

Risk factors

Any of the risks described below could have a material adverse effect on the business activities, financial condition, results of operations and prospects of ING. Additional risks of which the Company is not presently aware could also affect the business operations of ING and have a material adverse effect on ING's business activities, financial condition, results of operations and prospects. In addition, the business of a multinational, broad-based financial services firm such as ING is inherently exposed to risks that only become apparent with the benefit of hindsight. The market price of ING shares or other securities could decline due to any of those risks including the risks described below, and investors could lose all or part of their investments. The sequence in which the risk factors are presented below is not indicative of their likelihood of occurrence or the potential magnitude of their financial consequences.

Risks related to financial conditions, market environment and general economic trends

Because we are a financial services company conducting business on a global basis, our revenues and earnings are affected by the volatility and strength of the economic, business, liquidity, funding and capital markets environments specific to the geographic regions in which we conduct business. The ongoing turbulence and volatility of such factors have adversely affected, and may continue to adversely affect, the profitability, solvency and liquidity of our business.

Factors such as interest rates, securities prices, credit spreads, liquidity spreads, exchange rates, consumer spending, changes in client behaviour, business investment, real estate values and private equity valuations, government spending, inflation or deflation, the volatility and strength of the capital markets, political events and trends, and terrorism all impact the business and economic environment and, ultimately, our solvency, liquidity and the amount and profitability of business we conduct in a specific geographic region. We are particularly exposed to financial, economic, market and political conditions in the Benelux countries, from which we derive a significant portion of our revenues. In an economic downturn characterised by higher unemployment, lower family income, lower corporate earnings, higher corporate and private debt defaults, lower business investments and lower consumer spending, the demand for banking products is usually adversely affected and ING's reserves and provisions typically would increase, resulting in overall lower earnings. Securities prices, real estate values and private equity valuations may also be adversely impacted, and any such losses would be realised through profit and loss and shareholders' equity. We also offer a number of financial products that expose us to risks associated with fluctuations in interest rates, securities prices, corporate and private default rates, the value of real estate assets, exchange rates and credit spreads.

See also '—Interest rate volatility and other interest rate changes may adversely affect our profitability', '—Continued risk of resurgence of turbulence and ongoing volatility in the financial markets and the economy generally have adversely affected, and may continue to adversely affect, our business, financial condition and results of operations', and '—Market conditions observed over the past few years may increase the risk of loans being impaired. We are exposed to declining property values on the collateral supporting residential and commercial real estate lending' below.

In case one or more of the factors mentioned above adversely affects the profitability of our business, this might also result, among other things, in the following:

- reserve and provisions inadequacies, which could ultimately be realised through profit and loss and shareholders' equity;
- the write-down of tax assets impacting net results and/or equity;
- impairment expenses related to goodwill and other intangible assets, impacting net results;
- movements in risk weighted assets for the determination of required capital;
- changes in credit valuation adjustments and debt valuation adjustments; and/or
- additional costs related to maintenance of higher liquidity buffers and/or collateral placements.

Shareholders' equity and our net result may be significantly impacted by turmoil and volatility in the worldwide financial markets. Negative developments in financial markets and/or economies and changes in the regulatory environment in which we operate have in the past had and may in the future have a material adverse impact on shareholders' equity and net result, including as a result of the potential consequences listed above. See '— Continued risk of resurgence of turbulence and ongoing volatility in the financial markets and the economy generally have adversely affected, and may continue to adversely affect, our business, financial condition and results of operations' and '— We operate in highly regulated industries. Changes in laws and/ or regulations governing financial services or financial institutions or the application of such laws and/or regulations governing our business may reduce our profitability' below.

Continued risk of resurgence of turbulence and ongoing volatility in the financial markets and the economy generally have adversely affected, and may continue to adversely affect, our business, financial condition and results of operations.

General

Our business and results of operations are materially affected by conditions in the global capital markets and the economy generally. In 2008 and through early 2009, the financial services industry and the securities markets generally were materially and adversely affected by significant declines in the values of nearly all asset classes and by a serious lack of liquidity. Concerns over the slow economic recovery, the European sovereign debt crisis, the outcome of the negotiations between the UK and the EU following the UK referendum on EU membership (Brexit), the potential exit of other countries from the Eurozone, increasing political instability in Europe, unemployment, the availability and cost of credit, credit spreads, quantitative easing within the Eurozone through bond repurchases, the ECB's targeted longer-term refinancing operation ('TLTRO'), potential changes in U.S. laws, regulations and policies governing financial regulation, foreign trade and foreign investment following the inauguration of a new U.S. administration in January 2017, the level of U.S. national debt and the U.S. housing market, inflation/deflation levels, energy costs and heightened geopolitical issues all have contributed to increased volatility and diminished expectations for the economy and the markets in recent years.

These conditions have generally resulted in greater volatility, widening of credit spreads and overall shortage of liquidity and tightening of financial markets throughout the world. These concerns have since expanded to include a broad range of fixed income securities, including those rated investment grade and especially the sovereign debt of some EEA countries and the U.S., the international credit and interbank money markets generally, and a wide range of financial institutions and markets, asset classes, such as public and private equity, and real estate sectors. As a result of these and other factors, sovereign governments across the globe, including in regions where the Group operates, have also experienced budgetary and other financial difficulties, which have resulted in changes in economic policy including the implementation of austerity measures, downgrades in credit rating by credit agencies, planned or implemented bail-out measures and, on occasion, civil unrest (for further details regarding sovereign debt concerns, see '—U.S. Sovereign Credit Rating' and '—European sovereign debt crisis and the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union below). As a result, the market for fixed income instruments has experienced decreased liquidity, increased price volatility, credit downgrade events, and increased probability of default. In addition, the confluence of these and other factors has resulted in volatile foreign exchange markets. Securities that are less liquid are more difficult to value and may be hard to dispose of. International equity markets have also continued to experience heightened volatility and turmoil, with issuers, including ourselves, that have exposure to the real estate, mortgage, private equity and credit markets particularly affected. These events and market upheavals, including high levels of volatility, have had and may continue to have an adverse effect on our revenues and results of operations, in part because we have a large investment portfolio and extensive real estate activities around the world.

In addition, the confidence of customers in financial institutions is being tested. Consumer confidence in financial institutions may, for example, decrease due to our or our competitors' failure to communicate to customers the terms of, and the benefits to customers of, complex or high-fee financial products. Reduced confidence could have an adverse effect on our revenues and results of operations, including withdrawal of deposits. Because a significant percentage of our customer deposit base is originated via Internet banking, a loss of customer confidence may result in a rapid withdrawal of deposits over the Internet.

As a result of the ongoing and unprecedented volatility in the global financial markets since 2007, we incurred in past years substantial negative revaluations and impairments on our investment portfolio, which have impacted our shareholders' equity and earnings.

The aforementioned impacts have arisen primarily as a result of valuation and impairment issues arising in connection with our investments in real estate (both in and outside the U.S.) and private equity, exposures to European sovereign debt and to U.S. mortgage-related structured investment products, including sub-prime and 'Alt-A' residential and commercial mortgage-backed securities, collateralised debt obligations and collateralised loan obligations, private equity and other investments. In many cases, the markets for investments and instruments have been and remain highly illiquid, and issues relating to counterparty credit ratings and other factors have exacerbated pricing and valuation uncertainties. Valuation of such investments and instruments is a complex process involving the consideration of market transactions, pricing models, management judgment and other factors, and is also impacted by external factors, such as underlying mortgage default rates, interest rates, rating agency actions and property valuations. Although we continue to monitor our exposures, there can be no assurance that we will not experience further negative impacts to our shareholders' equity, solvency position, liquidity, financial condition or profit and loss accounts in future periods.

European sovereign debt crisis and the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union

Market concerns over the direct and indirect exposure of European banks and insurers to the sovereign debt of several EU Member States since 2010 have resulted in a widening of credit spreads and increased costs of funding for some European financial institutions. The sovereign debt crisis has also highlighted issues relating to the strength of the banking sector in Europe and the Euro. In addition, risks and ongoing concerns about the crisis in the Italian banking sector and its potential spill-over effect into other Member States, deterioration of the political situation in Turkey, as well as the possible default by one or more Member States could have a detrimental impact on the global economic recovery, sovereign and non-sovereign debt in these countries and the financial condition of European and other financial institutions, including us. For example, concerns regarding Greece's financial condition and potential exit from the Eurozone were raised again in early 2017. Additionally, the possibility of capital market volatility spreading through a highly integrated and interdependent banking system remains elevated. In the event of any default or similar event with respect to a sovereign issuer, some financial institutions may suffer significant losses, following which they would require additional capital, and such capital may not be available. We are exposed to the risk of downgrades of European sovereign ratings or corporate ratings, because they may affect our financial costs and, as a result, our profitability. Market disruptions in Europe related to sovereign debt and the banking sector continue to be a threat to global capital markets and remains a challenge to global financial stability. In the event of any default or similar event with respect to a sovereign issuer, some financial institutions may suffer significant losses, following which they would require additional capital, which may not be available. Market and economic disruptions stemming from the crisis in Europe also have affected, and may continue to affect, consumer confidence levels and spending, bankruptcy rates, levels of incurrence of, and default on, consumer debt and home prices, among other factors. There can be no assurance that market disruptions in Europe, including the increased cost of funding for certain government and financial institutions, will not spread, nor can there be any assurance that future assistance packages will be available or, even if provided, will be sufficient to stabilise the affected countries and markets in Europe or elsewhere. To the extent uncertainty regarding the economic recovery continues to negatively impact consumer confidence and consumer credit factors, our business and results of operations could be significantly and adversely impacted. Additionally, extreme prolonged market events, such as the recent global credit crisis, could cause us to incur significant losses and may lead to USD funding shortages for EU Banks.

In addition, although the UK is not a member state of the Eurozone, the decision of the UK to leave the EU may further destabilize the Eurozone. The outcome of the negotiations between the UK and the EU, which are expected to formally begin in March 2017 and to last for at least two years, remains highly uncertain as does its economic and operational impact on the Group and its counterparties. Concerns regarding other Member States' potential exit from the EU or the Eurozone also have emerged following the 'Brexit' referendum and may continue to emerge in the context of the French and German general elections in 2017. The possible exit from the EU and/or the Eurozone of one or more European states and/or the replacement of the Euro by one or more successor currencies could create significant uncertainties regarding the enforceability and valuation of Euro-denominated contracts to which we (or our counterparties) are a party and thereby materially and adversely affect our and/or our counterparties' liquidity, financial condition and operations. Such uncertainties may include the risk that (i) an obligation that was expected to be paid in Euros is redenominated into a new currency (which may not be easily converted into other currencies without incurring significant cost), (ii) currencies in some Member States may depreciate relative to others, (iii) former EU and/or Eurozone Member States may impose capital controls that would make it complicated or illegal to move capital out of such countries, and/or (iv) some courts (in particular, courts in countries that have left the EU and/or the Eurozone) may not recognise and/or enforce claims denominated in Euros (and/or in any replacement currency). These factors, combined with volatile oil prices, reduced business and consumer confidence and/or continued high unemployment, have negatively affected the economy of main geographic regions where we conduct our business. Our results of operations, liquidity position, capital position and investment portfolio are exposed to these risks and may be adversely affected as a result.

U.S. Sovereign Credit Rating

In 2011, Standard & Poor's Ratings Services ('S&P') lowered its long-term sovereign credit rating on the U.S. from AAA to AA+. Although other ratings agencies have not similarly lowered the long-term sovereign credit rating of the U.S., they have put that credit rating on watch. Amid the lingering uncertainty over the long-term outlook for the fiscal position and the future economic performance of the U.S. within the global economy and potential future budgetary restrictions in the U.S., there continues to be a perceived risk of a future sovereign credit ratings downgrade of the U.S. government, including the rating of U.S. Treasury securities. On 15 October 2013, Fitch Ratings placed the U.S.'s AAA credit rating under 'rating watch negative' in response to the financial crisis, a step that would precede an actual downgrade, which was however upgraded again to 'stable' in March 2014. It is foreseeable that the ratings and perceived creditworthiness of instruments issued, insured or guaranteed by institutions, agencies or instrumentalities directly linked to the U.S. government could also be correspondingly affected by any such downgrade. Instruments of this nature are key assets on the balance sheets of financial institutions and are widely used as collateral by financial institutions to meet their day-to-day cash flows in the short-term debt market. The impact of any further downgrades to the sovereign credit rating of the U.S. government or a default by the U.S. government to satisfy its debt obligations likely would create broader financial turmoil and uncertainty, which would weigh heavily on the global financial system and could consequently result in a significant adverse impact to the Group.

Adverse capital and credit market conditions as well as changes in regulations may impact our ability to access liquidity and capital, as well as the cost of liquidity, credit and capital.

Adverse capital market conditions have in the past affected, and may in the future affect, our cost of borrowed funds and our ability to borrow on a secured and unsecured basis, thereby impacting our ability to support and/or grow our businesses. Furthermore, although interest rates are at or near historically low levels, since the recent financial crisis, we have experienced increased funding costs due in part to the withdrawal of perceived government support of such institutions in the event of future financial crises. In addition, liquidity in the financial markets has also been negatively impacted as market participants and market practices and structures adjust to new regulations.

We need liquidity to pay our operating expenses, interest on our debt and dividends on our capital stock, maintain our securities lending activities and replace certain maturing liabilities. Without sufficient liquidity, we will be forced to curtail our operations and our business will suffer. The principal sources of our funding include a variety of short- and long-term instruments, including deposit fund, repurchase agreements, commercial paper, medium- and long-term debt, subordinated debt securities, capital securities and stockholders' equity.

In the event that our current resources do not satisfy our needs, we may need to seek additional financing. The availability of additional financing will depend on a variety of factors, such as market conditions, the general availability of credit, the volume of trading activities, the overall availability of credit to the financial services industry, our credit ratings and credit capacity, as well as the possibility that customers or lenders could develop a negative perception of our long- or short-term financial prospects. Similarly, our access to funds may be limited if regulatory authorities or rating agencies take negative actions against us. If our internal sources of liquidity prove to be insufficient, there is a risk that we may not be able to successfully obtain additional financing on favourable terms, or at all. Any actions we might take to access financing may, in turn, cause rating agencies to re-evaluate our ratings.

Disruptions, uncertainty or volatility in the capital and credit markets may also limit our access to capital. Such market conditions may in the future limit our ability to raise additional capital to support business growth, or to counterbalance the consequences of losses or increased regulatory capital and rating agency capital requirements. This could force us to (i) delay raising capital, (ii) reduce, cancel or postpone payment of dividends on our shares, (iii) reduce, cancel or postpone interest payments on our other securities, (iv) issue capital of different types or under different terms than we would otherwise, or (v) incur a higher cost of capital than in a more stable market environment. This would have the potential to decrease both our profitability and our financial flexibility. Our results of operations, financial condition, cash flows, regulatory capital and rating agency capital position could be materially adversely affected by disruptions in the financial markets.

In the course of 2008 and 2009, governments around the world, including the Dutch government, implemented unprecedented measures to provide assistance to financial institutions, in certain cases requiring (indirect) influence on or changes to governance and remuneration practices. In certain cases, governments nationalised companies or parts thereof. The measures adopted in the Netherlands included emergency funding and capital reinforcement, and a Dutch Credit Guarantee Scheme, both of which have expired. Our completed Restructuring Plan and the divestments in connection with that plan altered the size and structure of the Group and involved significant costs, which required changes in our operations, funding and liquidity. Any potential future transactions with the Dutch State or any other government or any actions by such government regarding ING could adversely impact the position or rights of shareholders, bondholders, customers or creditors and our results, operations, solvency, liquidity and governance.

We are subject to the jurisdiction of a variety of banking regulatory bodies, some of which have proposed regulatory changes in recent years that, if implemented, would hinder our ability to manage our liquidity in a centralised manner. As a holding company, ING Groep N.V. is dependent for liquidity on payments from its subsidiaries, which are subject to restrictions, as described in '—As a holding company, ING Groep N.V. is dependent for liquidity on payments from its subsidiaries, many of which are subject to regulatory and other restrictions.' Furthermore, regulatory liquidity requirements in certain jurisdictions in which we operate are generally becoming more stringent, including those forming part of the 'Basel III' requirements discussed further below under '—We operate in highly regulated industries. Changes in laws and/or regulations governing financial services or financial institutions or the application of such laws and/or regulations governing our business may reduce our profitability', undermining our efforts to maintain this centralised management of our liquidity. These developments may cause trapped pools of liquidity and capital, resulting in inefficiencies in the cost of managing our liquidity and solvency, and hinder our efforts to integrate our balance sheet.

Interest rate volatility and other interest rate changes may adversely affect our profitability.

Changes in prevailing interest rates may negatively affect our business, including the level of net interest revenue we earn, and the levels of deposits and the demand for loans. A sustained increase in the inflation rate in our principal markets may also negatively affect our business, financial condition and results of operations. For example, a sustained increase in the inflation rate may result in an increase in nominal market interest rates. A failure to accurately anticipate higher inflation and factor it into our product pricing assumptions may result in mispricing of our products, which could materially and adversely impact our results of operations. On the other hand, recent concerns regarding negative interest rates and the low level of interest rates generally may negatively impact our net interest income, which may have an adverse impact on our profitability.

Risk factors - continued

Declining interest rates or a prolonged period of low interest rates, as is currently the case, may result in:

- lower earnings over time on investments, as reinvestments will earn lower rates;
- increased prepayment or redemption of mortgages and fixed maturity securities in our investment portfolios, as well as increased prepayments of corporate loans. This as borrowers seek to borrow at lower interest rates potentially combined with lower credit spreads. Consequently, we may be required to reinvest the proceeds into assets at lower interest rates;
- lower profitability as the result of a decrease in the spread between client rates earned on assets and client rates paid on savings, current account and other liabilities;
- higher costs for certain derivative instruments that may be used to hedge certain of our product risks;
- lower profitability since we may not be able to fully track the decline in interest rates in our savings rates;
- lower profitability since we may not always be entitled to impose surcharges to customers to compensate for the decline in interest rates;
- lower profitability since we may have to pay a higher premium for the defined contribution scheme in the Netherlands for which the premium paid is dependent on interest rate developments and DNB's methodology for determining the ultimate forward rate;
- lower interest rates may cause asset margins to decrease thereby lowering our results of operations. This may for example be the consequence of increased competition for investments as result of the low rates, thereby driving margins down; and/or
- (depending on the position) a significant collateral posting requirement associated with our interest rate hedge programs, which could materially and adversely affect liquidity and our profitability.

All these effects may be amplified in a (prolonged) negative rate environment. In such environment there may also be the risk that a rate is to be paid on assets, while there is no (partial) compensation on the liabilities. This will reduce our results of operations then.

Rapidly increasing interest rates may result in:

- a decrease in the demand for loans;
- higher interest rates to be paid on debt securities that we have issued or may issue on the financial markets from time to time to finance our operations and on savings, which would increase our interest expenses and reduce our results of operations;
- higher interest rates can lead to lower investments prices reduce the revaluation reserves, thereby lowering IFRS equity and the capital ratios. Also the lower securities value leads to a loss of liquidity generating capacity which needs to be compensated by attracting new liquidity generating capacity which reduces our results of operations;
- prepayment losses if prepayment rates are lower than expected or if interest rates increase too rapidly to adjust the accompanying hedges; and/or
- (depending on the position) a significant collateral posting requirement associated with our interest rate hedge Program;

Inflation and deflation may negatively affect our business.

A sustained increase in the inflation rate in our principal markets would have multiple impacts on us and may negatively affect our business, solvency position and results of operations. For example, a sustained increase in the inflation rate may result in an increase in market interest rates, which may:

- decrease the estimated fair value of certain fixed income securities that we hold in our investment portfolios, resulting in:
 - reduced levels of unrealised capital gains available to us, which could negatively impact our solvency position and net income, and/or
 - a decrease in collateral values,
- result in increased withdrawal of certain savings products, particularly those with fixed rates below market rates,
- require us, as an issuer of securities, to pay higher interest rates on debt securities that we issue in the financial markets from time to time to finance our operations, which would increase our interest expenses and reduce our results of operations.

A significant and sustained increase in inflation has historically also been associated with decreased prices for equity securities and sluggish performance of equity markets generally. A sustained decline in equity markets may:

- result in impairment charges to equity securities that we hold in our investment portfolios and reduced levels of unrealised capital gains available to us which would reduce our net income, and
- lower the value of our equity investments impacting our capital position.

In addition, a failure to accurately anticipate higher inflation and factor it into our product pricing may result in a systemic mispricing of our products, which would negatively impact our results of operations.

On the other hand, deflation experienced in our principal markets may also adversely affect our financial performance. In recent years, the risk of low inflation and even deflation (i.e., a continued period with negative rates of inflation) in the Eurozone has materialized. Deflation may erode collateral values and diminish the quality of loans and cause a decrease in borrowing levels, which would negatively affect our business and results of operations.

We operate in highly regulated industries. Changes in laws and/or regulations governing financial services or financial institutions or the application of such laws and/or regulations governing our business may reduce our profitability.

We are subject to detailed banking laws and government regulation in the jurisdictions in which we conduct business. Regulatory agencies and supervisors have broad administrative power over many aspects of our business, which may include liquidity, capital adequacy, permitted investments, ethical issues, money laundering, anti-terrorism measures, privacy, recordkeeping, product and sale suitability, marketing and sales practices, remuneration policies, personal conduct and our own internal governance practices. Also, regulators and other supervisory authorities in the European Union ('EU'), the United States ('U.S.') and elsewhere continue to scrutinise payment processing and other transactions and activities of the financial services industry through laws and regulations governing such matters as money laundering, anti-terrorism financing, tax evasion, prohibited transactions with countries subject to sanctions, and bribery or other anti-corruption measures.

Our revenues and profitability and those of our competitors have been and will continue to be impacted by requirements relating to capital, additional loss-absorbing capacity, leverage, minimum liquidity and long-term funding levels, requirements related to resolution and recovery planning, derivatives clearing and margin rules and levels of regulatory oversight, as well as limitations on which and, if permitted, how certain business activities may be carried out by financial institutions.

Following the start of the financial crisis, regulators around the world have increased their focus on the regulation of the financial services industry. Most of the principal markets where we conduct our business have adopted, or are currently in the implementation phase of, major legislative and/or regulatory initiatives in response to the financial crisis. Governmental and regulatory authorities in the Netherlands, Germany, Belgium, the United Kingdom, the EU, the U.S. and elsewhere have implemented, or are in the process of implementing measures to increase regulatory control in their respective financial markets and financial services sectors, including, among others, in the areas of prudential rules, liquidity and capital requirements, executive compensation, crisis and contingency management, bank taxes and financial reporting. Additionally, governmental and regulatory authorities in the Netherlands, in the EU and the U.S. as well as in a multitude of jurisdictions where we conduct our business continue to consider new mechanisms to limit the occurrence and/or severity of future economic crises (including proposals to restrict the size of financial institutions operating in their jurisdictions and/or the scope of operations of such institutions). Furthermore, we are subject to different tax regulations in each of the jurisdictions where we conduct business. Changes in tax laws (including case law) could increase our taxes and our effective tax rates and could materially impact our tax receivables and liabilities as well as deferred tax assets and deferred tax liabilities, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition. One such change relates to the current debate in the U.S. over corporate tax reform for multinational corporations and corporate tax rates. Changes in tax laws could also make certain ING products less attractive, which could have adverse consequences for our businesses and results.

In addition, the International Accounting Standards Board ('IASB') issued in July 2014 a new accounting standard for financial instruments also known as IFRS 9 'Financial Instruments'. IFRS 9, which was endorsed by the EU in November 2016, will replace IAS 39, the accounting standard heavily criticised in the wake of the financial crisis, for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2018, with early adoption permitted. Such changes could also have a material impact on our reported results and financial condition, as well as on how ING manages its business, internal controls and disclosure.

Compliance with applicable laws and regulations is resources-intensive, and changes in laws and regulations may materially increase costs. We expect the scope and extent of regulation in the jurisdictions in which we conduct our business, as well as regulatory oversight and supervision, to generally continue to increase. However, we cannot predict whether or when future legislative or regulatory actions may be taken, or what impact, if any, actions taken to date or in the future could have on our business, results of operations and financial condition. Regulation is becoming increasingly more extensive and complex and the industries in which we operate are increasingly coming under the scrutiny of regulators, and affected companies, including ING, are required to meet the demands, which often necessitate additional resources. These regulations can limit our activities, among others, through stricter net capital, customer protection and market conduct requirements and restrictions on the businesses in which we can operate or invest.

Despite our efforts to maintain effective compliance procedures and to comply with applicable laws and regulations, there are a number of risks in areas where applicable regulations may be unclear, subject to multiple interpretations or under development, or where regulations may conflict with one another, or where regulators revise their previous guidance or courts overturn previous rulings, which could result in our failure to meet applicable standards. Regulators and other authorities have the power to bring administrative or judicial proceedings against us, which could result, among other things, in suspension or revocation of our licenses, cease and desist orders, fines, civil penalties, criminal penalties or other disciplinary action, which could materially harm our results of operations and financial condition. If we fail to address, or appear to fail to address, any of these matters appropriately, our reputation could be harmed and we could be subject to additional legal risk, which could, in turn, increase the size and number of claims and damages brought against us or subject us to enforcement actions, fines and penalties.

Basel III, CRD IV and CRD V

In December 2010, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision ('BCBS') announced higher global minimum capital standards for banks and introduced a new global liquidity standard and a new leverage ratio. The BCBS's package of reforms, collectively referred to as the 'Basel III' rules, will, among other requirements, increase the amount of common equity required to be held by subject banking institutions, prescribe the amount of liquid assets and the long-term funding a subject banking institution must hold at any given moment and limit leverage. Banks will be required to hold a 'capital conservation buffer' to withstand future periods of stress such that the total common equity Tier 1 ratio, when fully phased in on 1 January 2019, will rise to 7%. Basel III also introduced a 'countercyclical buffer' as an extension of the capital conservation buffer, which would allow national regulators to require banks to hold more capital during periods of high credit growth (to strengthen capital reserves and moderate the debt markets). Further, Basel III has strengthened the definition of capital that will have the effect of disqualifying many hybrid securities, including those issued by the Group, from inclusion in regulatory capital, as well as the higher capital requirements for trading, derivative and securitisation activities as part of a number of reforms to the Basel II framework. In addition, the BCBS and the Financial Stability Board ('FSB') published measures in October 2011 that would have the effect of requiring higher loss absorbency capacity, liquidity surcharges, exposure limits and special resolution regimes for, and instituting more intensive and effective supervision of, 'systemically important financial institutions' ('SIFIs') and so-called 'Global' SIFIs ('G-SIFIs'), in addition to the Basel III requirements otherwise applicable to most financial institutions. In particular in November 2015 the FSB published the final Total Loss-Absorbing Capacity (TLAC) standard for G-SIFIs, which aims for G-SIFIs to have sufficient loss-absorbing and recapitalisation capacity available in resolution. The implementation of these measures began in 2012, and full implementation is targeted for 2019, with the TLAC requirements to apply from 2019. ING Bank has been designated by the BCBS and the FSB as one of the global systemically important banks ('G-SIBs'), forming part of the G-SIFIs, since 2011, and by the Dutch Central Bank (De Nederlandsche Bank N.V., 'DNB') and the Dutch Ministry of Finance as a domestic SIFI since November 2011. The Basel III proposals and their potential impact are monitored via semi-annual monitoring exercises in which ING Bank participates. As a result of such monitoring exercises and ongoing discussions within the regulatory environment, revisions have been made to the original Basel III proposals as was the case with the revised Liquidity Coverage Ratio in January 2013 and the revised Net Stable Funding Ratio and Leverage Ratio in January 2014. In January 2017, the BCBS announced that it expected to complete finalisation of all revisions to the Basel III framework, including the calibration of an aggregate capital floors framework and a leverage ratio minimum requirement, in 'the near future'. There is a high degree of uncertainty as to whether any further amendments to the 2010 framework and standards will be made by the BCBS in the coming years, and how any such amendments would be implemented subsequently in the EU and in The Netherlands.

For European banks, the Basel III requirements were implemented through the Capital Requirements Regulation and Capital Requirements Directive IV ('CRD IV Regulation' and 'CRD IV Directive', respectively and together the 'CRR'), which were adopted by the EC in June 2013 following approval by the European Parliament in April 2013. The CRD IV Regulation entered into force on 28 June 2013 and the CRD IV Directive on 17 July 2013, and all banks and investment firms in the EU (as opposed to the scope of the Basel III requirements, which apply to 'internationally active banks') were required to apply the new rules from 1 January 2014 in phases, with full implementation by 1 January 2019. The full impact of these rules, and any additional requirements for SIFIs or G-SIFIs, if and as applicable to the Group, will depend on how the CRD IV Directive is transposed into national laws in each Member State, including the extent to which national regulators and supervisors set more stringent limits and additional capital requirements or surcharges. In the Netherlands, the CRD IV Directive has been implemented through amendments to the Financial Supervision Act. In the next phase for regulatory requirements for banks' risk and capital management, the regulators are focusing on the required capital calculations across banks. Since the start of the financial crisis there has been much debate on the risk-weighted capitalisation of banks, and specifically on whether internal models are appropriate for such purposes. These developments have suggested that stricter rules may be applied by a later framework. The BCBS released several consultative papers, containing proposals to change the methodologies for the calculation of capital requirements and is expected to issue further standards in this respect. Within these proposals BCBS suggests methods to calculate RWA using more standardised or simpler methods in order to achieve greater comparability, transparency and consistency. In November 2016, the EC proposed substantial amendments (commonly referred to as CRD V) to the CRR (including the CRD IV Directive), the BRRD and the Single Resolution Mechanism Regulation to, among other things, implement these revisions in the EU legislation. Legislation is expected to be finalised in 2018. These proposals will likely impact the capital requirements for currently reported exposures (e.g. credit risk via revised standardised RWA floor) but may also lead to new capital requirements. The proposals cover multiple areas, including the Pillar 2 framework, the leverage ratio, mandatory restrictions on distributions, permission for reducing own funds and eligible liabilities, macroprudential tools, a new category of 'non-preferred' senior debt, the minimum requirement for own funds and eligible liabilities (MREL) and the integration of the TLAC standard into EU legislation. The proposals are to be considered by the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union and therefore remain subject to change. The final package of new legislation may not include all elements of the proposals and new or amended elements may be introduced through the course of the legislative process. Until the proposals are in final form, it is uncertain how the proposals will affect the Group or holders of its securities. The current proposals, as well as on the economic and financial environment at the time of implementation and beyond, can have a material impact on ING's operations and financial condition and they may require the Group to seek additional capital.

Single Supervisory Mechanism

In November 2014, the European Central Bank ('ECB') assumed responsibility for a significant part of the prudential supervision of banks in the Eurozone, including ING Bank, following a year-long preparatory phase which included an in-depth comprehensive assessment of the resilience and balance sheets of the biggest banks in the Eurozone. ING Bank was among the seven Dutch institutions covered by the assessment (out of 130 institutions overall). While the ECB has assumed the supervisory tasks conferred on it by the Single Supervisory Mechanism ('SSM') Regulation, the DNB will still continue to play a big role in the supervision of ING Group and ING Bank.

In its capacity as principal bank supervisor in the European Union, the ECB has extensive supervisory and investigatory powers, including the ability to issue requests for information, to conduct regulatory investigations and on-site inspections, and to impose monetary and other sanctions. For example, under the SSM, the regulators with jurisdiction over the Group, including the ECB, may conduct stress tests and have discretion to impose capital surcharges on financial institutions for risks that are not otherwise recognised in risk-weighted assets or other surcharges depending on the individual situation of the bank and take or require other measures, such as restrictions on or changes to the Group's business. Competent regulators may also, if the Group fails to comply with regulatory requirements, in particular with minimum capital requirements (including buffer requirements) or with liquidity requirements, or if there are shortcomings in its governance and risk management processes, prohibit the Group from making dividend payments to shareholders or distributions to holders of its regulatory capital instruments. Generally, a failure to comply with the new quantitative and qualitative regulatory requirements could have a material adverse effect on the Group's business, financial condition and results of operations.

In 2016 the ECB has also started the Targeted Review of Internal Models (TRIM), an exercise which will take several years and is aimed at bringing assurance that capital held reflects the underlying risks. There is also heightened supervisory attention for the credit quality of loans to corporates and/or households. These exercises could impact the RWA we recognise for certain assets.

Dodd-Frank Act

On 21 July 2010, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act ('Dodd-Frank' or 'Dodd-Frank Act') was signed into law in the U.S. The Dodd-Frank Act effects comprehensive changes to the regulation of financial services in the U.S. and has implications for non-U.S. financial institutions with a U.S. presence or that transact with U.S. counterparties, such as ING. Dodd-Frank directs existing and newly created government agencies and bodies to perform studies and promulgate a multitude of regulations implementing the law, most of which are in place. Because some of the regulations have only recently taken effect or are yet to be finalized, we cannot predict with certainty how such regulations will affect the financial markets generally and impact the Group's business, credit rating, results of operations, cash flows or financial condition or liquidity. Key aspects of Dodd-Frank that we have identified to date as possibly having an impact on the Group include the aspects set out below:

Title VII of Dodd-Frank creates a new framework for regulation of the over-the-counter derivatives markets and certain market participants which could affect various activities of the Group and its subsidiaries. ING Capital Markets LLC, a wholly-owned indirect subsidiary of ING Bank N.V., has registered with the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission ('CFTC') as a swap dealer. The CFTC and other U.S. prudential regulators have adopted margin requirements on uncleared swaps, which will begin to come into effect for ING Capital Markets LLC in 2017. The SEC is expected to adopt regulations establishing margin and capital requirements for security-based swaps. Along with the still indeterminate effective date for SEC regulations on, among others, reporting, registration, and internal and external business conduct with respect to security-based swaps, these are likely to materially impact ING. Additionally, the CFTC is expected to adopt capital requirements for swap dealers, although the specific requirements, and any available exemptions, have not been finalized. If these requirements are applicable to ING, and no exemptions are available, it is possible that these requirements will be difficult for ING to comply with and may, as a result, materially and adversely impact ING's ability to operate as a swap dealer in the U.S. Other CFTC regulatory requirements, already implemented, include registration of swap dealers, business conduct rules imposed on swap dealers and requirements that some categories of swaps be centrally executed on regulated trading facilities and cleared through regulated clearing houses. In addition, new position limits requirements for market participants that may be contained in final regulations to be adopted by the CFTC could limit ING's position sizes in swaps referencing specified commodities and similarly limit the ability of counterparties to utilize certain of our products by narrowing the scope of hedging activity that is permitted for commercial end users and the trading activity of speculators. All of the foregoing areas of regulation of the derivative markets and market participants will likely result in increased cost of hedging and other trading activities, both for ING and its customers, which could expose our business to greater risk and could reduce the size and profitability of our customer business. In addition, the imposition of these regulatory restrictions and requirements, could result in reduced market liquidity, which could in turn increase market volatility and the risks and costs of hedging and other trading activities.

Pursuant to requirements of the Dodd-Frank Act, the SEC and CFTC are required to consider whether stable value contracts should be regulated as 'swap' derivative contracts. In the event that stable value contracts become subject to such regulation, certain aspects of our business could be adversely impacted, including issuance of stable value contracts and management of assets pursuant to stable value mandates.

Risk factors - continued

Dodd-Frank established the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau ('CFPB') as an independent agency within the Federal Reserve to regulate consumer financial products and services offered primarily for personal, family or household purposes. The CFPB has significant authority to implement and enforce federal consumer financial laws, including the new protections established under Dodd-Frank, as well as the authority to identify and prohibit unfair, deceptive and abusive acts and practices. In addition, the CFPB has broad supervisory, examination and enforcement authority over certain consumer products, such as mortgage lending. Insurance products and services are not within the CFPB's general jurisdiction, and broker-dealers and investment advisers are not subject to the CFPB's jurisdiction when acting in their registered capacity.

On 10 December 2013, various federal agencies approved a final rule implementing Section 619 of Dodd-Frank, commonly referred to as the 'Volcker Rule' and which places limitations and restrictions on the ability of U.S. FDIC insured depository institutions and non-U.S. banks with branches or agencies in the U.S. that become subject to the U.S. Bank Holding Company Act, as well as their affiliates, to engage in certain proprietary trading or sponsor and invest in private equity and hedge funds. As a general matter, such organisations have until July 2017 to comply with the prohibition on certain fund activities and until July 2015 to comply with the proprietary trading prohibitions. In the event that we or one of our affiliates becomes subject to the Volcker Rule, our investment activities could be so restricted. It is expected that we will experience significant additional compliance and operational costs and may be prohibited from engaging in certain activities we currently conduct if the Volcker Rule becomes applicable to us and our affiliates.

For instance, ING Group's wholly owned subsidiary, ING Bank, may at some point in time consider whether to establish a branch office in the U.S. If ING Bank were to establish a U.S. branch, we would be subject to supervision and regulation by the Federal Reserve under various laws and various restrictions on our activities under those laws, including the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended, and the International Banking Act of 1978, and, as a consequence, such supervision and regulation, including such restrictions on activities could materially impact our operations. These would include, among others, the Volcker Rule and heightened supervisory requirements and prudential standards. Dodd-Frank also includes various securities law reforms that may affect the Group's business practices and the liabilities and/or exposures associated therewith, including a provision intended to authorise the SEC to impose on broker-dealers' fiduciary duties to their customers, as applied to investment advisers under existing law, which new standard could potentially expose certain of ING's U.S. broker-dealers to increased risk of SEC enforcement actions and liability. In 2011, the SEC staff released a study on this issue, and members of the SEC's Investor Advisory Committee voted in November 2013 to recommend the proposal implementing a uniform fiduciary standard for most brokers and registered investment advisers to the SEC.

Although the full impact of Dodd-Frank and its implementing regulations cannot be determined at this time, many of their requirements have had and may continue to have profound and/or adverse consequences for the financial services industry, including for us. Dodd-Frank, in its current form, could make it more expensive for us to conduct business, require us to make changes to our business model or satisfy increased capital requirements, subject us to greater regulatory scrutiny or to potential increases in whistleblower claims in light of the increased awards available to whistleblowers under Dodd-Frank and have a material effect on our results of operations or financial condition.

In February 2017, the U.S. Secretary of Treasury was directed by executive order to consult with other financial regulatory agencies to evaluate the current financial regulatory framework against core principles set out by the new U.S. administration. Such review may result in the revision, amendment or repeal, in all or in part, of Dodd-Frank and related rules and regulations. There can be no assurance that these or any other future reforms will not significantly impact our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act and other US withholding tax regulations

Under provisions of U.S. tax law commonly referred to as FATCA, non-U.S. financial institutions are required to provide certain information on their U.S. account holders and/or certain U.S. investors to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service ("IRS"). A 30% withholding tax is imposed on 'withholdable payments' made to non-compliant non-U.S. financial institutions. In addition to FATCA, non-U.S. financial institutions are required to comply with other U.S. withholding and reporting requirements on certain payments. The Group intends to take all necessary steps to comply with FATCA and other U.S. withholding tax regulations. ING is for example updating and strengthening its withholding compliance programme and reviewing, amending and filing the necessary tax returns and information reports.

Many countries, including the Netherlands, have entered into agreements ('intergovernmental agreements' or 'IGAs') with the U.S. to facilitate the type of information reporting required under FATCA. While the existence of IGAs will not eliminate the risk of the withholding described above, these agreements are expected to reduce that risk for financial institutions and investors in countries that have entered into IGAs. IGAs will often require financial institutions in those countries to report information on their U.S. account holders to the taxing authorities of those countries, who will then pass the information to the IRS.

If the Group is unable to comply with requirements imposed under IGAs or otherwise comply with FATCA (including as a result of local laws in non-IGA countries prohibiting information-sharing with the IRS, as a result of contracts or local laws prohibiting withholding on certain payments to account holders or other investors, or as a result of the failure of account holders or other investors to provide requested information), certain payments to the Group may be subject to withholding under FATCA. Payments made with respect to certain products offered by members of the Group may also be or become subject to withholding under FATCA. The possibility of such withholding and the need for account holders and investors to provide certain information may adversely affect the sales of certain of the Group's products. In addition (i) compliance with the terms of IGAs and with FATCA, with any regulations or other guidance promulgated thereunder or any legislation promulgated under an IGA, and (ii) offering products subject to U.S. withholding, may substantially increase the Group's compliance costs. Because legislation and regulations implementing FATCA and the IGAs remain under development, the future impact of this law on the Group is uncertain. Failure to comply with FATCA and other U.S. withholding tax regulations could harm our reputation and could subject the Group to enforcement actions, fines and penalties, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, reputation, revenues, results of operations, financial condition and prospects. For additional information with respect to specific proceedings, see Note 45 'Legal proceedings' to the consolidated financial statements.

Common Reporting Standard

Similarly, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development ('OECD') has developed a Common Reporting Standard ('CRS') and model competent authority agreement to enable the multilateral and automatic exchange of financial account information. The CRS will require financial institutions to identify and report the tax residency and account details of non-resident customers to the relevant authorities in jurisdictions adhering to CRS. As of 2 November 2016, 87 jurisdictions, including the Netherlands, have signed a multilateral competent authority agreement to automatically exchange information pursuant to the CRS. The majority of countries where ING has a presence has committed to CRS. The EU has made CRS mandatory for all its member states. The first information exchange by the Netherlands (as for most of the signatories) is expected to start in September 2017.

Bank Recovery and Resolution Regimes

In June 2012, the 'Intervention Act' (Wet bijzondere maatregelen financiële ondernemingen) came into force in the Netherlands, with retroactive effect from 20 January 2012. The Intervention Act mainly amended the Dutch Financial Supervision Act and the Dutch Insolvency Act allowing Dutch authorities to take certain actions with respect to a failing bank or insurer that cannot be wound up under ordinary insolvency rules due to concerns regarding the stability of the overall financial system. It comprised two categories of measures. The first category of measures related to banks or insurers facing serious financial difficulties and included measures related to the timely and efficient liquidation of the failing institution. This set of measures gave the DNB the power to transfer customer deposits, assets and/or liabilities other than deposits and issued shares of an entity to third parties or to a bridge bank if the DNB deemed that, in respect of the relevant institution, there were signs of adverse developments with respect to its funds, solvency, liquidity or technical provisions and it could be reasonably foreseen that such developments would not be sufficiently or timely reversed. The DNB was also granted the power to influence the internal decision-making of failing institutions through the appointment of an 'undisclosed administrator'. The second category of measures can be triggered if the stability of the financial system is in serious and immediate danger as a result of the failure of a Dutch financial institution and includes measures intended to safeguard the stability of the financial system as a whole. This set of measures granted authority to the Dutch Minister of Finance to take immediate measures or proceed to expropriation of assets or liabilities, or shares in the capital, of failing financial institutions. Within the context of the resolution tools provided in the Intervention Act, holders of debt securities of a bank subject to resolution could also be affected by issuer substitution or replacement, transfer of debt, expropriation, modification of terms and/or suspension or termination of listings.

In addition, on 26 November 2015 the 'Act on implementing the European framework for the recovery and resolution of banks and Investment firms' (Implementatiewet Europees kader voor herstel en afwikkeling van banken en beleggingsondernemingen) came into force, implementing the 'Bank Recovery and Resolution Directive' ('BRRD') and partly amending the Intervention Act. Certain measures introduced by the Intervention Act were replaced, with respect to banking institutions, with measures based on the BRRD and the SRM Regulation, as described below. The BRRD came into effect on 2 July 2014. It includes, among other things, the obligation for institutions to draw up a recovery plan and for resolution authorities in the Member States to draw up a resolution plan, the resolution authorities' power to take early intervention measures and the establishment of a European system of financing arrangements. The BRRD confers extensive resolution powers on the resolution authorities, including the power to require the sale of (part of a) business, to establish a bridge institution, to separate assets and to take bail-in measures. The stated aim of the BRRD is to provide supervisory authorities and resolution authorities with common tools and powers to address banking crises pre-emptively in order to safeguard financial stability and minimise taxpayers' exposure to losses. In November 2016, the EC proposed amendments to the BRRD regarding the ranking of unsecured debt instruments in national insolvency proceedings (to include a new category of 'non-preferred' senior debt) and to enhance the stabilisation tools with the introduction of a moratorium tool.

Risk factors - continued

The powers granted to resolution authorities under the BRRD include, among others, the introduction of a statutory 'write-down and conversion' power and a 'bail-in' power, which gives the relevant resolution authority the power to, inter alia, (i) cancel existing shares and/or dilute existing shareholders by converting relevant capital instruments or eligible liabilities into shares of the surviving entity, (ii) cancel all or a portion of the principal amount of, or interest on, certain unsecured liabilities (which could include certain securities that have been or will be issued by ING) of a failing financial institution or group and/or (iii) convert certain debt claims (which could include certain securities that have been or will be issued by ING) into another security, including ordinary shares of the surviving group entity, if any. None of these actions would be expected to constitute an event of default under those securities entitling holders to seek repayment.

In addition to a 'write-down and conversion' power and a 'bail-in' power, the powers granted to the resolution authority under the BRRD include the two categories of measures introduced by the Intervention Act, as described above. In addition, the BRRD stipulates, among the broader powers to be granted to the relevant resolution authority, that it will confer powers to the relevant resolution authority to amend or alter the maturity date or interest payment date of debt instruments, including by suspending payment for a temporary period, or to amend the interest amount payable under such instruments. None of these actions would be expected to constitute an event of default under those debt instruments or other eligible liabilities entitling holders to seek repayment.

Many of the rules implementing the BRRD are contained in detailed technical and implementing rules, the exact text of which is subject to agreement and adoption by the relevant EU legislative institutions. Therefore, for some rules, there remains uncertainty regarding the ultimate nature and scope of these resolution powers and, when implemented, how they would affect us and the securities that have been issued or will be issued by us. Accordingly, it is not possible to assess the full impact of the BRRD on ING and on holders of any securities issued or to be issued by ING, and there can be no assurance that, once it is fully implemented, the manner in which it is applied or the taking of any actions by the relevant resolution authority contemplated in the BRRD would not adversely affect the rights of holders of the securities issued or to be issued by ING, the price or value of an investment in such securities and/or ING's ability to satisfy its obligations under such securities.

Finally, as part of the move towards a full banking union, on 19 August 2014, the Single Resolution Mechanism ('SRM') came into effect, with the aim to have a Single Resolution Board ('SRB') to be responsible for key decisions on how a bank subject to SSM supervision is to be resolved if a bank has irreversible financial difficulties and cannot be wound up under normal insolvency proceedings without destabilizing the financial system. The SRB is a key element of the SRM and is the European resolution authority for the Banking Union and is fully operational, with a complete set of resolution powers, as of 1 January 2016. The SRB works in close cooperation with the national resolution authorities such as the Dutch national resolution authority. The SRB is also in charge of the Single Resolution Fund, a pool of money financed by the banking sector which will be set up to ensure that medium-term funding support is available while a credit institution is being restructured. Historically, ING Bank has contributed to the Dutch National Resolution Fund (the 'NRF'). Beginning in 2016, contributions to the NRF will be phased out and will decrease steadily until they decrease to nil in 2023; during the same period, contributions to the SRF will commence and steadily increase, replacing ING Bank's contributions to the NRF. As the contributions for the NRF and the SRF are calculated on a different basis and by different authorities (DNB and SRB, respectively) the contributions to the SRF may deviate from the contributions to the NRF.

There are certain differences between the provisions of the Intervention Act, the BRRD and the SRM Regulation, which may further bring future changes to the law. We are unable to predict what specific effects the Intervention Act and the implementation of the BRRD and the entry into force of the SRM Regulation may have on the financial system generally, our counterparties, holders of securities issued by or to be issued by us, or on us, our operations or our financial position.

ING has a recovery plan in place to enhance the bank's readiness and decisiveness to tackle financial crises on its own. Effective since 2012, the plan is updated annually to make sure it stays fit for purpose. The completeness, quality and credibility of the recovery plan is assessed annually by ING's regulators. Since 2012, ING has worked together with the different resolution authorities to determine a resolution strategy and to identify potential impediments to resolution. This resulted in a resolvability assessment that is shared every year with the FSB and the preparation of a transitional resolution plan by the SRB. In November 2016, ING concluded that ING Groep N.V. should be the designated resolution entity. At the end of January 2017, the SRB has informed ING that it supports the designation of ING Groep N.V. as the point of entry.

Financial Stability Board

In addition to the adoption of the foregoing measures, regulators and lawmakers around the world are actively reviewing the causes of the financial crisis and exploring steps to avoid similar problems in the future. In many respects, this work is being led by the FSB, consisting of representatives of national financial authorities of the G20 nations. The G20 and the FSB have issued a series of papers and recommendations intended to produce significant changes in how financial companies, particularly companies that are members of large and complex financial groups, should be regulated. These proposals address such issues as financial group supervision, capital and solvency standards, systemic economic risk, corporate governance, including executive compensation and risk culture, and a host of related issues associated with responses to the financial crisis.

Risk factors - continued

In November 2015, the FSB published final standards on the adequacy of loss absorbing capacity held by G-SIBs. These comprise: (i) a set of principles on loss-absorbing and recapitalisation capacity of G-SIBs in resolution and (ii) a high level “termsheet” setting out an internationally agreed standard on the characteristics and adequacy of TLAC. The key requirement mandates G-SIBs to hold long-term debt that can be written down or converted into equity in the event that a G-SIB is put into liquidation, thereby providing a specific means of absorbing losses and recapitalising the G-SIB. The numbers are significant with the minimum standard requiring a G-SIB to hold TLAC of at least 16% of risk weighted assets and at least 6% of the leverage ratio denominator from 1 January 2019, and at least 18% and 6.75% respectively from 1 January 2022 on. In November 2016, the EC proposed amendments to the CRR and BRRD to implement the FSB’s minimum TLAC requirement for G-SIB that are intended to align the TLAC requirement with the minimum requirement for own funds and eligible liabilities (MREL). In October 2016, the BCBS issued a final standard regarding the regulatory capital treatments of TLAC holdings of other G-SIBs, confirming that G-SIBs must deduct from their own TLAC exposures TLAC instruments and liabilities issued by other G-SIBs.

Additional Governmental Measures

Governments in The Netherlands and abroad have also intervened over the past few years on an unprecedented scale, responding to stresses experienced in the global financial markets. Some of the measures adopted subject us and other institutions for which they were designed to additional restrictions, oversight or costs. Restrictions related to the Restructuring Plan are further described in Note 50 ‘The European Commission Restructuring Plan’ to the consolidated financial statements.

In February 2013, the EC adopted a proposal setting out the details of a financial transaction tax (‘FTT’) under the enhanced cooperation procedure, to be levied on transactions in financial instruments by financial institutions if at least one of the parties to the transaction is established in the financial transaction tax zone (‘FTT-zone’) or if the instrument which is the subject of the transaction is issued within the territory of a Member State in the FTT-Zone. 10 Member States have indicated they wish to participate in the FTT (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain) following Estonia’s withdrawal in 2015. The initial proposal contemplated that the FTT would enter into effect on 1 January 2014, which would have then required us to pay a tax on transactions in financial instruments with parties (including Group affiliates) located in such FTT-zone. However, the FTT remains subject to negotiation between the participating Member States and currently it is uncertain whether and in what form and by which Member States the FTT will be adopted. The implementation date of any FTT will thus depend on the future approval by participating Member States in the Council, consultation of other EU institutions, and the subsequent transposition into local law. Depending on its final form, the introduction of an FTT in the Netherlands or outside the Netherlands could have a substantial adverse effect on ING’s business and results.

As of 1 October 2012, banks that are active in the Netherlands are subject to a bank tax pursuant to a tax regulation that also includes measures to moderate bonuses awarded to executives at such banks. Increased bank taxes in countries where the Group is active result in increased taxes on ING’s banking operations, which could negatively impact our operations, financial condition and liquidity. For information regarding historical regulatory costs incurred by ING, please refer inter alia to Note 27 ‘Other operating expenses’ to the consolidated financial statements.

Additional Tier 1 Securities

In April 2015, ING issued USD 2.25 billion of Additional Tier 1 securities (‘AT1 Securities’) and in November 2016, ING issued USD 1 billion AT1 Securities. ING may issue additional AT1 Securities, or other instruments with similar terms (also known as contingent convertible bonds or ‘CoCos’), in the future. The Dutch parliament adopted Article 29a of the Dutch Corporate Income Tax Act of 1969 (Wet op de vennootschapsbelasting 1969) in 2015 to provide debt treatment of securities similar to the AT1 Securities for the purpose of Dutch corporate income tax (25% rate) and (indirectly) dividend withholding tax purposes (15% non-grossed up rate). The interest payment obligation for the year 2015 in respect of the AT1 Securities is EUR 90 million and for the year 2016 it is EUR 135 million. For 2015 and 2016, that amount was treated by ING as a deductible interest expense for Dutch corporate income tax purposes and as exempt for Dutch dividend withholding tax purposes. However, there is a risk that the EC will take the view, and that court would uphold such view if contested, that the tax deductibility of interest payments on the AT1 Securities is in contravention of the EC’s temporary state aid rules for assessing public support to financial institutions during the crisis (the ‘Revised State Aid Guidelines’). The Revised State Aid Guidelines provide for strengthened burden-sharing requirements, which require banks with capital needs to obtain shareholders’ and subordinated debt holders’ contributions before resorting to certain state aid measures. If a determination were made that deduction of interest payments on AT1 Securities and other similar securities, including those ING may issue in the future, is inconsistent with the Revised State Aid Guidelines, amounts ING would have to pay to the Dutch State with respect to interest payments that have previously been treated as an expense for Dutch corporate income tax purposes and that have been paid free of withholding taxes could be substantial, in particular if ING is unable to redeem the securities (e.g. for the year 2015, the total amount of payment in this respect could be EUR 38 million excluding interest and for the year 2016 it would be EUR 58 million excluding interest). The terms of the AT1 Securities provide that ING can redeem the AT1 Securities only upon the occurrence of specific events (not including a determination that the tax treatment of the AT1 Securities is inconsistent with European rules against state aid) or after 5 years or 10 years (depending on the series) after their date of issuance.

Because we operate in highly competitive markets, including our home market, we may not be able to increase or maintain our market share, which may have an adverse effect on our results of operations.

There is substantial competition in the Netherlands and the other countries in which we do business for the types of wholesale banking, retail banking, investment banking and other products and services we provide. Customer loyalty and retention can be influenced by a number of factors, including brand recognition, reputation, relative service levels, the prices and attributes of products and services, scope of distribution, credit ratings and actions taken by existing or new competitors. A decline in our competitive position as to one or more of these factors could adversely impact our ability to maintain or further increase our market share, which would adversely affect our results of operations. Such competition is most pronounced in our more mature markets of the Netherlands, Belgium, the rest of Western Europe and Australia. In recent years, however, competition in emerging markets, such as Latin America, Asia and Central and Eastern Europe, has also increased as large financial services companies from more developed countries have sought to establish themselves in markets which are perceived to offer higher growth potential, and as local institutions have become more sophisticated and competitive and proceeded to form alliances, mergers or strategic relationships with our competitors. The Netherlands is our largest market. Our main competitors in the banking sector in the Netherlands are ABN AMRO Bank and Rabobank. Competition could also increase due to new entrants in the markets that may have new operating models that are not burdened by potentially costly legacy operations and that are subject to reduced regulation. New entrants may rely on new technologies, advanced data and analytic tools, lower cost to serve, reduced regulatory burden and/or faster processes in order to challenge traditional banks. Developments in technology has also accelerated the use of new business models. For example, new business models have been observed in retail payments, consumer and commercial lending (such as peer-to-peer lending), foreign exchange and low-cost investment advisory services. In particular, the emergence of disintermediation in the financial sector resulting from new banking, lending and payment solutions offered by rapidly evolving incumbents, challengers and new entrants, in particular with respect to payment services and products, and the introduction of disruptive technology may impede our ability to grow or retain our market share and impact our revenues and profitability.

Increasing competition in the markets in which we operate may significantly impact our results if we are unable to match the products and services offered by our competitors. Future economic turmoil may accelerate additional consolidation activity. Over time, certain sectors of the financial services industry have become more concentrated, as institutions involved in a broad range of financial services have been acquired by or merged into other firms or have declared bankruptcy. These developments could result in our competitors gaining greater access to capital and liquidity, expanding their ranges of products and services, or gaining geographic diversity. We may experience pricing pressures as a result of these factors in the event that some of our competitors seek to increase market share by reducing prices.

The default of a major market participant could disrupt the markets.

Within the financial services industry, the severe distress or default of any one institution (including sovereigns and central counterparties (CCPs)) could lead to defaults by, or the severe distress of, other market participants. Such distress of, or default by, an influential financial institution could disrupt markets or clearance and settlement systems and lead to a chain of defaults by other financial institutions because the commercial and financial soundness of many financial institutions may be closely related as a result of credit, trading, clearing or other relationships. Even the perceived lack of creditworthiness of a sovereign or financial institution (or a default by any such entity) may lead to market-wide liquidity problems and losses or defaults by us or by other institutions. This risk is sometimes referred to as 'systemic risk' and may adversely affect financial intermediaries, such as clearing agencies, clearing houses, banks, securities firms and exchanges with whom we interact on a daily basis and financial instruments of sovereigns in which we invest. Systemic risk could have a material adverse effect on our ability to raise new funding and on our business, financial condition, results of operations, liquidity, solvency position and/or prospects. In addition, such distress or failure could impact future product sales as a potential result of reduced confidence in the financial services industry.

The inability of counterparties to meet their financial obligations could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations.

Third parties that owe us money, securities or other assets may not pay or perform under their obligations. These parties include the issuers and guarantors (including sovereigns) of securities we hold, borrowers under loans originated, reinsurers, customers, trading counterparties, securities lending and repurchase counterparties, counterparties under swaps, credit default and other derivative contracts, clearing agents, exchanges, clearing houses and other financial intermediaries. Defaults by one or more of these parties on their obligations to us due to bankruptcy, lack of liquidity, downturns in the economy or real estate values, continuing low oil or other commodity prices, operational failure or other factors, or even rumours about potential defaults by one or more of these parties or regarding a severe distress of the financial services industry generally, could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations, financial condition and liquidity. Given the high level of interdependence between financial institutions, we are and will continue to be subject to the risk of deterioration of the commercial and financial soundness, or perceived soundness, of sovereigns and other financial services institutions. This is particularly relevant to our franchise as an important and large counterparty in equity, fixed income and foreign exchange markets, including related derivatives.

Risk factors - continued

We routinely execute a high volume of transactions, such as unsecured debt instruments, derivative transactions and equity investments with counterparties and customers in the financial services industry, including brokers and dealers, commercial and investment banks, mutual and hedge funds, insurance companies, institutional clients, futures clearing merchants, swap dealers, and other institutions, resulting in large periodic settlement amounts, which may result in our having significant credit exposure to one or more of such counterparties or customers. As a result, we could face concentration risk with respect to liabilities or amounts we expect to collect from specific counterparties and customers. We are exposed to increased counterparty risk as a result of recent financial institution failures and weakness and will continue to be exposed to the risk of loss if counterparty financial institutions fail or are otherwise unable to meet their obligations. A default by, or even concerns about the creditworthiness of, one or more of these counterparties or customers or other financial services institutions could therefore have an adverse effect on our results of operations or liquidity.

With respect to secured transactions, our credit risk may be exacerbated when the collateral held by us cannot be or is liquidated at prices not sufficient to recover the full amount of the loan or derivative exposure due to us. We also have exposure to a number of financial institutions in the form of unsecured debt instruments, derivative transactions and equity investments. For example, we hold certain hybrid regulatory capital instruments issued by financial institutions which permit the issuer to cancel coupon payments on the occurrence of certain events or at their option. The EC has indicated that, in certain circumstances, it may require these financial institutions to cancel payment. If this were to happen, we expect that such instruments may experience ratings downgrades and/or a drop in value and we may have to treat them as impaired, which could result in significant losses. There is no assurance that losses on, or impairments to the carrying value of, these assets would not materially and adversely affect our business, results of operations or financial condition.

In addition, we are subject to the risk that our rights against third parties may not be enforceable in all circumstances. The deterioration or perceived deterioration in the credit quality of third parties whose securities or obligations we hold could result in losses and/ or adversely affect our ability to rehypothecate or otherwise use those securities or obligations for liquidity purposes. A significant downgrade in the credit ratings of our counterparties could also have a negative impact on our income and risk weighting, leading to increased capital requirements. While in many cases we are permitted to require additional collateral from counterparties that experience financial difficulty, disputes may arise as to the amount of collateral we are entitled to receive and the value of pledged assets. Also in this case, our credit risk may also be exacerbated when the collateral we hold cannot be liquidated at prices sufficient to recover the full amount of the loan or derivative exposure due to us, which is most likely to occur during periods of illiquidity and depressed asset valuations, such as those experienced during the financial crisis of 2008. The termination of contracts and the foreclosure on collateral may subject us to claims. Bankruptcies, downgrades and disputes with counterparties as to the valuation of collateral tend to increase in times of market stress and illiquidity. Any of these developments or losses could materially and adversely affect our business, financial condition, results of operations, liquidity and/or prospects.

Market conditions, including those observed over the past few years, may increase the risk of loans being impaired.

We are exposed to the risk that our borrowers (including sovereigns) may not repay their loans according to their contractual terms and that the collateral securing the payment of these loans may be insufficient. We may continue to see adverse changes in the credit quality of our borrowers and counterparties, for example, as a result of their inability to refinance their indebtedness, with increasing delinquencies, defaults and insolvencies across a range of sectors. This may lead to impairment charges on loans and other assets, higher costs and additions to loan loss provisions. A significant increase in the size of our provision for loan losses could have a material adverse effect on our financial position and results of operations.

Economic and other factors could lead to contraction in the residential mortgage and commercial lending market and to decreases in residential and commercial property prices, which could generate substantial increases in impairment losses. Additionally, continuing low oil prices could have an influence on the repayment capacity of borrowers.

We may incur losses due to failures of banks falling under the scope of state compensation schemes.

In the Netherlands and other jurisdictions, deposit guarantee schemes and similar funds ('Compensation Schemes') have been implemented from which compensation may become payable to customers of financial services firms in the event the financial service firm is unable to pay, or unlikely to pay, claims against it. In many jurisdictions in which we operate, these Compensation Schemes are funded, directly or indirectly, by financial services firms which operate and/or are licensed in the relevant jurisdiction. ING Bank is a participant in the Dutch Deposit Guarantee Scheme, which guarantees an amount of EUR 100,000 per person per bank (regardless of the number of accounts held). Until 2015, the costs involved with making compensation payments under the Dutch Deposit Guarantee Scheme had been allocated among the participating banks by the DNB, based on an allocation key related to their market shares with respect to the deposits protected by the Dutch Deposit Guarantee Scheme. Given our size, we may incur significant compensation payments to be made under the Dutch Deposit Guarantee Scheme, which we may be unable to recover from the bankrupt estate. Such costs and the associated costs to be borne by us may have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition. On 4 July 2015, the new EU Directive on deposit guarantee schemes had to be implemented by EU member states. As a consequence, the Dutch Deposit Guarantee Scheme has changed from an ex-post scheme, where we would have contributed after the failure of a firm, to an ex-ante scheme where we pay quarterly risk-weighted contributions into a fund for the Dutch Deposit Guarantee Scheme. The fund is to grow to a target size of 0.8% of all deposits guaranteed under the Dutch Deposit Guarantee Scheme, to be reached in July 2024. The Dutch decree implementing the Deposit Guarantee Scheme Directive entered into force on 26 November 2015.

The first ex-ante DGS contribution has been charged in respect of the first quarter of 2016. The build-up of the ex-ante fund will take place in 34 quarters. See also '—We operate in highly regulated industries. Changes in laws and/or regulations governing financial services or financial institutions or the application of such laws and/or regulations governing our business may reduce our profitability — Bank Recovery and Resolution Regimes'.

Currently, the EU is discussing the introduction of a pan-European deposit guarantee scheme, (partly) replacing or complementing national compensation schemes in two or three phases. Proposals contain elements of (re)insurance, mutual lending and mutualisation of funds. The new model is intended to be 'overall cost-neutral'. A more definitive proposal is expected in 2017 or 2018.

Risks related to the Group's business, operations and regulatory environment***As a holding company, ING Groep N.V. is dependent for liquidity on payments from its subsidiaries, many of which are subject to regulatory and other restrictions.***

ING Groep N.V. is a holding company and, therefore, depends on dividends, distributions and other payments from its subsidiaries to fund dividend payments and to fund all payments on its obligations, including debt obligations. Many of our subsidiaries, including our bank subsidiaries, are subject to laws that restrict dividend payments or authorize regulatory bodies to block or reduce the flow of funds from those subsidiaries to ING Groep N.V.

In addition, our bank subsidiaries are subject to restrictions on their ability to lend or transact with affiliates and to minimum regulatory capital and other requirements, as well as restrictions on their ability to use client funds deposited with them to fund their businesses. Additional restrictions on related-party transactions, increased capital and liquidity requirements and additional limitations on the use of funds in client accounts, as well as lower earnings, can reduce the amount of funds available to meet the obligations of ING Groep N.V., and even require ING Groep N.V. to provide additional funding to such subsidiaries. Restrictions or regulatory action of that kind could impede access to funds that ING Groep N.V. needs to make payments on its obligations, including debt obligations, or dividend payments. In addition ING Groep N.V.'s right to participate in a distribution of assets upon a subsidiary's liquidation or reorganization is subject to the prior claims of the subsidiary's creditors.

There is a trend towards increased regulation and supervision of our subsidiaries by the governments and regulators in the countries in which those subsidiaries are located or do business. Concerns about protecting clients and creditors of financial institutions that are controlled by persons or entities located outside of the country in which such entities are located or do business have caused or may cause a number of governments and regulators to take additional steps to "ring fence" or maintain internal total loss-absorbing capacity at such entities in order to protect clients and creditors of such entities in the event of financial difficulties involving such entities. The result has been and may continue to be additional limitations on our ability to efficiently move capital and liquidity among our affiliated entities, thereby increasing the overall level of capital and liquidity required by the firm on a consolidated basis.

Furthermore, ING Groep N.V. has in the past and may in the future guarantee the payment obligations of certain of its subsidiaries, including ING Bank N.V., subject to certain exceptions. Any such guarantee may require ING Groep N.V. to provide substantial funds or assets to its subsidiaries or their creditors or counterparties at a time when ING Groep N.V. or its subsidiaries are in need of liquidity to fund their own obligations.

The requirements for ING Groep N.V. to develop and submit recovery and resolution plans to regulators, and the incorporation of feedback received from regulators, may require us to increase capital or liquidity levels or issue additional long-term debt at ING Groep N.V. or particular subsidiaries or otherwise incur additional or duplicative operational or other costs at multiple entities, and may reduce our ability to provide ING Groep N.V. guarantees of the obligations of our subsidiaries or raise debt at ING Groep N.V. Resolution planning may also impair our ability to structure our intercompany and external activities in a manner that we may otherwise deem most operationally efficient. Furthermore, arrangements to facilitate our resolution planning may cause us to be subject to additional costs such as resolution planning related taxes and funds. Any such limitations or requirements would be in addition to the legal and regulatory restrictions described above on our ability to engage in capital actions or make intercompany dividends or payments.

Ratings are important to our business for a number of reasons. A downgrade or a potential downgrade in our credit ratings could have an adverse impact on our operations and net results.

Credit ratings represent the opinions of rating agencies regarding an entity's ability to repay its indebtedness. Our credit ratings are important to our ability to raise capital and funding through the issuance of debt and to the cost of such financing. In the event of a downgrade, the cost of issuing debt will increase, having an adverse effect on its net results. Certain institutional investors may also be obliged to withdraw their deposits from ING following a downgrade, which could have an adverse effect on our liquidity. We have credit ratings from S&P, Moody's Investor Service and Fitch Ratings. Each of the rating agencies reviews its ratings and rating methodologies on a recurring basis and may decide on a downgrade at any time.

Furthermore, ING Bank's assets are risk-weighted. Downgrades of these assets could result in a higher risk-weighting, which may result in higher capital requirements. This may impact net earnings and the return on capital, and may have an adverse impact on our competitive position.

As rating agencies continue to evaluate the financial services industry, it is possible that rating agencies will heighten the level of scrutiny that they apply to financial institutions, increase the frequency and scope of their credit reviews, request additional information from the companies that they rate and potentially adjust upward the capital and other requirements employed in the rating agency models for maintenance of certain ratings levels. It is possible that the outcome of any such review of us would have additional adverse ratings consequences, which could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations, financial condition and liquidity. We may need to take actions in response to changing standards or capital requirements set by any of the rating agencies, which could cause our business and operations to suffer. We cannot predict what additional actions rating agencies may take, or what actions we may take in response to the actions of rating agencies.

Because we use assumptions to model client behaviour for the purpose of our market risk calculations, the difference between the realisation and the assumptions may have an adverse impact on the risk figures and future results.

We use assumptions in order to model client behaviour for the risk calculations in our banking books. Assumptions are used to determine the interest rate risk profile of savings and current accounts and to estimate the embedded option risk in the mortgage and investment portfolios. The realisation or use of different assumptions to determine client behaviour could have a material adverse effect on the calculated risk figures and, ultimately, future results.

We may be unable to manage our risks successfully through derivatives.

We employ various economic hedging strategies with the objective of mitigating the market risks that are inherent in our business and operations. These risks include currency fluctuations, changes in the fair value of our investments, the impact of interest rates, equity markets and credit spread changes, the occurrence of credit defaults and changes in client behaviour. We seek to control these risks by, among other things, entering into a number of derivative instruments, such as swaps, options, futures and forward contracts, including, from time to time, macro hedges for parts of our business, either directly as a counterparty or as a credit support provider to affiliate counterparties. Developing an effective strategy for dealing with these risks is complex, and no strategy can completely insulate us from risks associated with those fluctuations. Our hedging strategies also rely on assumptions and projections regarding our assets, liabilities, general market factors and the creditworthiness of our counterparties that may prove to be incorrect or prove to be inadequate. Accordingly, our hedging activities may not have the desired beneficial impact on our results of operations or financial condition. Poorly designed strategies or improperly executed transactions could actually increase our risks and losses. Hedging strategies involve transaction costs and other costs, and if we terminate a hedging arrangement, we may also be required to pay additional costs, such as transaction fees or breakage costs. There have been periods in the past, and it is likely that there will be periods in the future, during which we have incurred or may incur losses on transactions, possibly significant, after taking into account our hedging strategies. Further, the nature and timing of our hedging transactions could actually increase our risk and losses. Hedging instruments we use to manage product and other risks might not perform as intended or expected, which could result in higher (un)realised losses, such as credit value adjustment risks or unexpected P&L effects, and unanticipated cash needs to collateralise or settle such transactions. Adverse market conditions can limit the availability and increase the costs of hedging instruments, and such costs may not be recovered in the pricing of the underlying products being hedged. In addition, hedging counterparties may fail to perform their obligations, resulting in unhedged exposures and losses on positions that are not collateralised. As such, our hedging strategies and the derivatives that we use or may use may not adequately mitigate or offset the risks they intend to cover, and our hedging transactions may result in losses.

Our hedging strategy additionally relies on the assumption that hedging counterparties remain able and willing to provide the hedges required by our strategy. Increased regulation, market shocks, worsening market conditions (whether due to the ongoing Euro crisis or otherwise), and/or other factors that affect or are perceived to affect the financial condition, liquidity and creditworthiness of ING may reduce the ability and/or willingness of such counterparties to engage in hedging contracts with us and/or other parties, affecting our overall ability to hedge our risks and adversely affecting our business, operations, financial condition and liquidity.

Our risk management policies and guidelines may prove inadequate for the risks we face.

We have developed risk management policies and procedures and will continue to review and develop these in the future. Nonetheless, our policies and procedures to identify, monitor and manage risks may not be fully effective, particularly during extremely turbulent times. The methods we use to manage, estimate and measure risk are partly based on historic market behaviour. The methods may, therefore, prove to be inadequate for predicting future risk exposure, which may be significantly greater than suggested by historical experience. For instance, these methods may not predict the losses seen in the stressed conditions in recent periods, and may also not adequately allow prediction of circumstances arising due to government interventions and stimulus packages, which increase the difficulty of evaluating risks. Other methods for risk management are based on evaluation of information regarding markets, customers, catastrophic occurrence or other information that is publicly known or otherwise available to us. Such information may not always be accurate, complete, updated or properly evaluated. Management of operational, compliance, legal and regulatory risks requires, among other things, policies and procedures to record and verify large numbers of transactions and events. These policies and procedures may not be fully effective.

Operational risks, such as systems disruptions or failures, breaches of security, cyber attacks, human error, changes in operational practices or inadequate controls including in respect of third parties with which we do business may adversely impact our business, results of operation and reputation.

We face the risk that the design and operating effectiveness of our controls and procedures may prove to be inadequate. Operational risks are inherent to our business. Our businesses depend on the ability to process a large number of transactions efficiently and accurately. In addition, we routinely transmit, receive and store personal, confidential and proprietary information by email and other electronic means. Although we endeavour to safeguard our systems and processes, losses can result from inadequately trained or skilled personnel, IT failures (including due to a computer virus or a failure to anticipate or prevent cyber attacks or other attempts to gain unauthorised access to digital systems for purposes of misappropriating assets or sensitive information, corrupting data, or impairing operational performance, or security breaches by third parties), inadequate or failed internal control processes and systems, regulatory breaches, human errors, employee misconduct, including fraud, or from natural disasters or other external events that interrupt normal business operations. We depend on the secure processing, storage and transmission of confidential and other information in our computer systems and networks. The equipment and software used in our computer systems and networks may not always be capable of processing, storing or transmitting information as expected. Despite our business continuity plans and procedures, certain of our computer systems and networks may have insufficient recovery capabilities in the event of a malfunction or loss of data. As part of a continuous life cycle management process we are replacing some important elements of our IT landscape as contemplated by our Think Forward strategy. Any failure or delay in implementation or integration of the new IT/operational systems on the anticipated time schedule or a failure of these systems to operate as anticipated could affect our ability to implement our Think Forward strategy in the manner and time frame currently contemplated. Like other financial institutions and global companies, we are regularly the target of attempted cyber attacks, including denial-of-service attacks and attempts to gain unauthorised access, and the techniques used for such attacks are increasingly sophisticated. We have faced, and expect this trend to continue, an increasing number of attempted cyber attacks as we have expanded our mobile- and other internet-based products and services, as well as our usage of mobile and cloud technologies. In addition, due to our interconnectivity with third-party vendors, exchanges, clearing houses, financial institutions and other third parties, we could be adversely impacted if any of them is subject to a successful cyber attack or other information security event. Whilst we have policies and processes to protect our systems and networks, and strive to continuously monitor and develop them to protect our technology infrastructure and data from misappropriation, they may be vulnerable to unauthorised access, computer viruses or other malicious code, cyber attacks and other external attacks or internal breaches that could have a security impact and jeopardise our confidential information or that of our clients or our counterparties. These events can potentially result in financial loss and harm to our reputation, hinder our operational effectiveness, result in regulatory censure, and could have a material adverse effect on our business, reputation, revenues, results of operations, financial condition and prospects.

Widespread outbreaks of communicable diseases may impact the health of our employees, increasing absenteeism, or may cause a significant increase in the utilisation of health benefits offered to our employees, either or both of which could adversely impact our business. In addition, other events including unforeseeable and/or catastrophic events can lead to an abrupt interruption of activities, and our operations may be subject to losses resulting from such disruptions. Losses can result from destruction or impairment of property, financial assets, trading positions, and the loss of key personnel. If our business continuity plans are not able to be implemented, are not effective or do not sufficiently take such events into account, losses may increase further.

We are subject to a variety of regulatory risks as a result of our operations in certain countries.

In certain countries in which we operate, judiciary and dispute resolution systems may be less developed. As a result, in case of a breach of contract, we may have difficulties in making and enforcing claims against contractual counterparties and, if claims are made against us, we might encounter difficulties in mounting a defence against such allegations. If we become party to legal proceedings in a market with an insufficiently developed judicial system, it could have an adverse effect on our operations and net results.

In addition, as a result of our operations in certain countries, we are subject to risks of possible nationalisation, expropriation, price controls, exchange controls and other restrictive government actions, as well as the outbreak of hostilities and or war, in these markets. Furthermore, the current economic environment in certain countries in which we operate may increase the likelihood for regulatory initiatives to enhance consumer protection or to protect homeowners from foreclosures. Any such regulatory initiative could have an adverse impact on our ability to protect our economic interest, for instance in the event of defaults on residential mortgages.

ING Group may be unable to retain key personnel.

As a financial services enterprise with a decentralised management structure, ING Group relies to a considerable extent on the quality of local management in the various countries in which it operates. The success of ING Group's operations is dependent, among other things, on its ability to attract and retain highly qualified personnel. Competition for key personnel in most countries in which ING Group operates is intense. ING Group's ability to attract and retain key personnel, in particular in areas such as technology and operational management, client relationship management, finance, risk and product development, is dependent on a number of factors, including prevailing market conditions and compensation packages offered by companies competing for the same talent.

As part of their responses to the financial crisis of 2008, the EC and national governments throughout Europe have introduced and are expected to continue introducing various legislative initiatives that aim to ensure that financial institutions' remuneration policies and practices are consistent with and promote sound and effective risk management, and impose restrictions on the remuneration of personnel, with a focus on risk alignment of performance-related remuneration. Such initiatives include, among others, measures set out in Directive 2013/36/EU (CRD IV), the Guidelines on Remuneration Policies and Practices published by (the predecessor of) the European Banking Authority, the Regulation of the DNB on Sound Remuneration Policies (Regeling beheerst beloningsbeleid Wft 2014), the Dutch law with respect to the limitation of liability of the DNB and AFM and the prohibition of the payment of variable remuneration to board members and day-to-day policy makers of financial institutions that receive state aid (*Wet aansprakelijkheidsbeperking DNB en AFM en bonusverbod staatsgesteunde ondernemingen*) and the Dutch Law on Remuneration Policies of Financial Undertakings (*Wet beloningsbeleid financiële ondernemingen*, Wbfo). Currently, implementation of the CRD IV rules varies significantly across the various Member States. The proportionality principle that allows for a minimum threshold for deferrals and pay-out in financial instruments to identified staff is applied differently in the various European countries. For instance, in the Netherlands a threshold of € 10.000 is applied; in Germany € 50.000; in Belgium € 75.000 and in the UK £500.000. This creates a situation where there is no level playing field. In addition, the Wbfo has introduced a variable remuneration cap of 20% of base salary for employees working in the financial sector in the Netherlands. Employees can be exempted and receive variable remuneration up to the Wbfo individual cap of 100%, provided that the average pay-out for the whole group does not exceed 20% of the collective base salaries. For this group, as well as for persons working outside the Netherlands, exceptions are possible, in line with CRD IV, but only under strict conditions. In addition, the Wbfo limits exit compensation, retention compensation and guaranteed variable remuneration. The introduction of the Wbfo has created an unlevel playing field in the Netherlands for ING due to the fact that branch offices in the Netherlands of financial institutions that fall under CRD IV (i.e. that have their corporate seat in another EER country) are not limited to the 20% cap but can apply to the higher CRD IV caps (e.g. 100%, or up to 200% with shareholder approval).

Since the financial crisis, ING has adapted its remuneration policies to the new national and international standards. Since the full repayment of the state aid by ING in 2014, the total remuneration package for the Executive Board members has been slightly increased, however, it remains significantly below the median of our EURO Stoxx 50 benchmark, which is made up of similar European financial and non-financial institutions.

The (increasing) restrictions on remuneration will continue to have an impact on existing ING Group remuneration policies and individual remuneration packages for personnel. This may restrict our ability to offer competitive compensation compared with companies (financial and/or non-financial) that are not subject to such restrictions and it could adversely affect ING Group's ability to retain or attract key personnel.

We may incur further liabilities in respect of our defined benefit retirement plans if the value of plan assets is not sufficient to cover potential obligations, including as a result of differences between results and underlying actuarial assumptions and models.

ING Group companies operate various defined benefit retirement plans covering a number of our employees. The liability recognised in our consolidated balance sheet in respect of our defined benefit plans is the present value of the defined benefit obligations at the balance sheet date, less the fair value of each plan's assets, together with adjustments for unrecognised actuarial gains and losses and unrecognised past service costs. We determine our defined benefit plan obligations based on internal and external actuarial models and calculations using the projected unit credit method. Inherent in these actuarial models are assumptions, including discount rates, rates of increase in future salary and benefit levels, mortality rates, trend rates in health care costs, consumer price index, and the expected return on plan assets. These assumptions are based on available market data and the historical performance of plan assets, and are updated annually. Nevertheless, the actuarial assumptions may differ significantly from actual results due to changes in market conditions, economic and mortality trends and other assumptions. Any changes in these assumptions could have a significant impact on our present and future liabilities to and costs associated with our defined benefit retirement plans.

Adverse publicity, claims and allegations, litigation and regulatory investigations and sanctions may have a material adverse effect on our business, revenues, results of operations, financial condition and/or prospects.

We are involved in governmental, regulatory, arbitration and legal proceedings and investigations involving claims by and against us which arise in the ordinary course of our businesses, including in connection with our activities as financial services provider, employer, investor and taxpayer. Financial reporting irregularities involving other large and well-known companies, possible findings of government authorities in various jurisdictions which are investigating several rate-setting processes, notifications made by whistleblowers, increasing regulatory and law enforcement scrutiny of 'know your customer' anti-money laundering, tax evasion, prohibited transactions with countries or persons subject to sanctions, and bribery or other anti-corruption measures and anti-terrorist-financing procedures and their effectiveness, regulatory investigations of the banking industry, and litigation that arises from the failure or perceived failure by us to comply with legal, regulatory, tax and compliance requirements could result in adverse publicity and reputational harm, lead to increased regulatory supervision, affect our ability to attract and retain customers and maintain access to the capital markets, result in cease and desist orders, claims, enforcement actions, fines and civil and criminal penalties, other disciplinary action or have other material adverse effects on us in ways that are not predictable. Some claims and allegations may be brought by or on behalf of a class and claimants may seek large or indeterminate amounts of damages, including compensatory, liquidated, treble and punitive damages. See '—ING is exposed to the risk of claims from customers who feel misled or treated unfairly because of advice or information received'. Our reserves for litigation liabilities may prove to be inadequate. Claims and allegations, should they become public, need not be well founded, true or successful to have a negative impact on our reputation. In addition, press reports and other public statements that assert some form of wrongdoing could result in inquiries or investigations by regulators, legislators and law enforcement officials, and responding to these inquiries and investigations, regardless of their ultimate outcome, is time consuming and expensive. Adverse publicity, claims and allegations, litigation and regulatory investigations and sanctions may have a material adverse effect on our business, revenues, results of operations, financial condition and/or prospects in any given period. For additional information, see the 'Review processes for setting benchmark rates' and 'Financial Economic Crime' paragraphs in the 'Main developments in 2016' part within the Compliance Risk in the Risk Management section in the annual report of ING Group. With respect to specific proceedings, see Note 45 'Legal proceedings' to the consolidated financial statements.

We may not be able to protect our intellectual property and may be subject to infringement claims by third parties, which may have a material adverse effect on our business and results of operations.

In the conduct of our business, we rely on a combination of contractual rights with third parties and copyright, trademark, trade name, patent and trade secret laws to establish and protect our intellectual property. Although we endeavour to protect our rights, third parties may infringe or misappropriate our intellectual property. We may have to litigate to enforce and protect our copyrights, trademarks, trade names, patents, trade secrets and know-how or to determine their scope, validity or enforceability. In that event, we may be required to incur significant costs, and our efforts may not prove successful. The inability to secure or protect our intellectual property assets could have a material adverse effect on our business and our ability to compete.

We may also be subject to claims made by third parties for (1) patent, trademark or copyright infringement, (2) breach of copyright, trademark or licence usage rights, or (3) misappropriation of trade secrets. Any such claims and any resulting litigation could result in significant expense and liability for damages. If we were found to have infringed or misappropriated a third-party patent or other intellectual property right, we could in some circumstances be enjoined from providing certain products or services to our customers or from utilizing and benefiting from certain methods, processes, copyrights, trademarks, trade secrets or licences. Alternatively, we could be required to enter into costly licensing arrangements with third parties or to implement a costly workaround. Any of these scenarios could have a material adverse effect on our business and results of operations.

ING is exposed to the risk of claims from customers who feel misled or treated unfairly because of advice or information received.

Our banking products and advice services for third-party products are exposed to claims from customers who might allege that they have received misleading advice or other information from advisers (both internal and external) as to which products were most appropriate for them, or that the terms and conditions of the products, the nature of the products or the circumstances under which the products were sold, were misrepresented to them. When new financial products are brought to the market, ING engages in a multidisciplinary product approval process in connection with the development of such products, including production of appropriate marketing and communication materials. Notwithstanding these processes, customers may make claims against ING if the products do not meet their expectations. Customer protection regulations, as well as changes in interpretation and perception by both the public at large and governmental authorities of acceptable market practices, influence customer expectations.

Products distributed through person-to-person sales forces have a higher exposure to such claims as the sales forces provide face-to-face financial planning and advisory services. Complaints may also arise if customers feel that they have not been treated reasonably or fairly, or that the duty of care has not been complied with. While a considerable amount of time and resources have been invested in reviewing and assessing historical sales practices and products that were sold in the past, and in the maintenance of effective risk management, legal and compliance procedures to monitor current sales practices, there can be no assurance that all of the issues associated with current and historical sales practices have been or will be identified, nor that any issues already identified will not be more widespread than presently estimated.

The negative publicity associated with any sales practices, any compensation payable in respect of any such issues and regulatory changes resulting from such issues, has had and could have a material adverse effect on our business, reputation, revenues, results of operations, financial condition and prospects. For additional information with respect to specific proceedings, see Note 45 'Legal proceedings' to the consolidated financial statements.

Additional risks relating to ownership of ING shares

The share price of ING shares has been, and may continue to be, volatile.

Our share price has experienced periods of volatility in the past, and the price and trading volume of our shares may be subject to significant fluctuations in the future, due, in part, to changes in our actual or forecast operating results and the inability to fulfil the profit expectations of securities analysts, as well as to the high volatility in the securities markets generally and more particularly in shares of financial institutions.

Other factors, besides our financial results, that may impact our share price include, but are not limited to:

- market expectations of the performance and capital adequacy of financial institutions in general;
- investor perception of the success and impact of our strategies;
- investor perception of our positions and risks;
- a downgrade or review of our credit ratings;
- potential litigation or regulatory action involving ING or sectors that we have exposure to;
- announcements concerning financial problems or any investigations into the accounting practices of other financial institutions; and
- general market circumstances.

There can be no assurance that we will pay dividends on our Ordinary Shares in the future.

It is ING's policy to pay dividends in relation to the long-term underlying development of cash earnings. Dividends can only be declared by shareholders when the Executive Board considers such dividends appropriate, taking into consideration the financial conditions then prevailing and the longer-term outlook. The Executive Board proposes to pay a total dividend of EUR 2,560 million, or EUR 0.66 per ordinary share, over the financial year 2016. This is subject to the approval of shareholders at the Annual General Meeting in May 2017. Taking into account the interim dividend of EUR 0.24 per ordinary share paid in August 2016, the final dividend will amount to EUR 0.42 per ordinary share and be paid in cash. However, there can be no assurance that we will pay dividends in the future.

Holders of ING shares may experience dilution of their holdings.

The issuance of equity securities resulting from the conversion of some or all of such instruments would dilute the ownership interests of existing holders of ING shares and such dilution could be substantial. Additionally, any conversion, or the anticipation of the possibility of a conversion, could depress the market price of ING shares.

Furthermore, we may undertake future equity offerings with or without subscription rights. In case of equity offerings with subscription rights, holders of ING shares in certain jurisdictions, however, may not be entitled to exercise such rights unless the rights and the related shares are registered or qualified for sale under the relevant legislation or regulatory framework. Holders of ING shares in these jurisdictions may suffer dilution of their shareholding should they not be permitted to, or otherwise chose not to, participate in future equity offerings with subscription rights.

Because we are incorporated under the laws of the Netherlands and many of the members of our Supervisory and Executive Board and our officers reside outside of the United States, it may be difficult to enforce judgments against ING or the members of our Supervisory and Executive Boards or our officers.

Most of our Supervisory Board members, our Executive Board members and some of the experts named in this Annual Report, as well as many of our officers are persons who are not residents of the United States, and most of our and their assets, are located outside the United States. As a result, it may not be able to serve process on those persons within the United States or to enforce in the United States judgments obtained in U.S. courts against us or those persons based on the civil liability provisions of the U.S. securities laws.

It also may not be able to enforce judgments of U.S. courts under the U.S. federal securities laws in courts outside the United States, including the Netherlands. The United States and the Netherlands do not currently have a treaty providing for the reciprocal recognition and enforcement of judgments (other than arbitration awards) in civil and commercial matters. Therefore, we may not be able to enforce in the Netherlands a final judgment for the payment of money rendered by any U.S. federal or state court based on civil liability, even if the judgment is not based only on the U.S. federal securities laws, unless a competent court in the Netherlands gives binding effect to the judgment.