

## 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. The market price of ING shares could decline due to any of these risks, and investors could lose all or part of their investments. 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 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 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 and solvency of our insurance, banking and asset management business.*

Factors such as interest rates, securities prices, credit spreads, liquidity spreads, exchange rates, consumer spending, changes in client behaviour, business investment, real estate and private equity valuations, government spending, inflation, 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. 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 and insurance 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. Some insurance products contain minimum return or accumulation guarantees. If returns do not meet or exceed the guarantee levels, we may need to set up additional reserves to fund these future guaranteed benefits. In addition, we may experience an elevated incidence of claims and lapses or surrenders of policies. Our policyholders may choose to defer paying insurance premiums or stop paying insurance premiums altogether. Similarly, a downturn in the equity markets causes a reduction in commission income we earn from managing portfolios for third parties, income generated from our own proprietary portfolios, asset-based fee income on certain insurance products, and our capital base. We also offer a number of insurance and 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 turbulence and volatility in the financial markets and the economy generally have adversely affected and may continue to affect our business 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:

- the unlocking of deferred acquisition costs ('DAC') impacting earnings;
- reserve inadequacies which could ultimately be realised through profit and loss and shareholders' equity;
- the write-down of tax assets impacting net results;
- 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.

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 may have a material adverse impact on shareholders' equity and net result in future periods, including as a result of the potential consequences listed above. See '–Continued turbulence and volatility in the financial markets and the economy generally have adversely affected and may continue to affect our business and results of operations' below.

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

The capital and credit markets have been experiencing extreme volatility and disruption since the second half of 2008. Adverse capital market conditions may affect the availability and cost of borrowed funds, thereby impacting our ability to support or grow our businesses.

We need liquidity in our day-to-day business activities 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 are deposit funds, insurance premiums, annuity considerations and cash flow from our investment portfolio and assets, consisting mainly of cash or assets that are readily convertible into cash. Sources of funding in normal markets may also include a variety of short- and long-term instruments, including repurchase agreements, commercial paper, medium-and long-term debt, subordinated debt securities, capital securities and stockholders' equity.

In the event 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 cause rating agencies to re-evaluate our ratings.

Disruptions, uncertainty or volatility in the capital and credit markets, such as that experienced over the past few years, including in relation to the ongoing European sovereign debt crisis, may also limit our access to capital required to operate our business. Such market conditions may in the future limit our ability to raise additional capital to support business growth, or to counter-balance the consequences of losses or increased regulatory 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 and regulatory 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 include both liquidity provision and capital reinforcement, and a Dutch Credit Guarantee Scheme. The liquidity and capital reinforcement measures expired on 10 October 2009, and the Credit Guarantee Scheme of the Netherlands expired on 31 December 2010. Our participation in these measures has resulted in certain material restrictions on us, including those required by the European Commission ('EC') as part of our Restructuring Plan. See 'Risks Related to the Restructuring Plan – Our agreements with the Dutch State impose certain restrictions regarding the issuance or repurchase of our shares and the compensation of certain senior management positions', 'Risks Related to the Restructuring Plan – The implementation of the Restructuring Plan and the divestments anticipated in connection with that plan will significantly alter the size and structure of the Group and involve significant costs and uncertainties that could materially impact the Group'. The Restructuring Plan, as well as any potential future transactions with the Dutch State or any other government, if any, or 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 and insurance regulatory bodies, some of which have proposed regulatory changes in the recent years that, if implemented, would hinder our ability to manage our liquidity in a centralised manner. 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. There could be an adverse change or increase in the financial services laws and/or regulations governing our business', undermining our efforts to maintain this centralised management of our liquidity. These developments may cause trapped pools of liquidity, resulting in inefficiencies in the cost of managing our liquidity, and hinder our efforts to integrate our balance sheet, which is an essential element of our Restructuring Plan.

***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) could lead to defaults or severe distress by other institutions. Such distress or defaults could disrupt securities markets or clearance and settlement systems in our markets. This could cause market declines or volatility. Such a failure could lead to a chain of defaults that could adversely affect us and our contractual counterparties. Concerns about the credit worthiness of a sovereign or financial institution (or a default by any such entity) could lead to significant liquidity and/or solvency problems, losses or defaults by other institutions, because the commercial and financial soundness of many financial institutions may be closely related as a result of their credit, trading, clearing or other relationships. Even the perceived lack of creditworthiness of, or questions about, a sovereign or a counterparty 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 and/or prospects. In addition, such a failure could impact future product sales as a potential result of reduced confidence in the financial services industry.

Management believes that despite increased attention recently, systemic risk to the markets in which we operate continues to exist, and dislocations caused by the interdependency of financial market participants continues to be a potential source of material adverse changes to our business, results of operations and financial condition.

***Because our life and non-life insurance and reinsurance businesses are subject to losses from unforeseeable and/or catastrophic events, which are inherently unpredictable, our actual claims amount may exceed our established reserves or we may experience an abrupt interruption of activities, each of which could result in lower net results and have an adverse effect on our results of operations.***

In our life and non-life insurance and reinsurance businesses, we are subject to losses from natural and man-made catastrophic events. Such events include, without limitation, weather and other natural catastrophes such as hurricanes, floods, earthquakes and epidemics that may be more severe or difficult to predict as a result of variable climate conditions, as well as man-made disasters and core infrastructure failures such as acts of terrorism, military actions, power grid and telephone/internet infrastructure failures and political and social unrest. The frequency and severity of such events, and the losses associated with them, are inherently unpredictable and cannot always be adequately reserved for. Furthermore, we are subject to actuarial and underwriting risks such as, for instance, mortality, longevity, morbidity, and adverse claims development which result from the pricing and acceptance of insurance contracts. In accordance with industry practices, modelling of natural catastrophes is performed and risk mitigation measures are taken. In case claims occur, reserves are established based on estimates using actuarial projection techniques. The process of estimating is based on information available at the time the reserves are originally established and includes updates when more information becomes available. Although we continually review the adequacy of the established claim reserves, there can be no assurances that our actual claims experience will not exceed our estimated claim reserves. If actual claim amounts exceed the estimated claim reserves, our earnings may be reduced and our net results may be adversely affected. Furthermore, claims resulting from a catastrophic event could also materially harm the financial condition of our reinsurers, which would increase the probability of default on reinsurance recoveries. Our ability to write new business could also be adversely affected.

In addition, and as discussed further below under 'Risks Related to the Group's Business, Operations, and Regulatory Environment— Operational risks are inherent in our business', because unforeseeable and/or catastrophic events can lead to an abrupt interruption of activities, our banking and insurance operations may be subject to losses resulting from such disruptions. Losses can relate to property, financial assets, trading positions, insurance and pension benefits to employees and also to key personnel. If our business continuity plans are not able to be put into action or do not take such events into account, our financial condition could be adversely affected.

***We operate in highly regulated industries. There could be an adverse change or increase in the financial services laws and/or regulations governing our business.***

We are subject to detailed banking, insurance, asset management and other financial services laws and government regulation in the jurisdictions in which we conduct business. Regulatory agencies have broad administrative power over many aspects of the financial services business, which may include liquidity, capital adequacy and permitted investments, ethical issues, anti-money laundering, anti-terrorism measures, privacy, recordkeeping, product and sale suitability, and marketing and sales practices, remuneration policies and our own internal governance practices. Banking, insurance and other financial services laws, regulations and

policies currently governing us and our subsidiaries may also change at any time and in ways which have an adverse effect on our business, and it is difficult to predict the timing or form of any future regulatory or enforcement initiatives in respect thereof. Also, regulators and other supervisory authorities in the EU, the U.S. and elsewhere continue to scrutinise payment processing and other transactions and activities of the financial services industry under regulations governing such matters as money-laundering, prohibited transactions with countries subject to sanctions, and bribery or other anti-corruption measures. Regulation is becoming increasingly more extensive and complex and regulators are focusing increased scrutiny on the industries in which we operate, often requiring additional Company resources. These regulations can serve to limit our activities, including through our net capital, customer protection and market conduct requirements, and restrictions on businesses in which we can operate or invest. If we fail to address, or appear to fail to address, appropriately any of these matters, 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 asserted against us or subject us to enforcement actions, fines and penalties.

In light of current conditions in the global financial markets and the global economy, regulators 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 considering, major legislative and/or regulatory initiatives in response to the financial crisis. Governmental and regulatory authorities in the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the United States and elsewhere are implementing measures to increase regulatory control in their respective financial markets and financial services sectors, including in the areas of prudential rules, capital requirements, executive compensation, crisis and contingency management, bank levies and financial reporting, among others. Additionally, governmental and regulatory authorities in the Netherlands as well as in a multitude of jurisdictions 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). In December 2012, EU leaders agreed on setting up a Single Supervisory Mechanism ('SSM'), a mechanism composed of national competent authorities and the European Central Bank ('ECB'), as part of the prospective EU banking union. In the SSM, it is expected that the ECB will assume direct responsibility for a significant part of the prudential supervision of ING Bank and its holding company ING Group. The SSM is envisaged to take effect by 1 March 2014 or one year after the Regulation has entered into force and is designed for countries within the Eurozone, with the possibility of non-Eurozone member states to participate by means of close cooperation. While it is at this stage difficult to identify what the exact impact will be on ING Bank and ING Group, it is expected that the SSM will have a significant impact on the way ING's banking operations are supervised in Europe.

Furthermore, we are subject to different tax regulations in each of the jurisdictions where we conduct business. Changes in tax laws could increase our taxes and our effective tax rates. Furthermore, legislative changes 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 and corporate tax rates.

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. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations is time-consuming and personnel-intensive, and changes in laws and regulations may materially increase the cost of compliance and other expenses of doing business.

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. 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, either because they are subject to multiple interpretations or under development, or where they may conflict with one another, or where regulators revise their previous guidance or courts overturn previous rulings, resulting 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 the 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.

### *Basel III*

In December 2010, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision ('Basel Committee') announced higher global minimum capital standards for banks and introduced a new global liquidity standard and a new leverage ratio. The Basel Committee'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 Tier 1 common equity ratio, when fully phased in on 1 January 2019, will rise to 7%. Basel III also introduces a 'countercyclical buffer' as an extension of the capital conservation buffer, which permits 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, potentially 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 Basel Committee 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. The implementation of these measures have begun in 2012 and full implementation is targeted for 2019. ING Bank was designated by the Basel Committee and FSB as one of the global systemically important banks ('G-SIBs'), forming part of the G-SIFIs, in November 2011 and November 2012, and by Dutch Central Bank (De Nederlandsche Bank N.V., 'DNB') and the Dutch Ministry of Finance as a domestic SIFI in 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 on-going 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. It remains to be seen whether further amendments to the 2010 framework and standards will be made by the Basel Committee in the coming years.

For European banks, these requirements will be implemented through the Capital Requirements Directive ('CRD') IV, which might deviate in its final state from the original Basel III requirements. While the full impact of the Basel III rules, and any additional requirements for SIFIs or G-SIFIs, if and as applicable to the Group, will depend on how they are implemented by national regulators, including the extent to which such regulators and supervisors can set more stringent limits and additional capital requirements or surcharges, as well as on the economic and financial environment at the time of implementation and beyond, we expect these rules can have a material impact on ING's operations and financial condition and may require the Group to seek additional capital. Further, the International Accounting Standards Board ('IASB') has issued and proposed certain amendments to several IFRS standards during the course of 2012, which changes could also have a material impact on our reported results and financial condition.

#### *Solvency II*

The European Council has agreed upon a full scale revision of the solvency framework and prudential regime applicable to insurance and reinsurance companies known as 'Solvency II', which was adopted on 25 November 2009 (Directive 2009/138/EG). A key aspect of Solvency II is the closer alignment of the assessment of risks and capital requirements with economic capital methodologies. Under the Solvency II regime, insurance companies may be permitted to make use of an internal economic capital model as a basis for calculation of their capital needs and solvency position (in the Netherlands, such a model (including ING's model) has to be approved by the DNB).

The final text of the Level I Framework Directive includes rules regarding, among other things, own funds, capital requirements, investments and group supervision. Following adoption of this Level I Framework Directive, the European Commission and European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority ('EIOPA'), formerly CEIOPS, have initiated the development of detailed rules following the Lamfalussy process. Under this process, Directives related to financial institutions are developed on the basis of a four level approach intended to complement the principles of the Directive Level 2 measures will be issued by the European Commission (delegated acts and/or implementing technical standards proposed by EIOPA) and Level 3 guidance will be issued by EIOPA.

Solvency II, if implemented, will effect a full revision of the insurance industry's solvency framework and prudential regime and will impose group level supervision mechanisms. Representatives from the European Parliament, the European Commission and the Council of the European Union are currently discussing the 'Omnibus II Directive' proposal, which, once approved, will amend certain aspects of the original Solvency II Directive. In addition, the European Commission is continuing to develop the detailed rules that will complement the high-level principles of the Solvency II Directive, referred to as 'implementing measures'. The implementing measures are not currently expected to be finalised until the Omnibus II Directive has entered into force and the implementation date of Solvency II by member states of the European Economic Area ('EEA') has been postponed from 31 October 2012 to 30 June 2013, and the application date by companies to 1 January 2014. There is significant uncertainty regarding the timeline and final outcome of this process and we are unable to predict precisely how the regulations resulting from such initiatives and proposals could affect the insurance industry generally or our results of operations, financial condition and liquidity in particular.

Significant efforts towards establishing a more cohesive and streamlined European supervisory framework, including the establishment of the European Systemic Risk Board and the EIOPA, may also affect the Group's operations.

#### *EU Insurance Guarantee Scheme*

In July 2010, the European Commission released a white paper detailing the need to establish minimum levels of protection for consumers of life and non-life insurance products in the event that insurance companies in the European Union with which they do business were to become insolvent. Though the mechanisms for providing any such protections remain under review by the European Commission, the European Parliament and the member states, the European Commission may currently be considering providing this protection by (i) mandating the creation of (or harmonisation of existing) national level insurance guarantee schemes and/or (ii) implementing an EU-wide insurance guarantee scheme, which such scheme(s) may require significant prefunding by insurance companies. As of 31 December 2012 no legislative proposal has been made at the EU level. However, the implementation of an insurance guarantee scheme requiring significant levels of prefunding (or, in the event that prefunding is not required, the occurrence of circumstances requiring the commencement of event-driven contributions) may have a material and adverse impact on the liquidity, financial condition and operations of companies engaged in the insurance business, including us.

#### *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 United States. The Dodd-Frank Act has imposed comprehensive changes to the regulation of financial services in the United States and has implications for non-U.S. financial institutions with a U.S. presence, such as ING. Dodd-Frank directs existing and newly-created government agencies and bodies to promulgate regulations implementing the law, a process that is underway and is expected to continue over the next few years. While some studies have already been completed and the rulemaking process is well underway, there continues to be significant uncertainty regarding the results of ongoing studies and the ultimate requirements of regulations that have not yet been adopted. We cannot predict with certainty how Dodd-Frank and such regulations will affect the financial markets generally, impact the Group's business, credit or financial strength ratings, results of operations, cash flows or financial condition or advise or require the Group to raise additional capital. Key aspects of Dodd-Frank that we have identified to date as possibly having an impact on the Group include:

- The Financial Stability Oversight Council ('FSOC') may designate the Group as a nonbank financial company whose material financial distress, or whose nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness or mix of activities, could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States. In such an instance, the Group would become subject to the oversight of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System ('Federal Reserve'). If the Group becomes subject to such examination, enforcement and supervisory authority of the Federal Reserve, the Federal Reserve would have authority to impose capital requirements on the Group and its subsidiaries. The Group cannot predict what capital regulations the Federal Reserve will promulgate under these authorisations, either generally or as applicable to organisations with the Group's operations, nor can management predict how the Federal Reserve will exercise potential general supervisory authority over the Group as to its business practices or those of its subsidiaries. If designated as systemically important by the FSOC, the Group would become subject to a comprehensive system of stricter prudential standards, including stricter requirements and limitations relating to risk-based capital, leverage, liquidity and credit exposure, as well as overall risk management requirements, management interlock prohibitions and a requirement to maintain a plan for rapid and orderly dissolution in the event of severe financial distress. The Group may become subject to stress tests to be promulgated by the Federal Reserve in consultation with the Federal Insurance Office (discussed below) to determine whether, on a consolidated basis, the Group has the capital necessary to absorb losses as a result of adverse economic conditions. We cannot predict how the stress tests will be designed or conducted or whether the results thereof will cause the Group to alter its business practices or affect the perceptions of regulators, rating agencies, customers, counterparties or investors about the Group's financial strength. The FSOC may also recommend that state insurance regulators or other regulators apply new or heightened standards and safeguards for activities or practices that the Group and other insurers or other financial services companies engage in.
- Title II of Dodd-Frank provides that a financial company, such as us, may be subject to a special orderly liquidation process outside the federal bankruptcy code, administered by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ('FDIC') as receiver, upon a determination that the company is in default or in danger of default and presents a systemic risk to U.S. financial stability. We cannot predict how ratings agencies or creditors of us or our subsidiaries will evaluate this potential risk or whether it will impact our financing or hedging costs.
- 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. New margin and capital requirements on market participants contained in final regulations adopted by the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission ('CFTC') could substantially increase the

cost of hedging and related operations, affect the profitability of our products or their attractiveness to our customers, or cause us to alter our hedging strategy or change the composition of risks we do not hedge.

- Under Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act, the CFTC has promulgated requirements for recordkeeping and reporting of swap transactions to swap data repositories. The rules require swap counterparties and underlying reference entities to be identified by a legal entity identifier ('LEI'). Recognizing that the rules will come into effect prior to the availability of global LEIs, the CFTC has mandated the use of interim entity identifiers called CFTC Interim Compliant Identifier ('CICI'). In the event that we are unable to obtain a CICI and implement it into our system we may be limited in our ability to engage in hedging transactions.
- Pursuant to requirements of the Dodd-Frank Act, the SEC and CFTC are currently considering 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.
- Dodd-Frank established the Federal Insurance Office ('FIO') within the United States Department of the Treasury ('Treasury Department') to be headed by a director appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury Department. While not having a general supervisory or regulatory authority over the business of insurance, the director of this office would perform various functions with respect to insurance (other than health insurance), including participating in the FSOC's decisions regarding insurers (potentially including the Group and its subsidiaries), to be designated for stricter regulation. The FIO may recommend enhanced regulations to state insurance regulatory bodies.
- Dodd-Frank also 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 will have 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 and deceptive acts and practices. In addition, the CFPB will have 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.
- 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 authorize the SEC to impose on broker-dealers fiduciary duties to their customers, as applies 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. The SEC staff released a study on this issue.
- Dodd-Frank could result in various ex-post assessments being imposed on us, the costs of which we are unable to estimate at this time.

Although the full impact of Dodd-Frank cannot be determined until the various studies mandated by the law are conducted and implementing regulations are adopted, many of the legislation's requirements could have profound and/or adverse consequences for the financial services industry, including for us. Dodd-Frank 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.

#### *Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act*

Under the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act ('FATCA'), U.S. federal tax legislation passed in 2010, a 30% withholding tax will be imposed on 'withholdable payments' made to non-U.S. financial institutions (including non-U.S. investment funds and certain other non-U.S. financial entities) that fail (or, in some cases, that have 50% affiliates which are also non-U.S. financial institutions that fail) to provide certain information regarding their U.S. accountholders and/or certain U.S. investors (such U.S. accountholders and U.S. investors, 'U.S. accountholders') to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service ('IRS'). For non-U.S. financial institutions that fail to comply, this withholding will generally apply without regard to whether the beneficial owner of a withholdable payment is a U.S. person or would otherwise be entitled to an exemption from U.S. federal withholding tax. 'Withholdable payments' generally include, among other items, payments of U.S.-source interest and dividends and the gross proceeds from the sale or other disposition of property that may produce U.S.-source interest and dividends. Furthermore, FATCA may also impose withholding on non-U.S. source payments by non-U.S. financial institutions that comply with FATCA to non-U.S. financial institutions that fail to comply with FATCA. This withholding will take effect on a 'phased' schedule, starting in January 2014 with withholding on non-U.S. source payments by non-U.S. financial institutions to start no earlier than January 2017. In general, non-publicly traded debt and equity interests in investment vehicles will be treated as 'accounts' and subject to these reporting requirements. In addition, certain insurance policies and annuities are considered accounts for these purposes.



Some countries have entered into, and other countries are expected to enter into, agreements ('intergovernmental agreements' or 'IGAs') with the United States 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 some information on their U.S. accountholders to the taxing authorities of those countries, who will then pass the information to the IRS.

The Group closely monitors all present and new legislation that is or will be applicable for its organisation, and is currently investigating all implications of FATCA and legislation of countries that have entered into IGAs. While investigating these implications, the Group is and will be in close contact with all of its stakeholders, including its peers and financial industry representative organisations.

The Group intends to take all necessary steps to comply with FATCA (including entering into such agreements with the U.S. tax authorities as may be required), in accordance with the timeframe set by the U.S. tax authorities. However, if the Group cannot enter into such agreements or satisfy the requirements thereunder (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 accountholders, policyholders, annuitants or other investors, or as a result of the failure of accountholders, policyholders, annuitants or other investors to provide requested information), certain payments to the Group may be subject to withholding under FATCA. The possibility of such withholding and the need for accountholders, policyholders, annuitants and investors to provide certain information may adversely affect the sales of certain of the Group's products. In addition, entering into agreements with the IRS compliance with the terms of such agreements and with FATCA any regulations or other guidance promulgated thereunder or any legislation promulgated under an IGA 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.

#### *Dutch Intervention Act*

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 amends the Dutch Financial Supervision Act and the Dutch Insolvency Act and allows Dutch authorities to take certain actions when banks and insurers fail and cannot be wound up under ordinary insolvency rules due to concerns regarding the stability of the overall financial system. It is composed of two categories of measures. The first category includes measures related to the timely and efficient liquidation of failing banks and insurers and would give the DNB the power to transfer customer deposits (only in the case of banks), assets and/or liabilities other than deposits and issued shares of an entity to third parties or to a bridge bank if the DNB deems that, in respect of the relevant bank or insurance company, there are signs of an adverse development with respect to its funds, solvency, liquidity or technical provisions and it can be reasonably foreseen that such development will not be sufficiently or timely reversed. The DNB would also be granted the power to influence the internal decision-making of failing institutions through the appointment of an 'undisclosed administrator'. The second category includes measures intended to safeguard the stability of the financial system as a whole and grants the authority to the Minister of Finance to take immediate measures or proceed to expropriation of assets of or shares in the capital of failing financial institutions. For example, on 1 February 2013, the Dutch State nationalised the SNS Reaal bank and insurance group ('SNS Reaal') by expropriating shares, core tier 1 securities and other subordinated debts issued by SNS Reaal. The Dutch Ministry of Finance has stated that it will impose in 2014 an aggregate EUR 1 billion one-time levy on Dutch banks, including ING Bank, to share the costs of the SNS Reaal nationalisation. Based on the currently available information, this is estimated to result in a charge of EUR 300-350 million for us. Currently, there is a debate in the Netherlands on the effectiveness of the legal regime, which may result in an implementation of more onerous legislation and/or regulations. The future form, amount and timing of the levy, and its future impact on us, our operations and our financial position, remain unclear.

The Intervention Act also includes measures that limit the ability of counterparties to exercise their rights after any of the measures mentioned above has been put into place, with certain exceptions. Also in June 2012, the European Commission published a proposal for a Directive establishing a framework for the recovery and resolution of credit institutions and investment firms ('Recovery and Resolution Directive'), which includes, among other things, the obligation for institutions to draw up a recovery plan and the obligation for resolution authorities in the member states to draw up a resolution plan, early intervention measures and a European System of financing arrangements.

A few provisions of the Intervention Act, including the provision with respect to the future financing of the deposit guarantee and the investor compensation scheme, have not yet come into force and there are certain differences between the provisions of the Intervention Act and the Recovery and Resolution Directive proposal, which may further bring out future changes in the law. We are unable to predict what specific effects the



Intervention Act and the future adoption of the Recovery and Resolution Directive may have on the financial system generally, our counterparties, or on us, our operations or our financial position.

ING Bank has set up an all-encompassing recovery planning process to enhance its readiness and decisiveness to tackle financial crises on its own strength. ING Bank's recovery plan has been submitted to and approved by the DNB in November 2012. Furthermore in the course of 2012, DNB has requested ING Bank to prepare and submit information on the basis of which the Dutch resolution authorities will be able to develop a resolution plan. ING is diligently working towards providing this information and meeting the deadlines, end 2013, provided by DNB.

The 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 a host of related issues associated with responses to the financial crisis. The lawmakers and regulatory authorities in a number of jurisdictions in which the Group's subsidiaries conduct business have already begun introducing legislative and regulatory changes consistent with G20 and FSB recommendations, and the potential impact of such changes on our business, results of operation and financial condition remains unclear.

#### *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. For restrictions related to the Core Tier 1 Securities and the IABF, as further described in 'Item 4. Information on the Company – Recent Developments' (together, the 'Dutch State Transactions'), see 'Risks related to the Restructuring Plan – Our agreements with the Dutch State impose certain restrictions regarding the issuance or repurchase of our shares and the compensation of certain senior management positions'. As a result of having received state aid through the Dutch State Transactions, we were required to submit our Restructuring Plan to the EC in connection with obtaining final approval for the Dutch State Transactions. See 'Risks related to the Restructuring Plan – The implementation of the Restructuring Plan and the divestments anticipated in connection with that plan will significantly alter the size and structure of the Group and involve significant costs and uncertainties that could materially impact the Group'.

Sections 382 and 383 of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code as amended, operate as anti-abuse rules, the general purpose of which is to prevent trafficking in tax losses and credits, but which can apply without regard to whether a 'loss trafficking' transaction occurs or is intended. These rules are triggered when an 'ownership change' – generally defined as when the ownership of a company, or its parent, changes by more than 50% (measured by value) on a cumulative basis in any three year period – occurs. If triggered, the amount of the taxable income for any post-change year which may be offset by a pre-change loss is subject to an annual limitation. As of 31 December 2012, we believe that our U.S. subsidiaries have not had an 'ownership change' for purposes of Sections 382 and 383. However, this determination is subject to uncertainties and is based on various assumptions. Future increases of capital or other changes in ownership may adversely affect our cumulative ownership, and could trigger an 'ownership change', which could limit the ability of our U.S. subsidiaries to use tax attributes, and could correspondingly decrease the value of these attributes.

On 14 February 2013, the European Commission adopted a proposal setting out the details of the financial transaction tax, which mirrors the scope of its original proposal of September 2011, to be levied on transactions in financial instruments by financial institutions if at least one of the parties to the transaction is located in the 'FTT-zone', currently limited to 11 participating member states (Austria, Belgium, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain). The adopted proposal foresees the financial transaction tax for the 11 participating member states entering into effect on 1 January 2014, which would then require us to pay a tax on transactions in financial instruments with parties (including Group affiliates) located in such FTT-zone. The actual implementation date would depend on the future approval by the European Council and consultation of other EU institutions, and the subsequent transposition into local law. Furthermore, the Dutch Parliament passed a bill on bank tax, which went into effect as of 1 October 2012. This tax results in increased taxes on ING's Banking operations, which could negatively impact our operations, financial condition and liquidity. [In addition, it is possible that the United States Congress may adopt a form of 'financial crisis responsibility' fee and tax on banks and other financial firms to mitigate costs to taxpayers of various government programs established to address the financial crisis and to offset the costs of potential future crises. The Obama Administration's 2013 revenue proposals include such a fee. Any regulations resulting from these financial transaction tax initiatives and proposals could affect our operational results, financial condition and

liquidity, and could negatively impact the costs and scope of our transactions, including transactions with other financial institutions.

In May 2012, the International Association of Insurance Supervisors ('IAIS'), of which the DNB is a member, published a proposed assessment methodology for designating global systemically important insurers ('G-SIIs'), as part of the global initiative to identify G-SIFIs. Insurers identified as G-SIIs would be subject to additional policy measures. IAIS stated that the proposed policy measures released in October 2012, as endorsed for consultation by the FSB will be finalised at the same time as the first group of G-SIIs is identified. The initial list of G-SIIs is expected to be published by the FSB in April 2013, with annual updates thereafter. The proposed policy measures, which would need to be implemented by legislation or regulation in relevant jurisdictions, include higher capital requirements (both for non-traditional and non-insurance activities and for G-SIIs overall), enhanced supervision (including more detailed and frequent reporting, removal of barriers to orderly resolution of the G-SII and reduction of the G-SII's systemic risk over time), as well as additional measures to improve the degree of self-sufficiency of a G-SII's different business segments (including separate legal structures for traditional insurance and non-traditional or non-insurance activities, and restrictions on intercompany subsidies). If ING were identified as a G-SII, compliance costs will increase and its competitive position relative to other life insurers that were not designated as G-SIIs may be adversely affected. See 'Item 4. Information on the Company – Recent Developments – Important changes in Regulation and Supervision – Global systemically important insurers (G-SIIs).

***Continued turbulence and volatility in the financial markets and the economy generally have adversely affected and may continue to affect our business 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. Concerns over the slow economic recovery, the European sovereign debt crisis, the ability of certain countries to remain in the Eurozone, unemployment, the availability and cost of credit, the level of U.S. national debt and the U.S. housing market, inflation levels, energy costs and geopolitical issues all have contributed to increased volatility and diminished expectations for the economy and the markets in recent years.

While certain of such conditions have improved over 2011 and 2012, 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. In addition, prices for many types of asset-backed securities ('ABS') and other structured products have significantly deteriorated. 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 United States, 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 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' 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 been experiencing 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 extreme 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 through an increase of lapses or surrenders of policies and 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. During 2010, 2011 and 2012 the revaluation reserve position improved substantially, positively impacting shareholders' equity. Although we believe that reserves for insurance liabilities are generally adequate at the Group, inadequacies in certain product areas have developed. The aforementioned developments in the global financial markets and in particular the decreasing interest rates

resulted in a decrease in our overall reserves adequacy and may further continue to produce reserves inadequacies in the future, potentially leading to reserve strengthening.

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 ('RMBS' and 'CMBS', respectively), Collateralised Debt Obligations ('CDOs') and Collateralised Loan Obligations ('CLOs'), monoline insurer guarantees, 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. We continue to monitor our exposures, however there can be no assurances that we will not experience further negative impacts to our shareholders' equity or profit and loss accounts in future periods.

#### *U.S. Sovereign Credit Rating*

After a period of uncertainty as to whether U.S. lawmakers would be able to reach the political consensus needed to raise the federal debt ceiling, and notwithstanding that U.S. lawmakers passed legislation to raise the federal debt ceiling before the U.S. actually defaulted on any of its obligations, in 2011, Standard & Poor's Ratings Group, Inc. ('S&P') lowered its long-term sovereign credit rating on the United States of America from AAA to AA+. Although other ratings agencies have not similarly lowered the long term sovereign credit rating of the United States of America, they have put that credit rating on review. Amid the lingering uncertainty over 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. 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. A downgrade of the sovereign credit ratings of the U.S. government and the perceived creditworthiness of U.S. government-related obligations could impact our ability to obtain funding that is collateralised by affected instruments, as well as affecting the pricing of that funding when it is available. A downgrade may also adversely affect the market value of such instruments. We cannot predict if, when or how any changes to the credit ratings or perceived creditworthiness of these organisations will affect economic conditions. Such ratings actions could result in a significant adverse impact to the Group.

#### *European Sovereign Debt Crisis*

In 2010, a financial crisis emerged in Europe, triggered by high budget deficits and rising direct and contingent sovereign debt in Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Spain, which created concerns about the ability of these EU 'peripheral' states to continue to service their sovereign debt obligations. Significant concerns regarding the sovereign debt of these countries, as well as certain other countries, of the 'core' European Union member states are ongoing and in some cases have required countries to obtain emergency financing. These concerns impacted financial markets and resulted in high and volatile bond yields on the sovereign debt of many EU nations. If these or other countries require additional financial support or if sovereign credit ratings continue to decline, yields on the sovereign debt of certain countries may continue to increase, the cost of borrowing may increase and credit may become more limited. Despite assistance packages to Greece, Ireland and Portugal, the creation of a joint EU-IMF European Financial Stability Facility in May 2010, the approval of further bailout of Greece by the relevant government and monetary bodies of the Eurozone and the International Monetary Fund in March 2012, and the establishment of the European Stability Mechanism on 27 September 2012 (which provided its first financial assistance in February 2013 for the recapitalisation of Spain's banking sector), uncertainty over the outcome of the EU governments' financial support programs and worries about sovereign finances persisted during the course of 2012. Market concerns over the direct and indirect exposure of European banks and insurers to the EU sovereign debt further resulted in a widening of credit spreads and increased costs of funding for some European financial institutions. In December 2011, European leaders agreed to implement steps (and continue to meet regularly to review, amend and supplement such steps) to encourage greater long-term fiscal responsibility on the part of the individual member states and bolster market confidence in the Euro and European sovereign debt, and the Treaty of Stability, Coordination and Governance ('Fiscal Treaty') was signed by 25 EU member states on 2 March 2012; however, such proposed steps are subject to final agreement (and in some cases, ratification and/or other approvals) by the European Union member states that are party to such arrangements and thus the implementation of such steps in their currently-contemplated form remains uncertain, and even if such steps are implemented, there is no guarantee that they will ultimately and finally resolve uncertainties regarding the ability of Eurozone states to continue to service their sovereign debt obligations. Further, even if such long-term structural adjustments are ultimately

implemented, the future of the Euro in its current form, and with its current membership, remains uncertain. The financial turmoil in Europe continues to be a threat to global capital markets and remains a challenge to global financial stability.

Risks and ongoing concerns about the debt crisis in Europe, as well as the possible default by, or exit from the Eurozone of one or more European states and/or the replacement of the Euro by one or more successor currencies, could have a detrimental impact on the global economic recovery, sovereign and non-sovereign debt in these European countries and the financial condition of European and other financial institutions, including us. 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 for which they would require additional capital, which may not be available. Market and economic disruptions stemming from the crisis in Europe 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 the 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. In addition, the possible exit from 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 significant cost), (ii) currencies in some European Union member states may devalue relative to others, (iii) former 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 Eurozone) may not recognise and/or enforce claims denominated in Euros (and/or in any replacement currency). The possible exit from the Eurozone of one or more European states and/or the replacement of the Euro by one or more successor currencies could also cause other significant market dislocations and lead to other adverse economic and operational impacts that are inherently difficult to predict or evaluate, and otherwise have potentially materially adverse impacts on us and our counterparties, including our depositors, lenders, borrowers and other customers. These factors, combined with volatile oil prices, reduced business and consumer confidence and continued high unemployment, have negatively affected the economy of main geographic regions where we conduct our business. Our results of operations, investment portfolio and AUM are exposed to these risks and may be adversely affected as a result. In addition, in the event of extreme prolonged market events, such as the recent global credit crisis, we could incur significant losses.

On 13 January 2012, S&P proceeded to downgrade the credit ratings of France, Austria, Italy, Spain, Portugal and a handful of other EEA states (while reaffirming the credit ratings of Germany, the Netherlands, Ireland and other EEA states and changed the outlook to 'negative' for 15 Eurozone countries). Further related downgrades of European sovereign ratings and of corporate ratings have occurred since that date, including the downgrade of Greece's sovereign credit rating to 'selective default' by S&P on 27 February 2012 as a result of a debt restructuring that is expected to impose significant losses on private creditors (including ING) and Fitch Ratings Ltd.'s downgrade of Spain's sovereign credit rating from A to BBB on 7 June 2012. Moody's also followed S&P's steps in downgrading France's credit rating in November 2012. These announcements, as well as any further future downgrades, could negatively affect borrowing costs of the affected entities, increase overall economic volatility, and affect the operation of our businesses.

***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 insurance, commercial banking, investment banking, asset management 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, investment performance of our products, the prices and attributes of products and services, scope of distribution, perceived financial strength, credit ratings and actions taken by 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, the United States 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

have sought alliances, mergers or strategic relationships with our competitors. The Netherlands and the United States are our largest markets. Our main competitors in the banking sector in the Netherlands are ABN AMRO Bank and Rabobank. Our main competitors in the insurance sector in the Netherlands are Achmea, ASR, Delta Lloyd and Aegon. Our main competitors in the United States are insurance companies such as Lincoln National, Hartford, Aegon Americas, AXA, Met Life, Prudential, Nationwide and Principal Financial. 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. Increasing competition in these or any of our other markets 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. In addition, under the Restructuring Plan we were required to agree to certain restrictions imposed by the EC, including with respect to our price leadership in EU banking markets and our ability to make acquisitions of financial institutions and other businesses. See 'Risks related to the Restructuring Plan – The limitations required by the EC on our ability to compete and to make acquisitions or call certain debt instruments could materially impact the Group'. Furthermore, if our financial strength and credit ratings are lower than those of our competitors, we may experience increased surrenders and/or a significant decline in sales of insurance and annuities products. Due to the competitive nature of the financial services industry, there can be no assurance that we will continue to effectively compete within the industry or that competition will not have a material adverse impact on our business, results of operations and financial conditions.

***Because we do business with many counterparties, the inability of these counterparties to meet their financial obligations could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations.***

#### *General*

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, customers, trading counterparties, counterparties under swaps, credit default and other derivative contracts, clearing agents, exchanges, clearing houses and other financial intermediaries. Severe distress or 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, operational failure or other factors, or even rumours about potential severe distress or defaults by one or more of these parties or regarding the financial services industry generally, could lead to losses for us, and defaults by other institutions. In light of experiences with significant constraints on liquidity and high cost of funds in the interbank lending market, and 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, which exposes it to concentration risk.

We routinely execute a high volume of transactions with counterparties in the financial services industry, including brokers and dealers, commercial banks, investment banks, mutual and hedge funds, insurance companies and other institutional clients, resulting in large daily settlement amounts and significant credit exposure. As a result, we face concentration risk with respect to 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 financial services institutions could therefore lead to further significant systemic liquidity problems, or losses or defaults by other financial institutions.

With respect to secured transactions, our credit risk may be exacerbated when the collateral held by us cannot be realised, or is liquidated at prices not sufficient to recover the full amount of the loan or derivative exposure due 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 defer 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 defer 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 or results of operations.

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. Our credit risk may also be exacerbated when the collateral we hold cannot be realised or is liquidated at prices not sufficient to recover the full amount of the loan or derivative exposure that is due to us, which is most likely to occur during periods of illiquidity and depressed asset valuations, such as those experienced during the recent financial crisis. The termination of contracts and the foreclosure on collateral may subject us to claims for the improper exercise of our rights under such contracts. 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.

#### *Reinsurers*

Our insurance operations have bought protection for risks that exceed certain risk tolerance levels set for both our life and non-life businesses. This protection is bought through reinsurance arrangements in order to reduce possible losses. However, we remain liable to the underlying policyholders, even if the reinsurer defaults on its obligations. Because in most cases we must pay the policyholders first, and then collect from the reinsurer, we are subject to credit risk with respect to each reinsurer for all such amounts. As a percentage of our net reinsurance exposure as of 31 December 2012, the greatest exposure after collateral to an individual external reinsurer was approximately 19%, approximately 46% related to four other external reinsurers and the remainder of the reinsurance exposure related to various other reinsurers. The inability or unwillingness of any one of these reinsurers to meet its financial obligations to us, or the insolvency of our reinsurers, could have a material adverse effect on our net results and our financial results.

***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.***

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 further contraction in the residential mortgage and commercial lending market and to further decreases in residential and commercial property prices which could generate substantial increases in impairment losses.

***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 for our banking business the levels of deposits and the demand for loans. In a period of changing interest rates, interest expense may increase and interest credited to policyholders may change at different rates than the interest earned on assets. Accordingly, changes in interest rates could decrease net interest revenue. Central banks around the world, including the European Central Bank, the Bank of England, the Bank of Japan, the Bank of Australia, the Central Bank of Brazil and the Central Bank of China, followed the actions of the Federal Reserve to lower interest rate in 2012, in response to concerns about Europe's sovereign debt crisis and slowing global economic growth. Changes in the interest rates may negatively affect the value of our assets and our ability to realise gains or avoid losses from the sale of those assets, all of which also ultimately affect earnings. In addition, our insurance and annuity products and certain of our retirement and investment products are sensitive to inflation rate fluctuations. A sustained increase in the inflation rate in our principal markets may also negatively affect our business, financial condition and results of operation. 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.

Declining interest rates may result in:

- life insurance and annuity products being relatively more attractive to consumers due to minimum guarantees with respect to such products that are frequently mandated by regulators;
- increased premium payments on products with flexible premium features;

- a higher percentage of insurance and annuity contracts remaining in force from year-to-year than we anticipated in our pricing, potentially resulting in greater claims costs than we expected and creating asset liability cash flow mismatches;
- additional provisions for guarantees included in life insurance and annuity contracts, as the guarantees become more valuable to policyholders;
- lower investment earnings because the interest earnings on our fixed income investments will likely have declined in parallel with market interest rates on our assets recorded at fair value;
- reserve strengthening by affecting the results of our reserve adequacy testing;
- higher prepayment or redemption of mortgages and fixed maturity securities in our investment portfolios as borrowers seek to borrow at lower interest rates. Consequently, we may be required to reinvest the proceeds in securities bearing lower interest rates;
- lower profitability as the result of a decrease in the spread between interest rates charged to policyholders and returns on our investment portfolios;
- higher costs for certain derivative instruments that may be used to hedge certain of our product risks; and/or
- lower profitability since we may not be able to fully track the decline in interest rates in our savings rate.

Accordingly, during periods of declining interest rates, our profitability may suffer as the result of a decrease in the spread between interest rates credited to insurance policyholders and annuity contract owners. An extended period of declining interest rates may also cause us to change our long-term view of the interest rates that we can earn on our investments. In addition, certain statutory capital and reserve requirements are based on formulas and models that consider interest rates, and an extended period of low interest rates may increase the statutory capital we are required to hold and the amount of assets we must maintain to support statutory reserves.

Rapidly increasing interest rates may result in:

- decrease the demand for loans;
- increase in policy loans, and withdrawals from and/or surrenders of life insurance policies and fixed annuity contracts as policyholders choose to forego insurance protection and seek higher investment returns. Obtaining cash to satisfy these obligations may require us to liquidate fixed maturity investments at a time when market prices for those assets are depressed because of increases in interest rates. This may result in realised investment losses. Regardless of whether we realise an investment loss, these cash payments would result in a decrease in total invested assets, and may decrease our net income. Premature withdrawals may also cause us to accelerate amortisation of deferred policy acquisition costs, which would also reduce our net income;
- prepayment losses if prepayment rates are lower than expected or if interest rates increase to rapidly to adjust the accompanying hedges;
- higher interest rates to be paid on debt securities we have issued or may issue on the financial markets from time to time to finance our operations, which would increase our interest expenses and reduce our results of operations;
- a material adverse effect on the value of our investment portfolio by, for example, decreasing the estimated fair values of the fixed income securities within our investment portfolio;
- a significant collateral posting requirement associated with our interest rate hedge programs, which could materially and adversely affect liquidity; and/or
- decreased fee income associated with a decline in the value of variable annuity account balances invested in fixed income funds.

***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. As a result of the increased number of bank failures, in particular since the fall of 2008, we expect that levies in the industry will continue to rise as a result of the Compensation Schemes. In particular, we are 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). The costs involved with making compensation payments under the Dutch Deposit Guarantee Scheme are 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 Schemes. 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. The ultimate costs to the industry of payments which may become due under the Compensation Schemes remains uncertain although they may be significant and these and the associated costs to us may have a material adverse effect on our



results of operations and financial condition. As of 1 July 2015, the Dutch Deposit Guarantee Scheme will change from an ex-post scheme, where we contribute after the failure of a firm, to an ex-ante scheme where we will pay risk-weighted contributions to the Dutch Deposit Guarantee Scheme. The fund is to grow to a target size of 1% of all deposits guaranteed under the Dutch Deposit Guarantee Scheme, approximately EUR 4 billion at present. The target size has to be reached in 15 years. The costs associated with potential future ex-ante contributions are today unknown and will depend on the methodology used to calculate risk-weighting, but given our size may be significant. See also ‘– We operate in highly regulated industries. There could be an adverse change or increase in the financial services laws and/or regulations governing our business – Dutch Intervention Act’.

#### **RISKS RELATED TO THE GROUP’S BUSINESS, OPERATIONS, AND REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT**

##### ***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 mortality and longevity. 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 credit worthiness 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, perhaps 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 (‘CVA’) 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 and may use may not adequately mitigate or offset the risk of interest rate volatility, 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.

##### **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 ING Group operates. The success of ING Group’s operations is dependent, among other things, on ING Group’s ability to attract and retain highly qualified professional 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 senior officers, experienced portfolio managers, mutual fund managers and sales executives, is dependent on a number of factors, including prevailing market conditions and compensation packages offered by companies competing for the same talent.

As a part of the responses of the European Commission and governments throughout Europe to the financial crisis in 2008, there have been and will be various legislative initiatives, including those set out in Directive 2010/76/EU (CRD III), the Guidelines on Remuneration Policies and Practices published by (the predecessor of) the European Banking Authority (‘EBA’) and the Regulation of the DNB on Sound Remuneration Policies

---

## [Table of Contents](#)

(Regeling beheerst beloningsbeleid Wft 2011) and 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), to ensure that financial institutions' remuneration policies and practices are consistent with and promote sound and effective risk management, and that impose restrictions on the remuneration of personnel, in particular senior management, with a focus on risk alignment of performance-related remuneration. Since the financial crisis, ING has adopted its remuneration policies to the new national and international standards. In March 2011, ING Group's Executive Board had announced that it had decided not to accept the variable remuneration awarded to it until the remaining capital support from the Dutch state has been fully repaired. No base salary increase in relation to 2013 has been proposed and, as of 31 December 2012, the remuneration level of the Executive Board of ING Group was below the median of our EURO Stoxx 50 benchmark, which is made up of similar European financial and non-financial institutions. These restrictions will continue to have an impact on existing ING Group's remuneration policies and individual remuneration packages of personnel.

These restrictions, alone or in combination with the other factors described above, could adversely affect ING Group's ability to retain or attract qualified employees.

***We may not be able to protect our intellectual property and may be subject to infringement claims.***

We rely on a combination of contractual rights with third parties and copyright, trademark, 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, patents, trade secrets and know-how or to determine their scope, validity or enforceability. This would represent a diversion of resources that may be significant 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 by third parties for (i) patent, trademark or copyright infringement, (ii) breach of copyright, trademark or license usage rights, or (iii) 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 licenses. Alternatively, we could be required to enter into costly licensing arrangements with third parties or implement a costly work around. Any of these scenarios could have a material adverse effect on our business and results of operations.

***Because we use assumptions about factors to calculate the amount of certain items, the use of different assumptions about these factors may have an adverse impact on our results of operations.***

The establishment of insurance provisions, including the impact of minimum guarantees which are contained within certain variable annuity products, the adequacy test performed on the provisions for life policies and the establishment of Deferred Acquisition Costs ('DAC') and Value of Business Acquired ('VOBA') are inherently uncertain processes involving assumptions about factors such as court decisions, changes in laws, social, economic and demographic trends, inflation, investment returns, policyholder behaviour (e.g., lapses, persistency, etc.) and other factors, and, in the life insurance business, assumptions concerning mortality, longevity and morbidity trends. The use of different assumptions about these factors could have a material effect on insurance provisions and underwriting expense. Changes in assumptions may lead to changes in the insurance provisions over time. Furthermore, some of these assumptions can be volatile.

***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 and insurance books. Assumptions are used to determine insurance liabilities, the price sensitivity of savings and current accounts and to estimate the embedded optional risk in the mortgage and investment portfolios. The realisation or use of different assumptions to determine the client behaviour could have material adverse effect on the calculated risk figures and ultimately future results.

ING Insurance has a significant exposure to the take-up of policy options by policyholders. The exposure is greatest for variable annuity business with guarantees deeply in-the-money, policyholder behaviour is difficult to predict and small changes in the proportion of policyholders taking up an option can have a significant financial impact. Furthermore, assumptions about policyholder behaviour are sometimes made for new insurance business without a substantial amount of experiential data. These assumptions may prove imperfect, which can

have a material impact on results. See 'Because we use assumptions about factors to calculate the amount of certain items, the use of different assumptions about these factors may have an adverse impact on our results of operations'.

***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 significant 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.

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

We have developed risk management policies and procedures and expect to continue to do so 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 what is suggested by historic 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 the 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, catastrophe 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, 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.

***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 judiciary system, it could have an adverse effect on our operations and net result.

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, in these markets. In addition, the current economic environment in certain of these 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 in the event of defaults on residential mortgages.

***Because we are continually developing new financial products, we might be faced with claims that could have an adverse effect on our operations and net result if clients' expectations are not met.***

When new financial products are brought to the market, communication and marketing aims to present a balanced view of such products. Whilst we engage in a due diligence process when we develop products, if the products do not generate the expected profit, or result in a loss, or otherwise do not meet expectations, customers may file mis-selling claims against us. Mis-selling claims are claims from customers who allege that they have received misleading advice or other information from either ING internal or external advisors (even though ING does not always have full control over the external advisors). 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 money has been invested in reviewing and assessing historic sales practices, and in the maintenance of 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 historic 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/or regulatory changes resulting from such issues could have a material adverse effect on our reputation, operations and net result. Customer protection regulations, as well as changes in interpretation and perception by both the public at large and governmental authorities of acceptable market practices, might influence client expectations.

***Ratings are important to our business for a number of reasons. A downgrade or a potential downgrade in our financial strength or 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 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 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 Standard & Poor's Ratings Service, 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. For example, on 15 June 2012, Moody's downgraded the long-term debt ratings of ING Groep N.V. from A1 to A3 with negative outlook and ING Bank from Aa3 to A2 with negative outlook. At the same time, Moody's took negative ratings actions with respect to a number of European-based banking organisations.

Claims-paying ability, at the Group or subsidiary level, and financial strength ratings are factors in establishing the competitive position of insurers. A rating downgrade could elevate lapses or surrenders of policies requiring cash payments by current customers seeking companies with higher financial strength ratings, which might force us to sell assets at a price that may result in realised investment losses. Among others, total invested assets decreases and deferred acquisition costs might need to be accelerated, adversely impacting earnings. Furthermore, sales of assets to meet customer withdrawal demands could also result in losses, depending on market conditions. In addition, a downgrade in either our financial strength or credit ratings could potentially, among other things, increase our borrowing costs and make it more difficult to access financing; adversely affect access to the commercial paper market or the availability of letters of credit and other financial guarantees; result in additional collateral requirements, or other required payments or termination rights under derivative contracts or other agreements; and/or impair, or cause the termination of, our relationships with creditors, broker-dealers, distributors of our products and services and customers, reinsurers or trading counterparties, which could potentially negatively affect our profitability, new sales, liquidity, capital and/or our competitive position.

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. For ING's insurance businesses in a number of jurisdictions, such as the U.S. and the EU, downgrades of assets will similarly affect the capital requirements for ING Insurance in those jurisdictions.

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.

***Our business may be negatively affected by a sustained increase in inflation.***

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:

(1) decrease the estimated fair value of certain fixed income securities 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 of collateral values,

(2) result in increased surrenders of certain life & savings products, particularly, those with fixed rates below market rates,

## [Table of Contents](#)

(3) require us, as an issuer of securities, to pay higher interest rates on debt securities 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, and/or

(4) result in decreased fee income associated with a decline in the variable annuity balances invested in fixed income funds.

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:

(1) 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 negatively impact our solvency position,

(2) negatively impact performance, future sales and surrenders of certain products where underlying investments are often allocated to equity funds,

(3) negatively impact the ability of our asset management subsidiaries to retain and attract assets under management, as well as the value of assets they do manage, which may negatively impact their results of operations, and/or

(4) result in decreased fee income associated with a decline in the variable annuity balances invested in fixed income funds. In addition, in the context of certain property & casualty risks underwritten by our insurance subsidiaries (particularly 'long-tail' risks), a sustained increase in inflation with a resulting increase in market interest rates may result in (i) claims inflation (i.e., an increase in the amount ultimately paid to settle claims several years after the policy coverage period or event giving rise to the claim), coupled with (ii) an underestimation of corresponding claims reserves at the time of establishment due to a failure to fully anticipate increased inflation and its effect on the amounts ultimately payable to policyholders, and, consequently, (iii) actual claims payments significantly exceeding associated insurance reserves which would negatively impact our results of operations. In addition, a failure to accurately anticipate higher inflation and factor it into our product pricing assumptions may result in a systemic mispricing of our products resulting in underwriting losses which would negatively impact our results of operations.

### ***Operational risks are inherent in our business.***

Our businesses depend on the ability to process a large number of transactions efficiently and accurately. Although we endeavour to safeguard our systems, losses can result from inadequately trained or skilled personnel, IT failures, inadequate or failed internal control processes and systems, regulatory breaches, human errors, employee misconduct including fraud, or from 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. In addition, whilst we have policies and processes to protect our systems and networks they may be vulnerable to unauthorised access, computer viruses or other malicious code 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 counterparts. These events can potentially result in financial loss, harm to our reputation and hinder our operational effectiveness.

We also face the risk that the design and operating effectiveness of our controls and procedures prove to be inadequate. Widespread outbreaks of communicable diseases, such as the outbreak of the H1N1 influenza virus, 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. 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 or do not sufficiently take such events into account, losses may increase further. We have suffered losses from operational risk in the past and there can be no assurance that we will not suffer material losses from operational risk in the future.

### ***Reinsurance may not be available, affordable or adequate to protect us against losses. We may also decide to reduce, eliminate or decline primary insurance or reinsurance coverage.***

As part of our overall risk and capacity management strategy, we purchase reinsurance for certain risks underwritten by our various insurance business segments. Market conditions beyond our control determine the availability and cost of the reinsurance protection we purchase. Accordingly, we may be forced to incur additional expenses for reinsurance or may not be able to obtain sufficient reinsurance on acceptable terms, which could adversely affect our ability to write future business.

In addition, we determine the appropriate level of primary insurance and reinsurance coverage based on a number of factors and from time to time decide to reduce, eliminate or decline coverage based on our assessment of the costs and benefits involved. In such cases, the uninsured risk remains with us.

***Our business may be negatively affected by adverse publicity, regulatory actions or litigation with respect to us, other well-known companies or the financial services industry in general.***

Adverse publicity and damage to our reputation arising from our failure or perceived failure to comply with legal and regulatory requirements, 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, increasing regulatory and law enforcement scrutiny of 'know your customer' anti-money laundering, prohibited transactions with countries subject to sanctions, and bribery or other anti-corruption measures and anti-terrorist-financing procedures and their effectiveness, regulatory investigations of the mutual fund, banking and insurance industries, and litigation that arises from the failure or perceived failure by us to comply with legal, regulatory and compliance requirements, could result in adverse publicity and reputation harm, lead to increased regulatory supervision, affect our ability to attract and retain customers, maintain access to the capital markets, result in cease and desist orders, suits, 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 for our employees. Some of the legal proceedings may be brought on behalf of a class and plaintiffs may seek large or indeterminate amounts of damage, including compensatory, liquidated, treble and/or punitive damages. Our reserves for litigation may prove to be inadequate. It is possible that our results of operations or cash flow in a particular quarterly or annual period could be materially affected by an ultimate unfavourable resolution of pending litigation depending, in part, upon the results of operations or cash flow for such period. Given the large or indeterminate amounts sometimes sought, and the inherent unpredictability of litigation, it is also possible that in certain cases an ultimate unfavourable resolution of one or more pending litigation matters could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition. For additional information with respect to specific proceedings, see 'Item 8. Financial Information – Legal Proceedings'.

#### **RISKS RELATED TO THE RESTRUCTURING PLAN**

***The implementation of the Restructuring Plan and the divestments anticipated in connection with that plan will significantly alter the size and structure of the Group and involve significant costs and uncertainties that could materially impact the Group.***

In November 2008 the Dutch State purchased the Core Tier 1 Securities, and in the first quarter of 2009 we entered into the Illiquid Asset Back-up Facility ('IABF') with the Dutch State, the structure of which has been since then modified as per the Amended and Restated Illiquid Assets Back-up Facility of 13 November 2012, in connection with the sale of ING Direct U.S. in February 2012. As a result of having received state aid through the Dutch State Transactions, we were required to submit a restructuring plan to the European Commission ('EC') in connection with obtaining final approval for the Dutch State Transactions under the EC state aid rules. On 26 October 2009, we announced our restructuring plan ('Initial Restructuring Plan'), pursuant to which we were required to divest by the end of 2013 all of our insurance business, including the investment management business, as well as ING Direct U.S., which operated our direct banking business in the United States, and certain portions of our retail banking business in the Netherlands. The EC's approval of the Initial Restructuring Plan was issued on 18 November 2009. On 28 January 2010 ING lodged an appeal with the General Court of the European Union ('General Court') against specific elements of the EC's decision regarding the Initial Restructuring Plan. On 2 March 2012, the General Court partially annulled the EC's decision of 18 November 2009. Subsequently, the EC filed an appeal against the General Court's judgment before the Court of Justice of the European Union. In parallel, the EC adopted a decision on 11 May 2012 that re-approved the state aid granted to ING Group as compatible with the internal market on the basis of the Initial Restructuring Plan. On the same date, the EC adopted an interim decision which opened an investigation concerning certain amendments and elements of the Initial Restructuring Plan. On 24 July 2012, ING announced that the Dutch State and ING were in dialogue with the European Commission on an amended and updated Restructuring Plan to be submitted to the European Commission. However, in order to safeguard its legal rights, ING filed an appeal with the General Court of the European Union against the European Commission's decision of 11 May 2012, which re-approved the Initial Restructuring Plan.

On 19 November 2012, ING and the Dutch State announced that they reached an agreement with the EC on significant amendments to the Initial Restructuring Plan ('Amended Restructuring Plan', and together with the Initial Restructuring Plan, 'Restructuring Plan'). The Amended Restructuring Plan extended the time horizon and increased the flexibility for the completion of divestments and adjusted other commitments set forth in the Initial Restructuring Plan.

As a result of the Amended Restructuring Plan, the EC has closed its formal investigations as announced on 11 May 2012, and ING has withdrawn its appeal with the General Court filed in July 2012. Although EC's appeal

against the March 2012 ruling of the General Court is expected to continue, ING, the Dutch State and the EC have agreed that any outcome of this procedure will not affect the approval of the Amended Restructuring Plan. See Note 34 of the Notes to the consolidated annual accounts of ING Group in the 2012 Annual Report of ING Groep N.V for more information on and implications of the Amended Restructuring Plan.

The restrictions imposed by the Restructuring Plan could adversely affect our ability to maintain or grow market share in key markets as well as our results of operations. See 'Risks Related to the Restructuring Plan. See '– The limitations required by the EC on our ability to compete and to make acquisitions or call certain debt instruments could materially impact the Group'.

There can be no assurance that we will be able to implement the Restructuring Plan successfully or complete the announced divestments on favorable terms or at all, particularly in light of the market developments in general as well as the fact that other financial institutions may place similar assets for sale during the same time period and may seek to dispose of assets in the same manner. Any failure to successfully implement the Restructuring Plan may result in EC enforcement actions or EC procedures and may have a material adverse impact on the assets, profitability, capital adequacy and business operations of the Group. Moreover, in connection with the implementation of the Restructuring Plan, including any proposed divestments, we or potential buyers may need to obtain various approvals, including of shareholders, works councils and regulatory and competition authorities, and we and potential buyers may face difficulties in obtaining these approvals in a timely manner or at all. In addition, the implementation of the Restructuring Plan may strain relations with our employees, and specific proposals in connection with the implementation may be opposed by labor unions or works councils. Furthermore, following the announcement of the Initial Restructuring Plan, for example, several of our subsidiaries were downgraded or put on credit watch by rating agencies. See 'Risks Related to the Group's Business, Operations, and Regulatory Environment – Ratings are important to our business for a number of reasons. A downgrade or a potential downgrade in our financial strength or our credit ratings could have an adverse impact on our operations and net results'.

Other factors that may impede our ability to implement the Restructuring Plan successfully include an inability of prospective purchasers to obtain funding due to the deterioration of the credit markets, insufficient access to equity capital markets, a general unwillingness of prospective purchasers to commit capital in the current market environment, antitrust concerns, any adverse changes in market interest rates or other borrowing costs and any declines in the value of the assets to be divested. Similarly, it may also be difficult to divest all or part of our insurance or investment management business through one or more initial public offerings. There can also be no assurance that we could obtain favorable pricing for a sale of all or part of our insurance or investment management business in the public markets or succeed in turning the relevant subsidiaries into viable stand-alone businesses. A divestment may also release less regulatory capital than we would otherwise expect.

Any failure to complete the divestments on favorable terms, could have a material adverse impact on our assets, profitability, capital adequacy and business operations. If we are unable to complete the announced divestments in a timely manner, we would be required to find alternative ways to reduce our leverage, and we could be subject to enforcement actions or proceedings by the EC. In particular, if we do not succeed in completing divestitures as described in the Amended Restructuring Plan within the timelines set out therein and/or do not succeed in satisfying the commitments with respect to Nationale Nederlanden Bank by year-end 2015 as described in the Amended Restructuring Plan, the Dutch State will re-notify this to the EC who may take any enforcement action, require additional restructuring measures and/or request the Dutch State to appoint a divestiture trustee with a mandate to complete the relevant divestiture with no minimum price.

The implementation of the divestments announced in connection with the Restructuring Plan, including the separation of the insurance and most of the investment management operations from the banking operations, will also give rise to additional costs related to the legal and financial assessment of potential transactions. The implementation may also result in increased operating and administrative costs. The process of completing the steps contemplated by the Restructuring Plan may be disruptive to our business and the businesses we are trying to sell and may cause an interruption or reduction of our business and the businesses to be sold as a result of, among other factors, the loss of key employees or customers and the diversion of management's attention from our day-to-day business as a result of the need to manage the divestment process as well as any disruptions or difficulties that arise during the course of the divestment process. We may face other difficulties in implementing the Restructuring Plan and completing the planned divestments. For instance, the divestments, individually or in the aggregate, may trigger provisions in various contractual obligations, including debt and capital instruments, which could require us to modify, restructure or refinance those or other related obligations. We may not be able to effect any such restructuring or refinancing on similar terms as the current contractual obligations or at all. In addition, the announced divestments could be the subject of challenges or litigation, and a court could delay any of the divestment transactions or prohibit them from occurring on their proposed terms, or from occurring at all, which could adversely affect our ability to use the funds of the divestments to repay the remaining amount of the Core Tier 1 Securities, reduce or eliminate our double leverage and strengthen our capital ratios as anticipated and eliminate the constraints on competition imposed by the EC.



***The limitations required by the EC on our ability to compete and to make acquisitions or call certain debt instruments could materially impact the Group.***

As part of our Restructuring Plan, we have undertaken with the EC to accept certain limitations on our ability to compete in certain retail, private and direct banking markets in the European Union and on our ability to acquire (i) financial institutions and (ii) businesses insofar this would delay our repayment of the remaining Core Tier 1 Securities held by the Dutch State. These restrictions in principle apply until the earlier of (1) 18 November 2015, and (2) the date upon which more than 50% of the required divestments has been made. We were also required to agree to limitations on our ability to call Tier-2 capital and Tier-1 hybrid debt instruments, which remain subject to authorisations by the EC on a case-by-case basis until the earlier of 18 November 2014 or the repayment of the remaining Core Tier 1 Securities (including the relevant accrued interest on Core Tier 1 coupons and exit premium fees). If the EC does not approve the calling of Tier-2 capital and Tier-1 hybrid debt instruments in the future, this may have adverse consequences for us, result in additional payments on these instruments and limit our ability to seek refinancing on more favorable terms. ING is furthermore restricted to a maximum ratio for mortgage production at ING Retail Banking Netherlands in relation to the mortgage production of Nationale-Nederlanden Bank until year-end 2015. The limitations described above will impose significant restrictions on our banking business operations and on our ability to take advantage of market conditions and growth opportunities. Such restrictions could adversely affect our ability to maintain or grow market share in key markets, as well as our results of operations.

***Upon the implementation of the Restructuring Plan, we will be less diversified and may experience competitive and other disadvantages.***

Following completion of the planned divestments under the Restructuring Plan, we expect to become a significantly smaller, regional financial institution focused on retail, direct and commercial banking in the Benelux region and certain other parts of Europe, as well as selected markets outside Europe. Although we will remain focused on banking operations, we may become a smaller bank than that represented by our current banking operations. In the highly competitive Benelux market and the other markets in which we operate, our competitors may be larger, more diversified and better capitalised and have greater geographical reach than us, which could have a material adverse effect on our ability to compete, as well as on our profitability. The divested businesses may also compete with the retained businesses, on their own or as part of the purchasers' enlarged businesses. In addition, the restrictions on our ability to be a price leader and make acquisitions and on our compensation policies could further hinder our capacity to compete with competitors not burdened with such restrictions, which could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations. There can be no assurance that the implementation of the Restructuring Plan will not have a material adverse effect on the market share, business and growth opportunities and results of operations for our remaining core banking businesses.

***Our restructuring programs may not yield intended reductions in costs, risk and leverage.***

Projected cost savings and impact on our risk profile and capital associated with the Restructuring Plan are subject to a variety of risks, including:

- contemplated costs to effect these initiatives may exceed estimates;
- divestments planned in connection with the Restructuring Plan may not yield the level of net proceeds expected, as described under 'Risks Related to the Restructuring Plan – The implementation of the Restructuring Plan and the divestments anticipated in connection with that plan will significantly alter the size and structure of the Group and involve significant costs and uncertainties that could materially impact the Group';
- initiatives we are contemplating may require consultation with various regulators as well as employees and labor representatives, and such consultations may influence the timing, costs and extent of expected savings;
- the loss of skilled employees in connection with the initiatives; and
- projected savings may fall short of targets.

While we have begun and expect to continue to implement these strategies, there can be no assurance that we will be able to do so successfully or that we will realise the projected benefits of these and other restructuring and cost-saving initiatives. If we are unable to realise these anticipated cost reductions, our business may be adversely affected. Moreover, our continued implementation of restructuring and cost saving initiatives may have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows.

***Our agreements with the Dutch State impose certain restrictions regarding the issuance or repurchase of our shares and the compensation of certain senior management positions.***

In connection with the transactions with the Dutch State, the Dutch State was granted the right to nominate two candidates for appointment to the Supervisory Board ('State Nominees'). The Dutch State's nominees have veto rights over certain material transactions. For so long as the Dutch State holds at least 25% of the Core Tier

1 Securities, for so long as the IABF is in place or for so long as any of the government-guaranteed senior unsecured bonds issued by ING Bank N.V. under the Credit Guarantee Scheme of the Netherlands ('Government Guaranteed Bonds') are outstanding, we are prohibited from issuing or repurchasing any of our own shares (other than as part of regular hedging operations and the issuance of shares according to employment schemes) without the consent of the State Nominees. In addition, under the terms of the Core Tier 1 Securities and IABF, we have agreed to institute certain restrictions on the compensation of the members of the Executive Board and senior management, including incentives or performance-based compensation. These restrictions could hinder or prevent us from attracting or retaining the most qualified management with the talent and experience to manage our business effectively. See 'Risks Related to the Group's Business, Operations, and Regulatory Environment – ING Group may be unable to retain key personnel' above. Our agreements with the Dutch State have also led to certain restrictions imposed by the EC as part of the Restructuring Plan, including with respect to our price leadership in EU banking markets and our ability to make acquisitions of financial institutions and other businesses. See '– The limitations required by the EC on our ability to compete and to make acquisitions or call certain debt instruments could materially impact the Group' above.

***Whenever the overall return on the (remaining) Core Tier 1 securities issued to the Dutch State is expected to be lower than 10% p.a. and/or in the event that ING does not repay the remaining Core Tier 1 securities in accordance with the repayment schedule that was submitted to the European Commission as part of the Amended Restructuring Plan, the European Commission may consider the imposition of additional behavioural constraints.***

As stated in the decision of the European Commission of 12 November 2008 (in State aid N 528/2008 – The Netherlands), the Core Tier 1 state-aid measure must be (re)notified to the European Commission by the Dutch authorities if the overall return on the Core Tier 1 Securities of at least 10% p.a. is not expected to be achieved. In such a case, the European Commission may require additional (behavioural) constraints as a condition of the compatibility of the measure.

In 2011, ING reported to the Dutch authorities that ING has abstained from paying dividends on its shares for a period of two consecutive years (i.e. 2009 and 2010) as a result of which the EC opened an investigation into ING's restructuring process. Following the approval of the Amended Restructuring Plan, the EC closed its formal investigations, and on 26 November 2012 ING repaid its first tranche of EUR 1,125 million to the Dutch State. This tranche consisted of EUR 750 million in repayment of Core Tier 1 Securities and EUR 375 million in premiums and interest. The remaining three tranches of EUR 1,125 million each will have a similar composition and are expected to be paid in November 2013, March 2014 and May 2015, respectively, translating into an overall internal rate of return of 12.5%. Any repayment of the remaining Core Tier Securities is conditional on approval from the DNB. Upon reaching the agreement on the Amended Restructuring Plan, ING indicated that it aims to repay the remaining Core Tier 1 Securities as soon as possible and accelerate repayments to the extent it is deemed prudent under prevailing financial circumstances. If the repayment of a tranche cannot be made in full or in part, ING will be required to make it up by a corresponding increase of the subsequent tranche to be repaid.

The Netherlands committed to re-notify the recapitalisation measure in the event that ING does not repay in full two consecutive tranches. Moreover, if ING does not repay a total of EUR 4.5 billion by 15 May 2015, the Dutch State commits to re-notify the recapitalisation measure.

If ING is unable to repay the remaining Core Tier 1 Securities according to the above-mentioned deadlines and other terms agreed with the European Commission, this could result in the European Commission imposing additional (behavioural) constraints on us or taking any enforcement action against us.

#### **ADDITIONAL RISKS RELATING TO OWNERSHIP OF ING SHARES**

***Because we are a Dutch company and because the Stichting ING Aandelen holds more than 99.9% of our Ordinary Shares, the rights of our depositary receiptholders may differ from the rights of shareholders in other jurisdictions or companies that do not use a similar trust structure, which could affect your rights as an equity investor.***

While holders of our bearer depositary receipts are entitled to attend and speak at our General Meeting of Shareholders ('General Meeting'), voting rights are not attached to the bearer depositary receipts. Stichting ING Aandelen ('Trust') holds more than 99.9% of our Ordinary Shares, and exercises the voting rights attached to the Ordinary Shares (for which bearer depositary receipts have been issued). Holders of bearer depositary receipts who attend – in person or by proxy – the General Meeting must obtain and are entitled to voting rights by proxy from the Trust. Holders of bearer depositary receipts and holders of the American Depositary Shares ('ADSs') representing the bearer depositary receipts who do not attend the General Meeting may give binding voting instructions to the Trust. The Trust is entitled to vote on any Ordinary Shares underlying the bearer depositary receipts for which the Trust has not granted voting proxies, or voting instructions have not

been given to the Trust. In exercising its voting discretion, the Trust is required to be guided primarily by the interests of the holders of bearer depositary receipts, while also taking into account:

- our interests, and
- the interests of our affiliates.

The Trust may, but has no obligation to, consult with the holders of bearer depositary receipts in exercising its voting rights in respect of any Ordinary Shares for which it is entitled to vote. These arrangements differ from practices in other jurisdictions, and accordingly may affect the rights of the holders of bearer depositary receipts and their power to affect ING's business and operations.

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

The share price of our bearer depositary receipts has been volatile in the past, and the share price and trading volume of our bearer depositary receipts may continue to be subject to significant fluctuations 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;
- the implementation and outcome of our Restructuring Plan;
- potential litigation or regulatory action involving ING or sectors we have exposure to through our insurance and banking activities;
- 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. See 'Item 8. Financial Information – Dividends'. Given the uncertain financial environment, ING will not pay a dividend over 2012 and until all remaining Core Tier 1 Securities have been repaid to the Dutch State and the Basel III requirements have been met. Furthermore, there can be no assurance that we will pay dividends in the future.

***The remaining Core Tier 1 Securities issued to the Dutch State may be converted into Ordinary Shares or bearer depositary receipts and dilute existing shareholders.***

The terms of the Core Tier 1 Securities permit us, on or after 12 November 2011, to convert any or all of the remaining Core Tier 1 Securities (EUR 2.25 billion per 26 November 2012) into Ordinary Shares or bearer depositary receipts on the basis of one Core Tier 1 Security for 1,335 Ordinary Shares on a one for one basis (subject to customary adjustments as may be necessary to preserve economic equivalence) or bearer depositary receipts. Any such conversion would dilute existing shareholders. If we exercise our conversion right, the Dutch State may opt to require us to redeem the Core Tier 1 Securities on the conversion date at the original issue price of EUR 10 per Core Tier 1 Security, together with the pro rata coupon, if due, accrued to such date.

***Certain holders of ING shares may not be able to participate in future equity offerings with subscription rights.***

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 participate in future equity offerings with subscription rights.