millions</i>	As of June 2017
Regulatory VaR	\$ 204
VaR x Multiplier	612 ¹
RWAs	\$ 7,650

	As of June 2017	Three Months Ended June 2017		
		High	Low	Mean
Group Inc.	\$ 204	\$ 255	\$ 204	\$ 226
Interest rates	138	162	138	150
Equity prices	109	123	109	115
Currency rates	79	111	74	87
Commodity prices	81	95	81	90
Diversification effect ²	\$ (203)			\$ (216)

- Regulatory VaR is subject to a regulatory multiplier that is set at a minimum of three (which is the multiplier used in this table) and can be increased up to four, depending upon the number of backtesting exceptions. See "Regulatory VaR Backtesting Results." This result is further multiplied by 12.5 to convert into RWAs.
- Diversification effect represents the difference between total VaR and the sum of the VaRs for the four risk categories. This effect arises because the four market risk categories are not perfectly correlated.

Stressed VaR. SVaR is the potential loss in value of inventory positions, as well as certain other financial assets and financial liabilities, during a period of significant market stress. SVaR is calculated at a 99% confidence level over a 10-day horizon using market data inputs from a continuous 12-month period of stress. We identify the stressed period by comparing VaR using market data inputs from different historical periods.

The table below presents our period-end, high, low and mean of the average weekly SVaR for the three months ended June 2017. Average, per the market risk regulatory capital requirements, is determined based on the average weekly amount for the preceding 12 weeks.

Table 12: Stressed VaR

<i>\$ in millions</i>	As of June 2017	Three Months Ended June 2017		
		High	Low	Mean
SVaR	\$ 664	\$ 742	\$ 664	\$ 717
SVaR x Multiplier	1,991 ¹			
RWAs	\$ 24,888			

- SVaR is subject to the same regulatory multiplier used for Regulatory VaR and is further multiplied by 12.5 to convert into RWAs.

Incremental Risk. Incremental risk is the potential loss in value of non-securitized inventory positions due to the default or credit migration of issuers of financial instruments over a one-year time horizon. As required by the market risk regulatory capital rules, this measure is calculated at a 99.9% confidence level over a one-year time horizon. It uses a multi-factor model assuming a constant level of risk. When assessing the risk, we take into account market and issuer-specific concentration, credit quality, liquidity horizons and correlation of default and migration risk. The liquidity horizon is calculated based upon the size of exposures and the speed at which we can reduce risk by hedging or unwinding positions, given our experience during a historical stress period, and is subject to the prescribed regulatory minimum.

The table below presents our period-end, high, low and mean of the maximum of the average weekly Incremental risk measure or the point-in-time measure. Average, per the market risk regulatory capital requirements, is determined based on the average weekly amount over the preceding 12 weeks.

Table 13: Incremental Risk

<i>\$ in millions</i>	As of June 2017	Three Months Ended June 2017		
		High	Low	Mean
Incremental Risk	\$ 786 ¹	\$ 937	\$ 703	\$ 797
RWAs	\$ 9,825			

- In order to convert the results of Incremental risk into RWAs, it is multiplied by 12.5.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

Comprehensive Risk. Comprehensive risk is the potential loss in value, due to price risk and defaults, within our credit correlation positions. A credit correlation position is defined as a securitization position for which all or substantially all of the value of the underlying exposures is based on the credit quality of a single company for which a two-way market exists, or indices based on such exposures for which a two-way market exists, or hedges of these positions (which are typically not securitization positions).

As required by the market risk regulatory capital requirements, Comprehensive risk comprises a model-based measure and a surcharge based on the standardized measurement method. The model-based measure is calculated at a 99.9% confidence level over a one-year time horizon applying a constant level of risk. The model comprehensively covers price risks including nonlinear price effects and takes into account contractual structure of cash flows, the effect of multiple defaults, credit spread risk, volatility of implied correlation, recovery rate volatility and basis risk. The liquidity horizon is based upon our experience during a historical stress period, subject to the prescribed regulatory minimum.

The surcharge is 8% of the standardized specific risk add-on. For detail on the calculation of the add-on for securitization positions, see “Specific Risk - Securitization Positions” below, and for detail on the calculation of the add-on for hedges see “Specific Risk - Other Specific Risk Positions” below.

As of June 2017, we had credit correlation positions, subject to the Comprehensive risk measure, with a fair value of \$210 million in net liabilities.

The table below presents our period-end, high, low and mean of the maximum of the average weekly Comprehensive risk measure or the point-in-time measure, inclusive of both modeled and non-modeled components for the three months ended June 2017. Average, per the market risk regulatory capital requirements, is determined based on the average weekly amount for the preceding 12 weeks.

Table 14: Comprehensive Risk

<i>\$ in millions</i>	As of	Three Months Ended		
	June 2017	June 2017		
		High	Low	Mean
Comprehensive Risk	\$ 278 ^{1,2}	\$ 316	\$ 278	\$ 293
RWAs	\$ 3,475			

1. In order to convert the Comprehensive risk measure into RWAs, it is multiplied by 12.5.
2. These results include a surcharge of \$0.14 billion on credit correlation positions.

Model Review and Validation

The models discussed above, which are used to determine Regulatory VaR, SVaR, Incremental risk and Comprehensive risk, are subject to independent review and validation by Model Risk Management. For more information, see “Model Risk Management.”

These models are regularly reviewed and enhanced in order to incorporate changes in the composition of positions included in our market risk measures, as well as variations in market conditions. Prior to implementing significant changes to our assumptions and/or models, Model Risk Management performs model validations. Significant changes to our models are reviewed with our chief risk officer and chief financial officer, and approved by the Firmwide Risk Committee.

Regulatory VaR Backtesting Results

As required by the market risk regulatory capital requirements, we validate the accuracy of our Regulatory VaR models by backtesting the output of such models against the daily positional loss results. The actual number of exceptions (that is, the number of business days for which the positional losses exceed the corresponding 99% one-day Regulatory VaR) over the most recent 250 business days is used to determine the size of the VaR multiplier, which could increase from a minimum of three to a maximum of four, depending on the number of exceptions.


Pillar 3 Disclosures

As defined in the market risk regulatory capital requirements, positional net revenues for any given day represent the impact of that day’s price variation on the value of positions held at the close of business the previous day. As a consequence, these results exclude certain revenues associated with market-making businesses, such as bid/offer net revenues, which are more likely than not to be positive by their nature. In addition, positional net revenues used in our Regulatory VaR backtesting relate only to positions which are included in Regulatory VaR and, as noted above, differ from positions included in our risk management VaR. This measure of positional net revenues is used to evaluate the performance of the Regulatory VaR model and is not comparable to our actual daily net revenues. See “Risk Management — Market Risk Management” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Our positional losses observed on a single day did not exceed our 99% one-day Regulatory VaR during the three months ended June 2017. Our positional losses observed on a single day did not exceed our 99% one-day Regulatory VaR during the previous 12 months. There was no change in the VaR multiplier used to calculate Market RWAs. Note that, although a one-day time horizon is used for backtesting purposes, a 10-day time horizon is used, as described earlier, to determine RWAs associated with Regulatory VaR.

The table below presents our 99% one-day Regulatory VaR during the previous 12 months.

Table 15: Daily Regulatory VaR



Stress Testing

Stress testing is a method of determining the effect of various hypothetical stress scenarios. We use stress testing to examine risks of specific portfolios as well as the potential impact of our significant risk exposures. We use a variety of stress testing techniques to calculate the potential loss from a wide range of market moves on our portfolios, including sensitivity analysis, scenario analysis and firmwide stress tests.

For a detailed description of our stress testing practices, see “Risk Management – Market Risk Management – Market Risk Management Process – Stress Testing” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Specific Risk

Specific risk is the risk of loss on a position that could result from factors other than broad market movements, including event risk, default risk and idiosyncratic risk. The specific risk add-on is applicable for both securitization positions and for certain non-securitized debt and equity positions, to supplement the model-based measures, and is primarily based on supervisory prescribed risk-weighting factors and methodologies. The table below presents the RWAs of our non-model-based specific risk measure on securitization (excluding credit correlation positions captured by the Comprehensive risk measure) and non-securitization positions.

Table 16: Specific Risk

<i>\$ in millions</i>	As of June 2017
Securitization positions	\$ 19,088
Other specific risk positions	18,738
Total Specific Risk RWAs	\$ 37,826

Pillar 3 Disclosures

Securitization Positions. The “Securitization Framework” section of the rules is used to calculate the RWAs for any covered position that has been identified as a securitization or resecuritization (for detailed descriptions of the regulatory definition of a securitization and of the hierarchy of approaches used within the Securitization Framework to calculate regulatory capital requirements, see “Securitized in the Banking Book”). Products covered by the regulatory definition of a securitization include mortgage-backed securities (MBS) and other asset-backed securities (ABS), derivatives referencing MBS or ABS, or derivatives referencing indices of MBS or ABS, which are held in inventory. The population includes positions purchased in the secondary market, as well as retained interests in securitization structures we sponsor. Consistent with the rules, this notably excludes mortgage-backed pass-through securities guaranteed by government-sponsored entities (for example, Federal National Mortgage Association).

The RWAs for trading book securitization positions are calculated by multiplying the exposure amount by the specific risk-weighting factors assigned and then multiplying by 12.5. The exposure amount is defined as the carrying value for securities, or the market value of the effective notional of the instrument or indices underlying derivative positions. The securitization capital requirements are the greater of the capital requirements on the net long or short exposure (incorporating applicable netting), and are capped at the maximum loss that could be incurred on any given transaction.

The table below presents our aggregate on-balance-sheet and off-balance-sheet trading book securitization exposures (excluding credit correlation positions captured by the Comprehensive risk measure) by underlying exposure type. Amounts below reflect securitization exposures, as defined for regulatory capital purposes and are not comparable to securitization measures reported in “Note 11. Securitization Activities” in Part I, Item 1 “Financial Statements” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Table 17: Trading Book Securitization Exposures

<i>\$ in millions</i>	As of June 2017
Residential mortgages	\$ 1,232
Commercial mortgages	1,266
Corporates ¹	701
Asset-backed and other	1,145
Total Securitization Exposures²	\$ 4,344

1. Reflects corporate collateralized debt and loan obligations.

2. Includes securities with a fair value of \$3.49 billion.

Securitization positions, including resecuritizations, are incorporated into our overall risk management approach for financial instruments. For a detailed discussion of our risk management process and practices, see “Risk Management – Market Risk Management” and “Risk Management – Credit Risk Management” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Other Specific Risk Positions. The standard specific risk add-on for debt positions ranges from 0.25% to 12%, other than for certain sovereign and supranational positions which have a 0% add-on. The add-on for sovereigns, public sector entities and depository institutions is based on the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development country risk classifications of the sovereign and the remaining contractual maturity of the position. The add-on for corporate entities that have issued public financial instruments is based on internal assessments of creditworthiness and the remaining contractual maturity of the position. All other types of debt positions are subject to an 8% add-on. The standard specific risk add-on for equity positions will generally be 8%, but this could decrease to 2% for well-diversified portfolios of equities, certain indices, and certain futures-related arbitrage strategies. The standard specific risk RWAs for debt and equity positions are calculated by multiplying the exposure amount by the appropriate standard specific risk add-on, and then multiplying by 12.5. The exposure amount is defined as the carrying value for securities and loans, or the market value of the effective notional of the instrument or indices underlying derivative positions. The specific risk capital requirements are capped at the maximum loss that could be incurred on any given transaction.

Operational Risk

Overview

Operational risk is the risk of loss resulting from inadequate or failed internal processes, people and systems or from external events. Our exposure to operational risk arises from routine processing errors as well as extraordinary incidents, such as major systems failures or legal and regulatory matters.

Potential types of loss events related to internal and external operational risk include:

- Clients, products and business practices;
- Execution, delivery and process management;
- Business disruption and system failures;
- Employment practices and workplace safety;
- Damage to physical assets;
- Internal fraud; and
- External fraud.

We maintain a comprehensive control framework designed to provide a well-controlled environment to minimize operational risks. The Firmwide Operational Risk Committee provides oversight of the ongoing development and implementation of our operational risk policies and framework. Operational Risk Management is a risk management function independent of our revenue-producing units, reports to our chief risk officer, and is responsible for developing and implementing policies, methodologies and a formalized framework for operational risk management with the goal of maintaining our exposure to operational risk at levels that are within our risk appetite.

Operational Risk Management Process

Managing operational risk requires timely and accurate information as well as a strong control culture. We seek to manage our operational risk through:

- Training, supervision and development of our people;
- Active participation of senior management in identifying and mitigating our key operational risks;
- Independent control and support functions that monitor operational risk on a daily basis, and implementation of extensive policies and procedures, and controls designed to prevent the occurrence of operational risk events;
- Proactive communication between our revenue producing units and our independent control and support functions; and
- A network of systems to facilitate the collection of data used to analyze and assess our operational risk exposure.

We combine top-down and bottom-up approaches to manage and measure operational risk. From a top-down perspective, our senior management assesses firmwide and business-level operational risk profiles. From a bottom-up perspective, revenue-producing units and independent control and support functions are responsible for risk identification and risk management on a day-to-day basis, including escalating operational risks to senior management.

Our operational risk management framework is in part designed to comply with the operational risk measurement rules under the Revised Capital Framework and has evolved based on the changing needs of our businesses and regulatory guidance.

Our operational risk management framework comprises the following practices:

- Risk identification and assessment;
- Risk measurement; and
- Risk monitoring and reporting.

Internal Audit performs an independent review of our operational risk management framework, including our key controls, processes and applications, on an annual basis to assess the effectiveness of our framework.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

Risk Identification and Assessment

The core of our operational risk management framework is risk identification and assessment. We have a comprehensive data collection process, including firmwide policies and procedures, for operational risk events.

We have established policies that require our revenue-producing units and our independent control and support functions to report and escalate operational risk events. When operational risk events are identified, our policies require that the events be documented and analyzed to determine whether changes are required in our systems and/or processes to further mitigate the risk of future events.

In addition, our systems capture internal operational risk event data, key metrics such as transaction volumes, and statistical information such as performance trends. We use an internally developed operational risk management application to aggregate and organize this information. One of our key risk identification and assessment tools is an operational risk and control self-assessment process, which is performed by managers from both revenue-producing units and independent control and support functions. This process consists of the identification and rating of operational risks, on a forward-looking basis, and the related controls. The results from this process are analyzed to evaluate operational risk exposures and identify businesses, activities or products with heightened levels of operational risk.

Risk Measurement

We measure our operational risk exposure over a twelve-month time horizon using both statistical modeling and scenario analyses, which involve qualitative assessments of the potential frequency and extent of potential operational risk losses, for each of our businesses. Operational risk measurement incorporates qualitative and quantitative assessments of factors including:

- Internal and external operational risk event data;
- Assessments of our internal controls;
- Evaluations of the complexity of our business activities;
- The degree of and potential for automation in our processes;
- New activity information;
- The legal and regulatory environment;
- Changes in the markets for our products and services, including the diversity and sophistication of our customers and counterparties; and
- Liquidity of the capital markets and the reliability of the infrastructure that supports the capital markets.

The results from these scenario analyses are used to monitor changes in operational risk and to determine business lines that may have heightened exposure to operational risk. These analyses ultimately are used in the determination of the appropriate level of operational risk capital to hold.

Regulatory Capital Measurement

We have been given permission by our regulators to calculate operational RWAs in accordance with the Advanced Measurement Approach (AMA) of the Revised Capital Framework.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

In accordance with the AMA, we employ a Scenario-Based Approach (SBA) model that incorporates qualitative and quantitative data elements. Scenario analysis is conducted across a matrix of businesses and centralized corporate functions throughout the firm and across their applicable operational risk categories: clients, products and business practices; execution, delivery and process management; business disruption and system failures; employment practices and workplace safety; damage to physical assets; internal fraud; and external fraud. Each intersection of a business or corporate function and a risk category is referred to as a risk class. For each risk class, internal loss data, external data, business environment and internal control factors and judgment are used to develop and substantiate estimates of the likely frequency and severity of operational risk losses over a twelve-month time horizon. These estimates are used as inputs to produce two separate distributions (one for frequency, one for severity) which are then combined for each risk class. The results for all risk classes are aggregated, taking into consideration the possibility of correlations between them. The SBA model calculates operational risk capital requirements for the firm at the 99.9th percentile confidence level.

For a subset of risks in our operational risk capital determination we incorporate insurance as a risk transfer mechanism. We continue to seek opportunities to use compliant insurance, where appropriate.

Risk Monitoring and Reporting

We evaluate changes in our operational risk profile and our businesses, including changes in business mix or jurisdictions in which we operate, by monitoring the factors noted above at a firmwide level. We have both preventive and detective internal controls, which are designed to reduce the frequency and severity of operational risk losses and the probability of operational risk events. We monitor the results of assessments and independent internal audits of these internal controls.

We also provide periodic operational risk reports to senior management, risk committees and the Board. In addition, we have established thresholds to monitor the impact of an operational risk event, including single loss events and cumulative losses over a twelve-month period, as well as escalation protocols. We also provide periodic operational risk reports, which include incidents that breach escalation thresholds, to senior management, firmwide and divisional risk committees and the Risk Committee of the Board.

Model Review and Validation

The SBA model discussed above is subject to independent review and validation by Model Risk Management. For additional information, see “Model Risk Management.”

Model Risk Management**Overview**

Model risk is the potential for adverse consequences from decisions made based on model outputs that may be incorrect or used inappropriately. We rely on quantitative models across our business activities primarily to value certain financial assets and liabilities, to monitor and manage our risk, and to measure and monitor our regulatory capital.

Our model risk management framework is managed through a governance structure and risk management controls, which encompass standards designed to ensure we maintain a comprehensive model inventory, including risk assessment and classification, sound model development practices, independent review and model-specific usage controls. The Firmwide Enterprise Risk Committee and the Firmwide Model Risk Control Committee oversee our model risk management framework. Model Risk Management, which is independent of model developers, model owners and model users, reports to our chief risk officer, is responsible for identifying and reporting significant risks associated with models, and provides periodic updates to senior management, risk committees and the Risk Committee of the Board.

Model Review and Validation

Model Risk Management consists of quantitative professionals who perform an independent review, validation and approval of our models. This review includes an analysis of the model documentation, independent testing, an assessment of the appropriateness of the methodology used, and verification of compliance with model development and implementation standards. Model Risk Management reviews all existing models on an annual basis, as well as new models or significant changes to models.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

The model validation process incorporates a review of models and trade and risk parameters across a broad range of scenarios (including extreme conditions) in order to critically evaluate and verify:

- The model’s conceptual soundness, including the reasonableness of model assumptions, and suitability for intended use;
- The testing strategy utilized by the model developers to ensure that the models function as intended;
- The suitability of the calculation techniques incorporated in the model;
- The model’s accuracy in reflecting the characteristics of the related product and its significant risks;
- The model’s consistency with models for similar products; and
- The model’s sensitivity to input parameters and assumptions.

For more information regarding the use of models within these areas, see “Critical Accounting Policies – Fair Value – Review of Valuation Models,” “Risk Management – Liquidity Risk Management,” “Risk Management – Market Risk Management,” “Risk Management – Credit Risk Management” and “Risk Management – Operational Risk Management” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q and “Credit Risk,” “Market Risk,” and “Operational Risk” in this document.

Interest Rate Sensitivity**Interest Rate Risk Management Practices**

The firm centrally monitors and sets limits on its interest rate risk sensitivity on both trading and banking book activities. Our interest rate risk is managed dynamically in response to changing market conditions. A significant portion of our assets reprice frequently in relation to interest rates because they are held at fair value, and are either floating rate or are hedged to floating rate. Although our assets are mostly funded by floating rate liabilities, they are also partially funded by fixed-rate debt and common equity. As a result, in an environment of rising interest rates, as floating rate assets generate increased revenues but fixed-rate liabilities do not generate a corresponding increase in interest expense, the impact on net revenues across our trading book and banking book exposures would be positive.

Common Equity and Fixed-Rate Liabilities

We monitor the implied interest rate sensitivity related to our common equity and fixed-rate liabilities by performing a hypothetical scenario on a quarterly basis in which we assess the short-term impact of an instantaneous rise in interest rates of 100 basis points and assume the size and composition of our balance sheet remains constant. As of June 2017, we estimate that this rise in interest rates could result in a positive impact of approximately \$1.6 billion to our net revenues over a one-year period. This hypothetical scenario does not reflect our expectations regarding the movement of interest rates in the near term. Furthermore, the level of client and other market activity is generally the primary driver of our net revenues, and changes to such activity levels as a consequence of a rise in interest rates are not reflected in this hypothetical scenario.

Interest Rate Risk in the Trading Book

Our exposure to interest rate risk in our trading book arises mostly from inventory held to support client market-making activities. This inventory is accounted for at fair value and its interest rate risk is monitored as a component of Market risk. For additional information regarding interest rate risk, see “Risk Management – Market Risk Management” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Interest Rate Risk in the Banking Book

Our exposure to interest rate risk in our banking book activities arises from differences in interest earned or paid as interest rates change, due to the reset characteristics of our assets and liabilities. Apart from our fixed-rate debt, a significant portion of both our assets and liabilities reset frequently in relation to interest rates, therefore limiting our exposure to interest rate risk. We evaluate our sensitivity to changes in interest rates across a range of interest rate scenarios. One of the methodologies used to monitor our sensitivity to interest rate risk is the Economic Value of Equity (EVE) sensitivity analysis. This measures the change in the present value of banking book assets and liabilities as a function of different interest rate assumptions.

For further information regarding asset-liability management, see “Risk Management – Liquidity Risk Management” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Supplementary Leverage Ratio

The Revised Capital Framework includes a supplementary leverage ratio requirement for Advanced approach banking organizations. Under amendments to the Revised Capital Framework, the U.S. federal bank regulatory agencies approved a final rule that implements the supplementary leverage ratio aligned with the definition of leverage established by the Basel Committee. The supplementary leverage ratio compares Tier 1 capital to a measure of leverage exposure, which consists of total daily average assets for the quarter and certain off-balance-sheet exposures (which include a measure of derivatives exposures and commitments), less certain balance sheet deductions. The Revised Capital Framework requires a minimum supplementary leverage ratio of 5.0% (comprised of the minimum requirement of 3.0% and a 2.0% buffer) for U.S. bank holding companies deemed to be G-SIBs, effective on January 1, 2018.

As of June 2017, our supplementary leverage ratio on both a fully phased-in basis and using transitional Tier 1 capital was 6.3%. For additional information on our supplementary leverage ratio on a fully phased-in basis, see “Equity Capital Management and Regulatory Capital – Supplementary Leverage Ratio” in Part I, Item 2 “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. For additional information on our supplementary leverage ratio on a transitional basis, see our FFIEC 101 Report, “Regulatory Capital Reporting for Institutions Subject to the Advanced Capital Adequacy Framework.”

Cautionary Note on Forward-Looking Statements

We have included or incorporated by reference in these disclosures, and from time to time our management may make, statements that may constitute “forward-looking statements” within the meaning of the safe harbor provisions of the U.S. Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. Forward-looking statements are not historical facts, but instead represent only our beliefs regarding future events, many of which, by their nature, are inherently uncertain and outside our control. These statements include statements other than historical information or statements of current conditions and may relate to our future plans and objectives and results, among other things, and may also include statements about the effect of changes to the capital and leverage rules applicable to bank holding companies, the impact of the Dodd-Frank Act on our businesses and operations, as well as statements about the objectives and effectiveness of our risk management and liquidity policies, statements about trends in or growth opportunities for our businesses, and statements about our future status, activities or reporting under U.S. or non-U.S. banking and financial regulation.

We have provided in this report information regarding interest rate sensitivity. Certain statements with respect to potential net revenue impact from a hypothetical change in interest rates on our banking book and trading book assets and common equity and fixed-rate liabilities are forward-looking statements that are based on the current composition of our balance sheet and do not address any adverse impacts on our businesses that could be caused by a change in interest rates. The estimated impact to our net revenues does not reflect our expectations regarding movement of interest rates in the near term or any estimated business revenue that might be generated in a changing interest rate environment.

We have provided in this report information regarding our supplementary leverage ratio on a fully phased-in basis. The statements with respect to this ratio are forward-looking statements, based on our current interpretation, expectations and understandings of the relevant regulatory rules and guidance, and reflect significant assumptions concerning the treatment of various assets and liabilities and the manner in which the ratio is calculated. As a result, the methods used to calculate this ratio may differ, possibly materially, from that used in calculating the firm’s ratio for any future disclosures. The ultimate method of calculating the ratio will depend on, among other things, implementation guidance or further rulemaking from the U.S. federal bank regulatory agencies and the development of market practices and standards.

It is possible that our actual results and financial condition may differ, possibly materially, from the anticipated results and financial condition indicated in these forward-looking statements. Important factors that could cause our actual results and financial condition to differ from those indicated in the forward-looking statements include, among others, those discussed in “Risk Factors” in Part I, Item 1A in our 2016 Form 10-K.

Glossary of Risk Terms

- **Advanced Internal Ratings-Based (AIRB).** The AIRB approach of the Revised Capital Framework provides a methodology for banks, subject to supervisory approval, to use various risk parameters to determine the EAD and risk-weights for regulatory capital calculations. Other risk parameters used in the determination of risk weights are each counterparty's Probability of Default (PD), Loss Given Default (LGD) and the effective maturity of the trade or portfolio of trades.
- **Advanced Measurement Approach (AMA).** The AMA of the Revised Capital Framework provides a methodology for a bank to estimate capital requirements for Operational Risk, subject to meeting a range of qualitative and quantitative data requirements, and to supervisory approval. The AMA establishes requirements for a bank's operational risk management processes, data and assessment systems, and quantification systems.
- **Central Counterparty (CCP).** A counterparty such as a clearing house that facilitates trades between counterparties.
- **Comprehensive Risk.** The potential loss in value, due to price risk and defaults, within our credit correlation positions. Comprehensive risk comprises a modeled measure which is calculated at a 99.9% confidence level over a one-year time horizon plus a surcharge which is 8% of the standardized specific risk add-on.
- **Credit Correlation Position.** A securitization position for which all or substantially all of the value of the underlying exposures is based on the credit quality of a single company for which a two-way market exists, or indices based on such exposures for which a two-way market exists, or hedges of these positions (which are typically not securitization positions).
- **Credit Risk.** The potential for loss due to the default or deterioration in credit quality of a counterparty (e.g., an OTC derivatives counterparty or a borrower) or an issuer of securities or other instruments we hold.
- **Current Exposure Methodology (CEM).** Calculation used to measure derivative current and potential future exposure. The potential future exposure is calculated using static conversion factors applied to gross notional balances and incorporates partial netting. The conversion factors are based on broad product type, and for some products on maturity bucket.
- **Default.** A default is considered to have occurred when either or both of the two following events have taken place: (i) we consider that the obligor is unlikely to pay its credit obligations to us in full; or (ii) the obligor has defaulted on a payment and/or is past due more than 90 days on any material Wholesale credit obligation, 180 days on residential mortgage obligations or 120 days on other retail obligations.
- **Default Risk.** The risk of loss on a position that could result from failure of an obligor to make timely payments of principal or interest on its debt obligation, and the risk of loss that could result from bankruptcy, insolvency, or similar proceedings.
- **Economic Value of Equity (EVE).** Methodology used to monitor interest rate risk sensitivity that measures the change in the present value of asset and liability cash flows as a function of different interest rate assumptions.
- **Effective Expected Positive Exposure (EEPE).** The time-weighted average of non-declining positive credit exposure over the EE simulation. EEPE is used in accordance with the IMM as the exposure measure that is then risk weighted to determine counterparty risk capital requirements.
- **Event Risk.** The risk of loss on equity or hybrid equity positions as a result of a financial event, such as the announcement or occurrence of a company merger, acquisition, spin-off, or dissolution.
- **Expected Exposure (EE).** The expected value of the probability distribution of non-negative credit risk exposures to a counterparty at any specified future date before the maturity date of the longest term transaction in a netting set.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

- **Exposure at Default (EAD).** The exposure amount that is risk weighted for regulatory capital calculations. For on-balance-sheet assets, such as receivables and cash, EAD is generally based on the balance sheet value. For the calculation of EAD for off-balance-sheet exposures, including commitments and guarantees, an equivalent exposure amount is calculated based on the notional amount of each transaction multiplied by a credit conversion factor designed to estimate the net additions to funded exposures that would be likely to occur over a one-year horizon, assuming the obligor were to default. For substantially all of the counterparty credit risk arising from OTC derivatives, exchange-traded derivatives and securities financing transactions, internal models calculate the distribution of exposure upon which the EAD calculation is based.
- **Global Systemically Important Banks (G-SIBs).** Of the 75 largest global banks as measured by the supplementary leverage exposure measure, those banks that are deemed to be systemically important by the Basel Committee. Banks are measured by size, interconnectedness, complexity, substitutability, and cross-jurisdictional activity. G-SIBs are subject to more stringent supervisory and regulatory requirements, including higher minimum risk-based capital requirements and higher minimum supplementary leverage ratio requirements, among others.
- **Idiosyncratic Risk.** The risk of loss in the value of a position that arises from changes in risk factors unique to that position.
- **Incremental Risk.** The potential loss in value of non-securitized inventory positions due to the default or credit migration of issuers of financial instruments over a one-year time horizon. This measure is calculated at a 99.9% confidence level over a one-year time horizon using a multi-factor model.
- **Internal Models Methodology (IMM).** The IMM of the Revised Capital Framework establishes a methodology for banks to use their internal models to estimate exposures arising from OTC derivatives, securities financing transactions, eligible margin loans, and cleared transactions subject to qualitative and quantitative requirements and supervisory approval.
- **Loss Given Default (LGD).** An estimate of the economic loss rate if a default occurs during economic downturn conditions.
- **Market Risk.** The risk of loss in the value of our inventory, as well as certain other financial assets and financial liabilities, due to changes in market conditions.
- **Model Risk.** The potential for adverse consequences from decisions made based on model outputs that may be incorrect or used inappropriately.
- **Model Validation.** The set of processes and activities intended to verify that models are performing as expected.
- **Operational Risk.** The risk of loss resulting from inadequate or failed internal processes, people and systems or from external events.
- **Probability of Default (PD).** Estimate of the probability that an obligor will default over a one-year horizon.
- **Regulatory VaR Backtesting.** Comparison of daily positional loss results to the Regulatory VaR measure calculated as of the end of the prior business day.
- **Resecuritization Position.** Represents an on or off-balance-sheet transaction in which one or more of the underlying exposures is a securitization position, or an exposure that directly or indirectly references a re-securitization exposure.
- **Retail Exposure.** Residential mortgage exposures, qualifying revolving exposures, or other retail exposures that are managed as part of a segment with homogeneous risk characteristics, not on an individual exposure basis.
- **Securitization Position.** Represents an on- or off-balance-sheet transaction in which all or a portion of the credit risk of one or more underlying exposures is transferred to one or more third parties; the credit risk associated with the underlying exposures has been separated into at least two tranches, reflecting different levels of seniority; the performance of the securitization exposures is dependent upon the performance of the underlying exposures; all or substantially all of the underlying exposures are financial exposures; and the underlying exposure ownership is subject to certain ownership criteria prescribed by the regulatory rules.

Pillar 3 Disclosures

- **Simplified Supervisory Formula Approach (SSFA).** Calculation method used in the Securitization Framework under which RWAs are based on the capital requirements that would apply to the underlying pool of assets if they were held directly on the balance sheet; this is then adjusted to take account for the degree of subordination of a given tranche. The capital requirement applicable to the assets in the securitization pool are calculated using the general risk-based requirements (i.e. the Standardized Capital Rules), rather than the Basel III Advanced Rules. The SSFA is allowed only if the information needed to use the SFA is not available, and only if the data used in the calculation is no more than 91 calendar days old.
- **Specific Risk.** The risk of loss on a position that could result from factors other than broad market movements and includes event risk, default risk and idiosyncratic risk. The specific risk add-on is applicable for both securitization positions and for certain non-securitized debt and equity positions, to supplement the model-based measures.
- **Stress Testing.** Stress testing is a method of determining the effect on the firm of various hypothetical stress scenarios.
- **Stressed VaR (SVaR).** The potential loss in value of inventory positions, as well as certain other financial assets and financial liabilities, during a period of significant market stress. SVaR is calculated at a 99% confidence level over a 10-day horizon using market data inputs from a continuous 12-month period of stress.
- **Supervisory Formula Approach (SFA).** Calculation methodology used in the Securitization Framework under which RWAs are based on the capital requirements that would apply to the underlying pool of assets if they were held directly on our balance sheet; this is then adjusted to take account of the degree of subordination (i.e. loss absorbance by junior tranches) of a given tranche.
- **Synthetic Securitization.** Defined in the Revised Capital Framework as a transaction in which all or some of the following criteria are met; all or a portion of the credit risk of the underlying exposures is transferred to a third party through the use of credit derivatives or guarantees; credit risk associated with the underlying exposures has been separated into at least two tranches reflecting different levels of seniority; the performance of the securitization exposures depends on the performance of the underlying exposures; and, all or substantially all of the underlying exposures are financial exposures.
- **Traditional Securitization.** Defined in the Revised Capital Framework as a transaction which meets various criteria including that all or a portion of the credit risk of underlying exposures is transferred to a third party other than through the use of credit derivatives or guarantees; the credit risk associated with the underlying exposures has been separated into at least two tranches reflecting different levels of seniority; the performance of the securitization exposures depends on the performance of the underlying exposures; and, all or substantially all of the underlying exposures are financial exposures.
- **Value-at-Risk (VaR).** The potential loss in value of inventory positions, as well as certain other financial assets and financial liabilities, due to adverse market movements over a defined time horizon with a specified confidence level. Risk management VaR is calculated at a 95% confidence level over a one-day horizon.
- **Wholesale Exposure.** A term used in the Revised Capital Framework to refer collectively to credit exposures to companies, sovereigns or government entities (other than Securitization, Retail or Equity exposures).

Pillar 3 Disclosures**Index of References**

Category	Description	Pillar 3 Report page reference	June 2017 Form 10-Q page reference
Scope of Application	Basis of Consolidation	4	6-8
	Restrictions on the Transfer of Funds or Regulatory Capital within the Firm	4	75, 118, 129
Capital Structure	Terms and Conditions of Capital Instruments	7	58-59, 64-66
	Capital Components	6-7	70
Capital Adequacy	Capital Management	5	113-116
	Basel III Advanced Transitional Capital Ratios	5	70
	Basel III Advanced Transitional Risk-Weighted Assets	8	72
Credit Risk: General Disclosures	Credit Risk Management Overview and Credit Risk Management Process	8-9	140-141
	Model Review and Validation	13, 30-31	141, 147-148
	Impaired Loans and Loans on Non-Accrual Status, and Allowance for Losses on Loans and Lending Commitments	10	43-44
Credit Risk: Internal Ratings Based Approach and Counterparty Credit Risk	Parameter Definition, Estimation Methods, and Governance and Validation of Risk Parameters	11-13	-
	Credit Risk Wholesale Exposures and Retail Exposures by PD Band	11, 12	-
	Credit Risk Exposures including Derivative and Securities Financing Transaction Exposures	10-12	23-24, 44-46, 142-145
	Credit Derivatives	14	30-32
Credit Risk Mitigation	Counterparty Netting and Collateral Management	13-14	10, 141-143
	Investing & Lending Exposures Covered by Credit Derivatives	14	-
Securitizations in the Banking Book	Overview, Activity and Objectives	18	-
	Securitization Exposures and Risk-Weighted Assets	21	-
	Current Year Securitization Activity	22	-
Market Risk	Market Risk Management Overview	22	135
	Regulatory VaR, Stressed VaR, Incremental Risk, Comprehensive Risk and Specific Risk	23-26	69, 72-73
	Model Review and Validation	25, 30-31	137, 147-148
	Regulatory VaR Backtesting Results	25-26	69
	Stress Testing	26	136
Operational Risk	Operational Risk Management Overview	28	146
	Advanced Measurement Approach	29-30	69
	Model Review and Validation	30, 30-31	147, 147-148
Model Risk Management	Overview, Model Review and Validation	30-31	147-148
Equity Exposures in the Banking Book	Overview and Risk Management	15-16	-
	Equity Exposures by Risk Weight	17	-
Interest Rate Risk in the Banking Book	Interest Rate Sensitivity	31	-
	Net Revenue Sensitivity to Rate Shocks	31	-
Liquidity Risk Management	Liquidity Risk	-	127-134
Supplementary Leverage Ratio	Supplementary Leverage Ratio	32	117