	Rate Duri	Rate During Period	
Last six months	High \$	Low \$	
2012			
October	1.31	1.29	
November	1.30	1.27	
December	1.33	1.29	
2013			
January	1.36	1.30	
February	1.36	1.31	
March	1.31	1.28	
April (through April 17)	1.31	1.28	

On April 17, 2013, the exchange rate for euros and dollars (expressed in dollars per euro), as published by the ECB, was \$1.31.

For a discussion of the accounting principles used in translation of foreign currency-denominated assets and liabilities to euros, see Note 2 (a) of our consolidated financial statements.

B. Capitalization and indebtedness.

Not Applicable.

C. Reasons for the offer and use of proceeds.

Not Applicable.

D. Risk factors.

Because our loan portfolio is concentrated in Continental Europe, the United Kingdom and Latin America, adverse changes affecting the economies of Continental Europe, the United Kingdom or certain Latin American countries could adversely affect our financial condition.

Our loan portfolio is concentrated in Continental Europe (in particular, Spain), the United Kingdom and Latin America. At December 31, 2012, Continental Europe accounted for 40% of our total loan portfolio (Spain accounted for 28% of our total loan portfolio), while the United Kingdom and Latin America accounted for 34% and 20%, respectively. Accordingly, the recoverability of these loan portfolios in particular, and our ability to increase the amount of loans outstanding and our results of operations and financial condition in general, are dependent to a significant extent on the level of economic activity in Continental Europe (in particular, Spain), the United Kingdom and Latin America. Continued recessionary economic conditions in the economies of Continental Europe (in particular, Spain), or a return to recessionary conditions in the United Kingdom or the Latin American countries in which we operate, would likely have a significant adverse impact on our loan portfolio and, as a result, on our financial condition, cash flows and results of operations. See "Item 4. Information on the Company—B. Business Overview."

We are vulnerable to the current disruptions and volatility in the global financial markets.

In the past five years, financial systems worldwide have experienced difficult credit and liquidity conditions and disruptions leading to less liquidity, greater volatility, general widening of spreads and, in some cases, lack of price transparency on interbank lending rates. Global economic conditions deteriorated significantly between 2007 and 2009, and many of the countries in which we operate fell into recession. Recessionary conditions continue in some countries. Many major financial institutions, including some of the world's largest global commercial banks, investment banks, mortgage lenders, mortgage guarantors and insurance companies experienced, and some continue to experience, significant difficulties. Around the world, there have also been runs on deposits at several financial institutions, numerous institutions have sought additional capital or have been assisted by governments, and many lenders and institutional investors have reduced or ceased providing funding to borrowers (including to other financial institutions).

In particular, we may face, among others, the following risks related to the economic downturn:

We potentially face increased regulation of our industry. Compliance with such regulation may increase our costs, may affect the pricing for our
products and services, and limit our ability to pursue business opportunities.

- Reduced demand for our products and services.
- Inability of our borrowers to timely or fully comply with their existing obligations.
- The process we use to estimate losses inherent in our credit exposure requires complex judgments, including forecasts of economic conditions and how these economic conditions might impair the ability of our borrowers to repay their loans. The degree of uncertainty concerning economic conditions may adversely affect the accuracy of our estimates, which may, in turn, impact the reliability of the process and the quality of our assets.
- The value and liquidity of the portfolio of investment securities that we hold may be adversely affected.
- Worsening of the global economic conditions may delay the recovery of the international financial industry and impact our financial condition and results of operations.
- The recoverability of our retail loans in particular may be increasingly vulnerable to macroeconomic shocks that could negatively impact the household income of our retail customers and result in increased loan losses.

Some uncertainty remains concerning the future economic environment. While certain segments of the global economy are currently experiencing a moderate recovery, we expect such uncertainty will continue, which could have a negative impact on our business and results of operations. Global investor confidence remains cautious and downgrades of the sovereign debt of Ireland, Greece, Portugal, Spain, Italy and France, as well as the recent developments and banking crisis in Cyprus, have caused volatility in the capital markets. A slowing or failing of the economic recovery would likely aggravate the adverse effects of these difficult economic and market conditions on us and on others in the financial services industry.

Continued or worsening disruption and volatility in the global financial markets could have a material adverse effect on us, including our ability to access capital and liquidity on financial terms acceptable to us, if at all. If capital markets financing ceases to become available, or becomes excessively expensive, we may be forced to raise the rates we pay on deposit to attract more customers and become unable to maintain certain liability maturities. Any such increase in capital markets funding costs or deposit rates could have a material adverse effect on our interest margins.

If all or some of the foregoing risks were to materialize, this could have a material adverse effect on us.

We may suffer adverse effects as a result of the ongoing economic and sovereign debt tensions in the eurozone

Eurozone markets and economies continue to show signs of fragility and volatility, with recession in several economies, including Germany, and only sporadic access to capital markets in others. Interest rate differentials among eurozone countries are affecting government finance and borrowing rates in those economies.

The European Central Bank (the "ECB") and European Council took actions in 2012 to aim to reduce the risk of contagion throughout and beyond the eurozone. These included the creation of the Open Market Transaction facility of the ECB and the decision by eurozone governments to create a banking union. Nonetheless, a significant number of financial institutions throughout Europe have substantial exposures to sovereign debt issued by nations that are under financial pressure. Should any of those nations default on their debt, or experience a significant widening of credit spreads, major financial institutions and banking systems throughout Europe could be destabilized, resulting in the further spread of the ongoing economic crisis.

The continued high cost of capital for some European governments has impacted the wholesale markets and there has been a consequent increase in the cost of retail funding, with greater competition in a savings market that is growing slowly by historical standards. In the absence of a permanent resolution of the eurozone crisis, conditions could deteriorate.

We have direct and indirect exposure to financial and economic conditions throughout the eurozone economies. Although we believe the possibility to be remote following the measures taken in 2012, if a wide-scale break-up of the eurozone were to occur, it would most likely be associated with a deterioration in the economic and financial environment and could have a material adverse impact on the whole financial sector, creating new challenges in sovereign and corporate lending and resulting in significant disruptions in financial activities at both the market and retail levels. This could materially and adversely affect our operating results, financial position and prospects.

Market conditions have, and could result, in material changes to the estimated fair values of our financial assets. Negative fair value adjustments could have a material adverse effect on our operating results, financial condition and prospects

In the past five years, financial markets have been subject to significant stress resulting in steep falls in perceived or actual financial asset values, particularly due to volatility in global financial markets and the resulting widening of credit

spreads. We have material exposures to securities and other investments that are recorded at fair value and are therefore exposed to potential negative fair value adjustments. Asset valuations in future periods, reflecting then prevailing market conditions, may result in negative changes in the fair values of our financial assets and these may also translate into increased impairments. In addition, the value ultimately realized by us on disposal may be lower than the current fair value. Any of these factors could require us to record negative fair value adjustments, which may have a material adverse effect on our operating results, financial condition or prospects.

In addition, to the extent that fair values are determined using financial valuation models, such values may be inaccurate or subject to change, as the data used by such models may not be available or may become unavailable due to changes in market conditions, particularly for illiquid assets, and particularly in times of economic instability. In such circumstances, our valuation methodologies require us to make assumptions, judgments and estimates in order to establish fair value, and reliable assumptions are difficult to make and are inherently uncertain and valuation models are complex, making them inherently imperfect predictors of actual results. Any consequential impairments or write-downs could have a material adverse effect on our operating results, financial condition and prospects.

Our financial statements are based in part on assumptions and estimates which, if inaccurate, could cause material misstatement of the results of our operations and financial position.

The preparation of financial statements requires management to make judgments, estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets, liabilities, income and expenses. Due to the inherent uncertainty in making estimates, actual results reported in future periods may be based upon amounts which differ from those estimates. Estimates, judgments and assumptions are continually evaluated and are based on historical experience and other factors, including expectations of future events that are believed to be reasonable under the circumstances. Revisions to accounting estimates are recognized in the period in which the estimate is revised and in any future periods affected. The accounting policies deemed critical to our results and financial position, based upon materiality and significant judgments and estimates, include impairment of loans and advances, goodwill impairment, valuation of financial instruments, impairment of available-for-sale financial assets, deferred tax assets and provision for liabilities.

The valuation of financial instruments measured at fair value can be subjective, in particular where models are used which include unobservable inputs. Given the uncertainty and subjectivity associated with valuing such instruments it is possible that the results of our operations and financial position could be materially misstated if the estimates and assumptions used prove to be inaccurate.

If the judgment, estimates and assumptions we use in preparing our consolidated financial statements are subsequently found to be incorrect, there could be a material effect on our results of operations and a corresponding effect on our funding requirements and capital ratios.

We are subject to substantial regulation which could adversely affect our business and operations.

As a financial institution, we are subject to extensive regulation, which materially affects our businesses. For example, we are subject to capital adequacy requirements which, among other things, require us to maintain minimum ratios of regulatory capital to risk-weighted assets. Any failure by us to comply with capital adequacy requirements may result in administrative actions or sanctions which may affect our ability to fulfill our obligations.

Statutes, regulations and policies to which we are subject, in particular those relating to the banking sector and financial institutions, may be changed at any time. For example, in response to the recent financial crisis, regulators world-wide have imposed, and may continue to impose, more stringent capital adequacy requirements, including increasing the minimum regulatory capital requirements imposed on us. Regulators world-wide have also produced a range of proposals for future legislative and regulatory changes which could force us to comply with certain operational restrictions or take steps to raise further capital, or could increase our expenses, or otherwise adversely affect our operating results, financial condition and prospects. The interpretation and the application by regulators of the laws and regulations to which we are subject may also change from time to time. Any legislative or regulatory actions and any required changes to our business operations resulting from such legislation and regulations could result in significant loss of revenue, limit our ability to pursue business opportunities in which we might otherwise consider engaging, affect the value of assets that we hold, require us to increase our prices and therefore reduce demand for our products, impose additional costs on us or otherwise adversely affect our businesses. Accordingly, there can be no assurance that future changes in regulations or in their interpretation or application will not adversely affect us.

Changes in regulations may also cause us to face increased compliance costs and limitations on our ability to pursue certain business opportunities and provide certain products and services. As some of the banking laws and regulations have

been recently adopted, the manner in which those laws and related regulations are applied to the operations of financial institutions is still evolving. Moreover, to the extent these recently adopted regulations are implemented inconsistently in the various jurisdictions in which we operate, it may face higher compliance costs. No assurance can be given generally that laws or regulations will be adopted, enforced or interpreted in a manner that will not have a material adverse effect on our business and results of operations.

Extensive legislation affecting the financial services industry has recently been adopted in Spain, the United States, the European Union and other jurisdictions, and regulations are in the process of being implemented.

The European Union has created a European Systemic Risk Board to monitor financial stability and has implemented rules that will increase capital requirements for certain trading instruments or exposures and impose compensation limits on certain employees located in affected countries. In addition, the European Union Commission is considering a wide array of other initiatives, including new legislation that will affect derivatives trading, impose surcharges on "globally" systemically important firms and possibly impose new levies on bank balance sheets.

Regulators in the U.K. have produced a range of proposals for future legislative and regulatory changes, which could force us to comply with certain operational restrictions or take steps to raise further capital, or could increase our expenses, or otherwise adversely affect our operating results, financial condition and prospects. These proposals include (i) the introduction of recovery and resolution planning requirements (popularly known as "living wills") for banks and other financial institutions as contingency planning for the failure of a financial institution that may affect the stability of the financial system, (ii) implementation of the Financial Services Act 2012, which enhances the FSA's disciplinary and enforcement powers, (iii) the introduction of more regular and detailed reporting obligations, (iv) a move to pre-funding of the deposit protection scheme in the U.K., (v) a proposal to require large U.K. retail banks to hold a minimum Core Tier 1 to risk-weighted assets ratio of at least 10 percent., which is, broadly, 3 percent higher than the minimum capital levels required under Basel III, and to have a minimum primary loss-absorbing capacity of 17 percent of risk-weighted assets, and (vi) proposed revisions to the approaches for determining trading book capital requirements and banking book risk-weighted assets from the Basel Committee.

In December 2010, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (the "Basel Committee") reached agreement on comprehensive changes to the capital adequacy framework, known as Basel III. A revised version of Basel III was published in June 2011. Basel III is intended to raise the resilience of the banking sector by increasing both the quality and quantity of the regulatory capital base and enhancing the risk coverage of the capital framework. Among other things, Basel III introduces new eligibility criteria for Common Equity Tier 1, Additional Tier 1 and Tier 2 capital instruments that are intended to raise the quality of regulatory capital, and increases the amount of regulatory capital that institutions are required to hold. Basel III also requires institutions to maintain a capital conservation buffer above the minimum capital ratios in order to avoid certain capital distribution constraints. The capital conservation buffer, to be comprised of Common Equity Tier 1 capital, would result in an effective Common Equity Tier 1 capital requirement of 7 percent of risk-weighted assets. In addition, Basel III directs national regulators to require certain institutions to maintain a counter-cyclical capital buffer during periods of excessive credit growth. Basel III introduces a leverage ratio for institutions as a backstop measure, to be applied alongside current risk-based regulatory capital requirements. The implementation of Basel III in the European Union is being performed through the Capital Requirements Directive IV & Capital Requirements Regulation ("CRDIV/CRR") legislative package. In early 2013 the draft legislation remains under discussion between the European Parliament, the European Commission and the Council of Ministers. The final capital framework to be established in the EU under CRDIV/CRR is likely to differ from Basel III in certain areas and the implementation date is still subject to uncertainty.

In addition to the changes to the capital adequacy framework published in December 2010 described above, the Basel Committee also published its global quantitative liquidity framework, comprising the Liquidity Coverage Ratio ("LCR") and Net Stable Funding Ratio ("NSFR") metrics, with objectives to (1) promote the short-term resilience of banks' liquidity risk profiles by ensuring they have sufficient high-quality liquid assets to survive a significant stress scenario; and (2) promote resilience over a longer time horizon by creating incentives for banks to fund their activities with more stable sources of funding on an ongoing basis. The LCR has been subsequently revised by the Basel Committee in January 2013 which amended the definition of high-quality liquid assets and agreed a revised timetable for phase-in of the standard from 2015 to 2019, as well as making some technical changes to some of the stress scenario assumptions. As with the Basel Committee's proposed changes to the capital adequacy framework, the draft liquidity framework remains under discussion within the EU and the final framework to be established could differ from Basel III in certain areas. The implementation date is still subject to uncertainty.

The Spanish Government approved on February 3, 2012 the Royal Decree-Law 2/2012 and on May 18, 2012 the Royal Decree-Law 18/2012 on the clean-up of the financial sector, through which the following actions were performed:

- Review of the minimum provisioning percentages to be taken into consideration in the estimate of the impairment losses relating to financing granted to the property sector in Spain and to the foreclosed assets and assets received in payment of debt arising from financing granted to that sector, as a result of the impairment of these assets.
- Increase in the level of minimum capital requirements of Spanish credit institutions on the basis of the assets relating to the property sector in Spain presented on the balance sheet of each entity at December 31, 2012.

In September 2011, the European Commission (the "Commission") tabled a proposal for a common system of financial transactions taxes ("FTT"). Despite intense discussions on this proposal there was no unanimity amongst the 27 Member States. Eleven Member States ("participating Member State") requested enhanced cooperation on a FTT based upon the Commission's original proposal. The Commission presented a decision to this effect which was adopted by the EU's Council of Finance Ministers at its committee meeting on January 22, 2013. The formal Directive was published on February 14, 2013, under which participating Member States may charge a FTT on all financial transactions with effect from January 1, 2014 where (i) at least one party to the transaction is established in the territory of a participating Member State and (ii) a financial institution established in the territory of a participating Member State is a party to the transaction acting either for its own account or for the account of another person, or is acting in the name of a party to the transaction. We are still assessing the proposals to determine the likely impact on us.

In the United Kingdom, on June 16, 2010, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced the creation of the Independent Commission on Banking (the 'ICB'), chaired by Sir John Vickers. The ICB was asked to consider structural and related non-structural reforms to the U.K. banking sector to promote financial stability and competition, and to make recommendations to the U.K. Government. The ICB gave its recommendations on September 12, 2011 and proposed: (i) implementation of a retail ring fence; (ii) increased capital requirements; and (iii) improvement of competition – which were broadly endorsed by the Government in its response published on December 19, 2011. A White Paper was published on June 14, 2012 detailing how the Government intends to implement the recommendations of the ICB. A draft of the initial bill to implement the ICB recommendations was published on October 12, 2012, in the format of framework legislation to put in place the architecture to effect the reforms, with detailed policy being provided for through secondary legislation. On February 4, 2013, the Financial Services (Banking Reform) Bill was introduced to Parliament. The Government expects the legislation to be in place by 2015 and to take effect by 2019. Implementation of the proposals may require us to make changes to our structure and business.

In the United States, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the "Dodd-Frank Act") which was adopted in 2010 will continue to result in significant structural reforms affecting the financial services industry. This legislation provides for, among other things, the establishment of a Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with broad authority to regulate the credit, savings, payment and other consumer financial products and services that we offer, the creation of a structure to regulate systemically important financial companies, more comprehensive regulation of the over-the-counter derivatives market, prohibitions of our engagement in certain proprietary trading activities and restrictions on our ownership of, investment in or sponsorship of hedge funds and private equity funds, restrictions on the interchange fees we earn through debit card transactions, and a requirement that bank regulators phase out the treatment of trust preferred capital instruments as Tier 1 capital for regulatory capital purposes.

With respect to OTC derivatives, the Dodd-Frank Act provides for an extensive framework for the regulation of OTC derivatives, including mandatory clearing, exchange trading and transaction reporting of certain OTC derivatives. Entities that are swap dealers, security-based swap dealers, major swap participants or major security-based swap participants will be required to register with the SEC or the CFTC, or both, and will become subject to new capital, margin, business conduct, recordkeeping, clearing, execution, reporting and other requirements. We will likely register one or more entities as swap dealers with the CFTC or SEC, or both. Although the full impact of U.S. derivatives regulation on us is still unclear, registration with the CFTC and SEC could materially increase our operating costs and adversely affect our derivatives business.

In June 2012, U.S. bank regulators proposed a broad revision of the regulatory capital rules applicable to U.S. banks, bank holding companies and other U.S. banking organizations. The proposals would implement the Basel III capital standards in the United States and modify existing standardized risk weights for certain types of asset classes, including residential mortgages and securitization exposures. The proposals are intended to comply with the Dodd-Frank Act's minimum risk-based capital requirements and would be phased in over a multi-year period. Once fully implemented, the new rules would generally increase both the quality and quantity of regulatory capital that U.S. banking organizations are required to maintain. It was originally contemplated that the revised capital rules would be phased in beginning in January 2013. In November 2012, however, U.S. bank regulators announced that the proposals would not become effective in January 2013. The announcement did not specify new implementation or phase-in dates. U.S. bank regulators are working to finalize the proposals.

In addition, in December 2012, pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Act's systemic risk regulation provisions, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System ("Federal Reserve") proposed to apply enhanced prudential standards to the U.S.

operations of large foreign banking organizations, including us. Under the Federal Reserve's proposal, a number of large foreign banking organizations would be required to establish a separately capitalized top-tier U.S. intermediate holding company ("IHC") that would hold all of the large foreign banking organization's U.S. bank and nonbank subsidiaries. Under the Federal Reserve's proposal, an IHC would be subject to U.S. capital, liquidity, single counterparty credit limits, risk management, stress testing and other enhanced prudential standards on a consolidated basis, and the Federal Reserve would have the authority to examine any IHC and any subsidiary of an IHC. Although U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks would not be required to be held beneath an IHC, such branches and agencies would be subject to liquidity, single counterparty credit limits, and, in certain circumstances, asset maintenance requirements. The rules have a proposed effective date of July 1, 2015. The Federal Reserve is currently accepting comments on its proposal.

These and any additional legislative or regulatory actions in Spain, the European Union, the United States, the U.K. or other countries, and any required changes to our business operations resulting from such legislation and regulations, could result in reduced capital availability, significant loss of revenue, limit our ability to continue organic growth (including increased lending), pursue business opportunities in which we might otherwise consider engaging and provide certain products and services, affect the value of assets that we hold, require us to increase our prices and therefore reduce demand for our products, impose additional costs on us or otherwise adversely affect our businesses. Accordingly, we cannot provide assurance that any such new legislation or regulations would not have an adverse effect on our business, results of operations or financial condition in the future.

We may also face increased compliance costs. As some of the banking laws and regulations have been recently adopted, the manner in which those laws and related regulations are applied to the operations of financial institutions is still evolving. Moreover, to the extent these recently adopted regulations are implemented inconsistently in the various jurisdictions in which we operate, we may face higher compliance costs. No assurance can be given generally that laws or regulations will be adopted, enforced or interpreted in a manner that will not have material adverse effect on our business and results of operations.

Changes in taxes and other assessments may adversely affect us.

The Spanish Government regularly enacts reforms to the tax and other assessment regimes to which we and our customers are subject. Such reforms include changes in the rate of assessments and, occasionally, enactment of temporary taxes, the proceeds of which are earmarked for designated governmental purposes. The effects of these changes and any other changes that result from enactment of additional tax reforms have not been, and cannot be, quantified and there can be no assurance that these reforms will not, once implemented, have an adverse effect upon our business. Furthermore, such changes may increase the cost of borrowing and contribute to the increase in our non-performing credit portfolio.

We cannot predict if tax reforms will be implemented in the future. The effects of these changes, if enacted, and any other changes that could result from the enactment of additional tax reforms, cannot be quantified.

Changes in accounting standards could impact reported earnings.

The accounting standard setters and other regulatory bodies periodically change the financial accounting and reporting standards that govern the preparation of our consolidated financial statements. These changes can materially impact how we record and report our financial condition and results of operations. In some cases, we could be required to apply a new or revised standard retroactively, resulting in the restatement of prior period financial statements.

If we are unable to effectively control the level of non-performing or poor credit quality loans in the future, or if our loan loss reserves are insufficient to cover future loan losses, this could have a material adverse effect on us.

Risks arising from changes in credit quality and the recoverability of loans and amounts due from counterparties are inherent in a wide range of our businesses. Non-performing or low credit quality loans can negatively impact our results of operations. We cannot assure you that we will be able to effectively control the level of the impaired loans in our total loan portfolio. In particular, the amount of our reported non-performing loans may increase in the future as a result of growth in our total loan portfolio, including as a result of loan portfolios that we may acquire in the future, or factors beyond our control, such as adverse changes in the credit quality of our borrowers and counterparties or a general deterioration in economic conditions in Continental Europe, the United Kingdom, Latin America, the United States or global economic conditions, impact of political events, events affecting certain industries or events affecting financial markets and global economies.

Our current loan loss reserves may not be adequate to cover any increase in the amount of non-performing loans or any future deterioration in the overall credit quality of our total loan portfolio. Our loan loss reserves are based on our current assessment of and expectations concerning various factors affecting the quality of our loan portfolio. These factors include, among other things, our borrowers' financial condition, repayment abilities and repayment intentions, the realizable value of

any collateral, the prospects for support from any guarantor, government macroeconomic policies, interest rates and the legal and regulatory environment. As the recent global financial crisis has demonstrated, many of these factors are beyond our control. As a result, there is no precise method for predicting loan and credit losses, and we cannot assure you that our loan loss reserves will be sufficient to cover actual losses. If our assessment of and expectations concerning the above mentioned factors differ from actual developments, if the quality of our total loan portfolio deteriorates, for any reason, including the increase in lending to individuals and small and medium enterprises, the volume increase in the credit card portfolio and the introduction of new products, or if the future actual losses exceed our estimates of incurred losses, we may be required to increase our loan loss reserves, which may adversely affect us. If we were unable to control or reduce the level of our non-performing or poor credit quality loans, this could have a material adverse effect on us.

Mortgage loans are one of our principal assets, comprising 51% of our loan portfolio as of December 31, 2012. As a result, we are exposed to developments in housing markets, especially in Spain and the United Kingdom. In addition, we have exposure to a number of large real estate developers in Spain. From 2002 to 2007, demand for housing and mortgage financing in Spain increased significantly driven by, among other things, economic growth, declining unemployment rates, demographic and social trends, the desirability of Spain as a vacation destination and historically low interest rates in the eurozone. The United Kingdom experienced an increase in housing and mortgage demand driven by, among other things, economic growth, declining unemployment rates, demographic trends and the increasing prominence of London as an international financial center. During late 2007, the housing market began to adjust in Spain and the United Kingdom as a result of excess supply (particularly in Spain) and higher interest rates. Since 2008, as economic growth stalled in Spain and the United Kingdom, persistent housing oversupply, decreased housing demand, rising unemployment, subdued earnings growth, greater pressure on disposable income, a decline in the availability of mortgage finance and the continued effect of global market volatility have caused home prices to decline, while mortgage delinquencies increased. As a result of these and other factors, our NPL ratio increased from 0.94% at December 31, 2007, to 2.02% at December 31, 2008, to 3.24% at December 31, 2009, to 3.55% at December 31, 2010 and to 3.89% at December 31, 2011. At December 31, 2012, our NPL ratio was 4.54%. These trends, especially higher unemployment rates coupled with declining real estate prices, could have a material adverse impact on our mortgage payment delinquency rates, which in turn could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

The value of the collateral securing our loan portfolio may fluctuate or decline due to factors beyond our control, including macroeconomic factors affecting Europe, the United States and Latin American countries. The real estate market is particularly vulnerable in the current economic climate and this may affect us as real estate represents a significant portion of the collateral securing our residential mortgage loan portfolio. We may also not have sufficiently recent information on the value of collateral, which may result in an inaccurate assessment for impairment losses of our loans secured by such collateral. If this were to occur, we may need to make additional provisions to cover actual impairment losses of our loans, which may materially and adversely affect our results of operations and financial condition.

Failure to successfully implement and continue to improve our risk management policies, procedures and methods, including our credit risk management system, could materially and adversely affect us, and we may be exposed to unidentified or unanticipated risks.

The management of risk is an integral part of our activities. We seek to monitor and manage our risk exposure through a variety of separate but complementary financial, credit, market, operational, compliance and legal reporting systems. While we employ a broad and diversified set of risk monitoring and risk mitigation techniques, such techniques and strategies may not be fully effective in mitigating our risk exposure in all economic market environments or against all types of risk, including risks that we fail to identify or anticipate.

As a commercial bank, one of the main types of risks inherent in our business is credit risk. For example, an important feature of our credit risk management system is to employ an internal credit rating system to assess the particular risk profile of a customer. As this process involves detailed analyses of the customer or credit risk, taking into account both quantitative and qualitative factors, it is subject to human error. In exercising their judgment, our employees may not always be able to assign an accurate credit rating to a customer or credit risk, which may result in our exposure to higher credit risks than indicated by our risk rating system.

In addition, we have been trying to refine our credit policies and guidelines to address potential risks associated with particular industries or types of customers. However, we may not be able to timely detect these risks before they occur, or due to limited tools available to us, our employees may not be able to effectively implement them, which may increase our credit risk. Failure to effectively implement, consistently follow or continuously refine our credit risk management system may result in an increase in the level of non-performing loans and a higher risk exposure for us, which could have a material adverse effect on us.

Some of our qualitative tools and metrics for managing risk are based upon our use of observed historical market behavior. We apply statistical and other tools to these observations to arrive at quantifications of our risk exposures. These qualitative tools and metrics may fail to predict future risk exposures. These risk exposures could, for example, arise from factors we did not anticipate or correctly evaluate in its statistical models. This would limit our ability to manage our risks. Our losses thus could be significantly greater than the historical measures indicate. In addition, our quantified modeling does not take all risks into account. Our more qualitative approach to managing those risks could prove insufficient, exposing us to material unanticipated losses. If existing or potential customers believe our risk management is inadequate, they could take their business elsewhere. This could harm our reputation as well as our revenues and profits.

Our loan and investment portfolios are subject to risk of prepayment, which could have a material adverse effect on us.

Our fixed rate loan and investment portfolios are subject to prepayment risk, which results from the ability of a borrower or issuer to pay a debt obligation prior to maturity. Generally, in a declining interest rate environment, prepayment activity increases, which reduces the weighted average lives of our earning assets and could have a material adverse effect on us. We would also be required to amortize net premiums into income over a shorter period of time, thereby reducing the corresponding asset yield and net interest income. Prepayment risk also has a significant adverse impact on credit card and collateralized mortgage loans, since prepayments could shorten the weighted average life of these assets, which may result in a mismatch in our funding obligations and reinvestment at lower yields. Prepayment risk is inherent to our commercial activity and an increase in prepayments could have a material adverse effect on us.

We may generate lower revenues from fee and commission based businesses.

The fees and commissions that we earn from the different banking and other financial services that we provide (credit and debit cards, insurance, account management, bill discounting, guarantees and other contingent liabilities, advisory and custody services, etc.) and from our mutual and pension funds management services represent a significant source of our revenues.

Market downturns have led and are likely to continue to lead, to a decline in the volume of transactions that we execute for our customers and, therefore, to a decline in our non-interest revenues. In addition, because the fees that we charge for managing our clients' portfolios are in many cases based on the value or performance of those portfolios, a market downturn that reduces the value of our clients' portfolios or increases the amount of withdrawals would reduce the revenues we receive from our asset management, private banking and custody businesses and adversely affect our results of operations. Moreover, our customers may further significantly decrease their risk tolerance to non-deposit investments such as stocks, bonds and mutual funds, which would adversely affect our fee and commission income.

Even in the absence of a market downturn, below-market performance by our mutual funds may result in increased withdrawals and reduced inflows, which would reduce the revenue we receive from our asset management business and adversely affect our results of operations.

Our financial results are constantly exposed to market risk. We are subject to fluctuations in interest rates and other market risks, which may materially and adversely affect us.

Market risk refers to the probability of variations in our net interest income or in the market value of our assets and liabilities due to volatility of interest rate, exchange rate or equity price. Changes in interest rates affect the following areas, among others, of our business:

- net interest income;
- the volume of loans originated;
- the market value of our securities holdings; and
- gains from sales of loans and securities.

Variations in short-term interest rates could affect our net interest income, which comprises the majority of our revenue. When interest rates rise, we may be required to pay higher interest on our floating-rate borrowings while interest earned on our fixed-rate assets does not rise as quickly, which could cause profits to grow at a reduced rate or decline in some parts of our portfolio. Interest rate variations could adversely affect us, including our net interest income, reducing its growth rate or even resulting in losses. Interest rates are highly sensitive to many factors beyond our control, including increased regulation of the financial sector, monetary policies, domestic and international economic and political conditions and other factors.

Increases in interest rates may reduce the volume of loans we originate. Sustained high interest rates have historically discouraged customers from borrowing and have resulted in increased delinquencies in outstanding loans and deterioration in the quality of assets. Increases in interest rates may also reduce the propensity of our customers to prepay or refinance fixed-rate loans. Increases in interest rates may reduce the value of our financial assets.

If interest rates decrease, although this is likely to decrease our funding costs, it is likely to adversely impact the income we receive arising from our investments in securities as well as loans with similar maturities. In addition, we may also experience increased delinquencies in a low interest rate environment when such an environment is accompanied by high unemployment and recessionary conditions.

The market value of a security with a fixed interest rate generally decreases when the prevailing interest rates rise, which may have an adverse effect on our earnings and financial condition. In addition, we may incur costs (which, in turn, will impact our results) as we implement strategies to reduce future interest rate exposure. The market value of an obligation with a floating interest rate can be adversely affected when interest rates increase, due to a lag in the implementation of repricing terms or an inability to refinance at lower rates.

Increases in interest rates may reduce gains or require us to record losses on sales of our loans or securities.

We are also exposed to foreign exchange rate risk as a result of mismatches between assets and liabilities denominated in different currencies. Fluctuations in the exchange rate between currencies may negatively affect our earnings and value of our assets and securities.

We are also exposed to equity price risk in connection with our trading investments in equity securities as part of our normal course of business as a commercial bank. The performance of financial markets may cause changes in the value of our investment and trading portfolios. The volatility of world equity markets due to the continued economic uncertainty and sovereign debt crisis has had a particularly strong impact on the financial sector. Continued volatility may affect the value of our investments in entities in this sector and, depending on their fair value and future recovery expectations, could become a permanent impairment which would be subject to write-offs against our results. To the extent any of these risks materialize, our net interest income or the market value of our assets and liabilities could be adversely affected.

Liquidity and funding risks are inherent in our business and could have a material adverse effect on us.

Liquidity risk is the risk that we either do not have available sufficient financial resources to meet our obligations as they fall due or can secure them only at excessive cost. This risk is inherent in any retail and commercial banking business and can be heightened by a number of enterprise-specific factors, including over-reliance on a particular source of funding, changes in credit ratings or market-wide phenomena such as market dislocation. While we implement liquidity management processes to seek to mitigate and control these risks, unforeseen systemic market factors in particular make it difficult to eliminate completely these risks. Adverse and continued constraints in the supply of liquidity, including inter-bank lending, has affected and may materially and adversely affect the cost of funding our business, and extreme liquidity constraints may affect our current operations as well as limit growth possibilities.

Continued or worsening disruption and volatility in the global financial markets could have a material adverse effect on our ability to access capital and liquidity on financial terms acceptable to us.

Our cost of obtaining funding is directly related to prevailing market interest rates and to our credit spreads. Increases in interest rates and our credit spreads can significantly increase the cost of our funding. Changes in our credit spreads are market-driven, and may be influenced by market perceptions of our creditworthiness. Changes to interest rates and our credit spreads occur continuously and may be unpredictable and highly volatile.

If wholesale markets financing ceases to become available, or becomes excessively expensive, we may be forced to raise the rates we pay on deposits, with a view to attracting more customers, and/or to sell assets, potentially at depressed prices. The persistence or worsening of these adverse market conditions or an increase in base interest rates could have a material adverse effect on our ability to access liquidity and cost of funding (whether directly or indirectly).

We rely, and will continue to rely, primarily on commercial deposits to fund lending activities. The ongoing availability of this type of funding is sensitive to a variety of factors outside our control, such as general economic conditions and the confidence of commercial depositors in the economy, in general, and the financial services industry in particular, and the availability and extent of deposit guarantees, as well as competition between banks for deposits. Any of these factors could significantly increase the amount of commercial deposit withdrawals in a short period of time, thereby reducing our ability to access commercial deposit funding on appropriate terms, or at all, in the future. If these circumstances were to arise, this could have a material adverse effect on our operating results, financial condition and prospects.

We anticipate that our customers will continue, in the near future, to make short-term deposits (particularly demand deposits and short-term time deposits), and we intend to maintain our emphasis on the use of banking deposits as a source of funds. The short-term nature of this funding source could cause liquidity problems for us in the future if deposits are not made in the volumes we expect or are not renewed. If a substantial number of our depositors withdraw their demand deposits or do not roll over their time deposits upon maturity, we may be materially and adversely affected.

We cannot assure you that in the event of a sudden or unexpected shortage of funds in the banking system, we will be able to maintain levels of funding without incurring high funding costs, a reduction in the term of funding instruments or the liquidation of certain assets. If this were to happen, we could be materially adversely affected.

Credit, market and liquidity risk may have an adverse effect on our credit ratings and our cost of funds. Any downgrading in our credit rating would likely increase our cost of funding, require us to post additional collateral or take other actions under some of our derivative contracts and adversely affect our interest margins and results of operations.

Credit ratings affect the cost and other terms upon which we are able to obtain funding. Rating agencies regularly evaluate us, and their ratings of our debt are based on a number of factors, including our financial strength and conditions affecting the financial services industry generally. In addition, due to the methodology of the main rating agencies, our credit rating is affected by the rating of Spanish sovereign debt. If Spain's sovereign debt is downgraded, our credit rating would also likely be downgraded by an equivalent amount.

Any downgrade in our debt credit ratings would likely increase our borrowing costs and require us to post additional collateral or take other actions under some of our derivative contracts, and could limit our access to capital markets and adversely affect our commercial business. For example, a ratings downgrade could adversely affect our ability to sell or market certain of our products, engage in certain longer-term and derivatives transactions and retain our customers, particularly customers who need a minimum rating threshold in order to invest. In addition, under the terms of certain of our derivative contracts, we may be required to maintain a minimum credit rating or terminate such contracts. Any of these results of a ratings downgrade, in turn, could reduce our liquidity and have an adverse effect on us, including our operating results and financial condition.

Banco Santander, S.A.'s long-term debt is currently rated investment grade by the major rating agencies—Baa2 by Moody's Investors Service España, S.A., BBB by Standard & Poor's Ratings Services and BBB+ by Fitch Ratings Ltd.—all of which have a negative outlook due to the difficult economic environment in Spain. All three agencies downgraded our rating in February 2012 together with that of the other main Spanish banks, due to the weaker-than-previously-anticipated macroeconomic and financial environment in Spain with dimming growth prospects in the near term, depressed real estate market activity and heightened turbulence in the capital markets. In addition, Standard & Poor's Ratings Services downgraded our rating by two notches in April 2012 together with that of 15 other Spanish banks following that rating agency's decision to downgrade Spain's sovereign debt rating by two notches. Moody's Investors Service España, S.A. further downgraded our rating in May 2012, together with downgrades of 15 other Spanish banks and Santander UK plc, our United Kingdom-domiciled subsidiary. In June 2012, Fitch Ratings Ltd. cut the rating of Spanish sovereign debt three notches to BBa3, its lowest investment grade rating. Following its downgrade of Spanish sovereign debt, Fitch Ratings Ltd. further downgraded our rating on June 11, 2012 from A to BBB+. Moody's Investors Service downgraded our rating on June 25, 2012 from A3 to BBB+. Boody's Investors Ratings Services and A with stable outlook by Fitch Ratings. All three agencies revised Santander UK's ratings during 2012 following the downgrades of the Kingdom of Spain.

We conduct substantially all of our material derivative activities through Banco Santander, S.A. and Santander UK. We estimate that as of December 31, 2012, if all the rating agencies were to downgrade Banco Santander, S.A.'s long-term senior debt ratings by one notch we would be required to post up to €3 million in additional collateral pursuant to derivative and other financial contracts. A hypothetical two notch downgrade would result in a requirement to post up to €14 million in additional collateral. We estimate that as of December 31, 2012, if all the rating agencies were to downgrade Santander UK's long-term credit ratings by one notch, and thereby trigger a short-term credit rating downgrade, this could result in outflows from Santander UK's total liquid assets of £2.0 billion of cash and £6.6 billion in additional collateral that Santander UK would be required to post under the terms of secured funding and derivatives contracts. A hypothetical two notch downgrade would result in an additional outflow of £0.4 billion of cash and £1.4 billion of collateral under secured funding and derivatives contracts.

However, while certain potential impacts are contractual and quantifiable, the full consequences of a credit rating downgrade are inherently uncertain, as they depend upon numerous dynamic, complex and inter-related factors and assumptions, including market conditions at the time of any downgrade, whether any downgrade of a firm's long-term credit rating precipitates downgrades to its short-term credit rating, and assumptions about the potential behaviors of various customers, investors and counterparties. Actual outflows could be higher or lower than this hypothetical example, depending upon certain factors including which credit rating agency downgrades our credit rating, any management or restructuring actions that could be taken to reduce cash outflows and the potential liquidity impact from loss of unsecured funding (such as from money market funds) or loss of secured funding capacity. Although, unsecured and secured funding stresses are included in our stress testing scenarios and a portion of our total liquid assets is held against these risks, it is still the case that a credit rating downgrade could have a material adverse effect on us. In addition, if we were required to cancel our derivatives contracts with certain counterparties and were unable to replace such contracts, our market risk profile could be altered.

In light of the difficulties in the financial services industry and the financial markets, there can be no assurance that the rating agencies will maintain our current ratings or outlooks. Our failure to maintain favorable ratings and outlooks would likely increase our cost of funding and adversely affect our interest margins, which could have a material adverse effect on us.

We are subject to market, operational and other related risks associated with our derivative transactions that could have a material adverse effect on us.

We enter into derivative transactions for trading purposes as well as for hedging purposes. We are subject to market and operational risks associated with these transactions, including basis risk (the risk of loss associated with variations in the spread between the asset yield and the funding and/or hedge cost) and credit or default risk (the risk of insolvency or other inability of the counterparty to a particular transaction to perform its obligations thereunder, including providing sufficient collateral).

Market practices and documentation for derivative transactions in the countries where we operate differ from each other. In addition, the execution and performance of these transactions depends on our ability to develop adequate control and administration systems and to hire and retain qualified personnel. Moreover, our ability to adequately monitor, analyze and report derivative transactions continues to depend, to a great extent, on our information technology systems. This factor further increases the risks associated with these transactions and could have a material adverse effect on us.

Competition with other financial institutions could adversely affect us.

We face substantial competition in all parts of our business, including in originating loans and in attracting deposits. The competition in originating loans comes principally from other domestic and foreign banks, mortgage banking companies, consumer finance companies, insurance companies and other lenders and purchasers of loans.

In addition, there has been a trend towards consolidation in the banking industry, which has created larger and stronger banks with which we must now compete. There can be no assurance that this increased competition will not adversely affect our growth prospects, and therefore our operations. We also face competition from non-bank competitors, such as brokerage companies, department stores (for some credit products), leasing and factoring companies, mutual fund and pension fund management companies and insurance companies.

Increasing competition could require that we increase our rates offered on deposits or lower the rates we charge on loans, which could also have a material adverse effect on us, including our profitability. It may also negatively affect our business results and prospects by, among other things, limiting our ability to increase our customer base and expand our operations and increasing competition for investment opportunities.

In addition, if our customer service levels were perceived by the market to be materially below those of our competitor financial institutions, we could lose existing and potential business. If we are not successful in retaining and strengthening customer relationships, we may lose market share, incur losses on some or all of our activities or fail to attract new deposits or retain existing deposits, which could have a material adverse effect on our operating results, financial condition and prospects.

We are exposed to risks faced by other financial institutions.

We routinely transact with counterparties in the financial services industry, including brokers and dealers, commercial banks, investment banks, mutual funds, hedge funds and other institutional clients. Defaults by, and even rumors or questions about the solvency of, certain financial institutions and the financial services industry generally have led to market-wide liquidity problems and could lead to losses or defaults by other institutions. Many of the routine transactions we enter into expose us to significant credit risk in the event of default by one of our significant counterparties. In 2012, the financial health of a number of European governments was shaken by the European sovereign debt crisis, contributing to volatility of the capital

and credit markets, and the risk of contagion throughout and beyond the eurozone remains, as a significant number of financial institutions throughout Europe have substantial exposures to sovereign debt issued by nations which are under considerable financial pressure. These liquidity concerns have had, and may continue to have, an adverse effect on interbank financial transactions in general. Should any of these nations default on their debt, or experience a significant widening of credit spreads, major financial institutions and banking systems throughout Europe could be destabilized. A default by a significant financial counterparty, or liquidity problems in the financial services industry generally, could have a material adverse effect on us.

The financial problems faced by our customers could adversely affect us.

Market turmoil and economic recession could materially and adversely affect the liquidity, businesses and/or financial conditions of our borrowers, which could in turn increase our own non-performing loan ratios, impair our loan and other financial assets and result in decreased demand for borrowings in general. In addition, our customers may further significantly decrease their risk tolerance to non-deposit investments such as stocks, bonds and mutual funds, which would adversely affect our fee and commission income. Any of the conditions described above could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Our ability to maintain our competitive position depends, in part, on the success of new products and services we offer our clients and our ability to continue offering products and services from third parties, and we may not be able to manage various risks we face as we expand our range of products and services that could have a material adverse effect on us.

The success of our operations and our profitability depends, in part, on the success of new products and services we offer our clients and our ability to continue offering products and services from third parties. However, we cannot guarantee that our new products and services will be responsive to client demands or successful once they are offered to our clients, or that they will be successful in the future. In addition, our clients' needs or desires may change over time, and such changes may render our products and services obsolete, outdated or unattractive and we may not be able to develop new products that meet our clients' changing needs. If we cannot respond in a timely fashion to the changing needs of our clients, we may lose clients, which could in turn materially and adversely affect us.

As we expand the range of our products and services, some of which may be at an early stage of development in the markets of certain regions where we operate, we will be exposed to new and potentially increasingly complex risks and development expenses in those markets, with respect to which our experience and the experience of our partners may not be helpful. Our employees and our risk management systems may not be adequate to handle such risks. In addition, the cost of developing products that are not launched is likely to affect our results of operations. Any or all of these factors, individually or collectively, could have a material adverse effect on us.

If we are unable to manage the growth of our operations, this could have an adverse impact on our profitability.

We allocate management and planning resources to develop strategic plans for organic growth, and to identify possible acquisitions and disposals and areas for restructuring our businesses. From time to time, we evaluate acquisition and partnership opportunities that we believe offer additional value to our shareholders and are consistent with our business strategy. However, we may not be able to identify suitable acquisition or partnership candidates, and our ability to benefit from any such acquisitions and partnerships will depend in part on our successful integration of those businesses. We can give no assurances that our expectations with regards to integration and synergies will materialize. We also cannot provide assurance that we will, in all cases, be able to manage our growth effectively or deliver our strategic growth objectives. Challenges that may result from our strategic growth decisions include our ability to:

- manage efficiently the operations and employees of expanding businesses;
- maintain or grow our existing customer base;
- assess the value, strengths and weaknesses of investment or acquisition candidates;
- · finance strategic investments or acquisitions;
- · fully integrate strategic investments, or newly-established entities or acquisitions in line with its strategy;
- align our current information technology systems adequately with those of an enlarged Group;
- apply our risk management policy effectively to an enlarged Group; and
- manage a growing number of entities without over-committing management or losing key personnel.

Any failure to manage growth effectively, including relating to any or all of the above challenges associated with our growth plans, could have a material adverse effect on our operating results, financial condition and prospects.

Operational risks, including risks relating to data collection, processing and storage systems are inherent in our business.

Our businesses depend on the ability to process a large number of transactions efficiently and accurately, and on our ability to rely on our digital technologies, computer and email services, software and networks, as well as on the secure processing, storage and transmission of confidential and other information in our computer systems and networks. The proper functioning of financial control, accounting or other data collection and processing systems is critical to our businesses and to our ability to compete effectively. Losses can result from inadequate personnel, inadequate or failed internal control processes and systems, or from external events that interrupt normal business operations. We also face the risk that the design of our controls and procedures prove to be inadequate or are circumvented. Although we work with our clients, vendors, service providers, counterparties and other third parties to develop secure transmission capabilities and prevent against cyber attacks, we routinely exchange personal, confidential and proprietary information by electronic means, and we may be the target of attempted cyber attacks. If we cannot maintain an effective data collection, management and processing system, we may be materially and adversely affected.

We take protective measures and continuously monitor and develop our systems to protect our technology infrastructure and data from misappropriation or corruption, but our systems, software and networks nevertheless may be vulnerable to unauthorized access, misuse, computer viruses or other malicious code and other events that could have a security impact. An interception, misuse or mishandling of personal, confidential or proprietary information sent to or received from a client, vendor, service provider, counterparty or third party could result in legal liability, regulatory action and reputational harm. There can be no assurance that we will not suffer material losses from operational risk in the future, including relating to cyber attacks or other such security breaches. Further, as cyber attacks continue to evolve, we may incur significant costs in its attempt to modify or enhance our protective measures or investigate or remediate any vulnerabilities.

We manage and hold confidential personal information of customers in the conduct of our banking operations. Although we have procedures and controls to safeguard personal information in our possession, unauthorized disclosures could subject us to legal actions and administrative sanctions as well as damages that could materially and adversely affect our results of operations and financial condition.

In addition, our businesses are exposed to risk from potential non-compliance with policies, employee misconduct or negligence and fraud, which could result in regulatory sanctions and serious reputational or financial harm. In recent years, a number of multinational financial institutions have suffered material losses due to the actions of 'rogue traders' or other employees. It is not always possible to deter employee misconduct and the precautions we take to prevent and detect this activity may not always be effective.

Any failure to effectively improve or upgrade our information technology infrastructure and management information systems in a timely manner could have a material adverse effect on us.

Our ability to remain competitive depends in part on our ability to upgrade our information technology on a timely and cost-effective basis. We must continually make significant investments and improvements in our information technology infrastructure in order to remain competitive. We cannot assure you that in the future we will be able to maintain the level of capital expenditures necessary to support the improvement or upgrading of our information technology infrastructure. Any failure to effectively improve or upgrade our information technology infrastructure and management information systems in a timely manner could have a material adverse effect on us.

We rely on recruiting, retaining and developing appropriate senior management and skilled personnel.

Our continued success depends in part on the continued service of key members of our management team. The ability to continue to attract, train, motivate and retain highly qualified professionals is a key element of our strategy. The successful implementation of our growth strategy depends on the availability of skilled management, both at our head office and at each of our business units. If we or one of our business units or other functions fails to staff its operations appropriately or loses one or more of its key senior executives and fails to replace them in a satisfactory and timely manner, our business, financial condition and results of operations, including control and operational risks, may be adversely affected.

In addition, the financial industry has and may continue to experience more stringent regulation of employee compensation, which could have an adverse effect on our ability to hire or retain the most qualified employees. If we fail or are unable to attract and appropriately train, motivate and retain qualified professionals, our business may also be adversely affected.

We may not be able to detect money laundering and other illegal or improper activities fully or on a timely basis, which could expose us to additional liability and could have a material adverse effect on us.

We are required to comply with applicable anti-money laundering, anti-terrorism and other laws and regulations in the jurisdictions in which we operate. These laws and regulations require us, among other things, to adopt and enforce "know-your-customer" policies and procedures and to report suspicious and large transactions to the applicable regulatory authorities. These laws and regulations have become increasingly complex and detailed, require improved systems and sophisticated monitoring and compliance personnel and have become the subject of enhanced government supervision.

While we have adopted policies and procedures aimed at detecting and preventing the use of our banking network for money laundering and related activities, such policies and procedures have in some cases only been recently adopted and may not completely eliminate instances where we may be used by other parties to engage in money laundering and other illegal or improper activities. To the extent we fail to fully comply with applicable laws and regulations, the relevant government agencies to which we report have the power and authority to impose fines and other penalties on us, including the revocation of licenses. In addition, our business and reputation could suffer if customers use our banking network for money laundering or illegal or improper purposes.

In addition, while we review our relevant counterparties' internal policies and procedures with respect to such matters, we, to a large degree, rely upon our relevant counterparties to maintain and properly apply their own appropriate anti-money laundering procedures. Such measures, procedures and compliance may not be completely effective in preventing third parties from using our (and our relevant counterparties) as a conduit for money laundering (including illegal cash operations) without our (and our relevant counterparties') knowledge. If we are associated with, or even accused of being associated with, or become a party to, money laundering, then our reputation could suffer and/or we could become subject to fines, sanctions and/or legal enforcement (including being added to any "black lists" that would prohibit certain parties from engaging in transactions with us), any one of which could have a material adverse effect on our operating results, financial condition and prospects.

We are exposed to risk of loss from legal and regulatory proceedings.

We face various issues that may give rise to risk of loss from legal and regulatory proceedings, including tax litigation. These issues, including appropriately dealing with potential conflicts of interest, and legal and regulatory requirements, could increase the amount of damages asserted against us or subject us to regulatory enforcement actions, fines and penalties. The current regulatory environment, which suggests an increased supervisory focus on enforcement, combined with uncertainty about the evolution of the regulatory regime, may lead to material operational and compliance costs.

We are from time to time subject to certain claims and parties to certain legal proceedings incidental to the normal course of our business, including in connection with our lending activities, relationships with our employees and other commercial or tax matters. In view of the inherent difficulty of predicting the outcome of legal matters, particularly where the claimants seek very large or indeterminate damages, or where the cases present novel legal theories, involve a large number of parties or are in the early stages of discovery, we cannot state with confidence what the eventual outcome of these pending matters will be or what the eventual loss, fines or penalties related to each pending matter may be. We believe that we have made adequate reserves related to the costs anticipated to be incurred in connection with these various claims and legal proceedings. However, the amount of these provisions is substantially less than the total amount of the claims asserted against us and in light of the uncertainties involved in such claims and proceedings, there is no assurance that the ultimate resolution of these matters will not significantly exceed the reserves currently accrued by us. As a result, the outcome of a particular matter may be material to our operating results for a particular period, depending upon, among other factors, the size of the loss or liability imposed and our level of income for that period.

Damage to our reputation could cause harm to our business prospects.

Maintaining a positive reputation is critical to our attracting and maintaining customers, investors and employees. Damage to our reputation can therefore cause significant harm to its business and prospects. Harm to our reputation can arise from numerous sources, including, among others, employee misconduct, litigation or regulatory outcomes, failure to deliver minimum standards of service and quality, compliance failures, unethical behavior, and the activities of customers and counterparties. Further, negative publicity regarding us, whether or not true, may result in harm to our prospects.

Actions by the financial services industry generally or by certain members of, or individuals in, the industry can also affect our reputation. For example, the role played by financial services firms in the financial crisis and the seeming shift toward increasing regulatory supervision and enforcement has caused public perception of us and others in the financial services industry to decline.

We could suffer significant reputational harm if we fail to properly identify and manage potential conflicts of interest. Management of potential conflicts of interest has become increasingly complex as we expand our business activities through more numerous transactions, obligations and interests with and among our clients. The failure to adequately address, or the perceived failure to adequately address, conflicts of interest could affect the willingness of clients to deal with us, or give rise to litigation or enforcement actions against us. Therefore, there can be no assurance that conflicts of interest will not arise in the future that could cause material harm to us.

We rely on third parties for important products and services.

Third party vendors provide key components of our business infrastructure such as loan and deposit servicing systems, internet connections and network access. Any problems caused by these third parties, including as a result of their not providing us their services for any reason or their performing their services poorly, could adversely affect our ability to deliver products and services to customers and otherwise to conduct business. Replacing these third party vendors could also entail significant delays and expense.

We engage in transactions with our subsidiaries or affiliates that others may not consider to be on an arm's-length basis.

We and our subsidiaries and affiliates have entered into a number of services agreements pursuant to which we render services, such as administrative, accounting, finance, treasury, legal services and others. In addition, we have entered into services agreements with certain affiliates to allow these companies to offer their products and services within our branch network or that assist with our activities in consideration for certain fees.

Spanish law applicable to public companies and financial groups and institutions, as well as our bylaws, provide for several procedures designed to ensure that the transactions entered into with or among our financial subsidiaries do not deviate from prevailing market conditions for those types of transactions, including the requirement that our board of directors approve such transactions.

We are likely to continue to engage in transactions with our subsidiaries or affiliates. Future conflicts of interests between us and any of our subsidiaries or affiliates, or among our subsidiaries and affiliates, may arise, which conflicts are not required to be and may not be resolved in our favor.

Our business could be affected if its capital is not managed effectively or if changes limiting our ability to manage our capital position are adopted.

Effective management of our capital position is important to our ability to operate our business, to continue to grow organically and to pursue our business strategy. However, in response to the recent financial crisis, a number of changes to the regulatory capital framework have been adopted or are being considered. As these and other changes are implemented or future changes are considered or adopted that limit our ability to manage our balance sheet and capital resources effectively or to access funding on commercially acceptable terms, we may experience a material adverse effect on our financial condition and regulatory capital position.

Portions of our loan portfolio are subject to risks relating to force majeure events and any such event could materially adversely affect our operating results.

Our financial and operating performance may be adversely affected by force majeure events, such as natural disasters, particularly in locations where a significant portion of our loan portfolio is composed of real estate loans. Natural disasters such as earthquakes and floods may cause widespread damage which could impair the asset quality of our loan portfolio and could have an adverse impact on the economy of the affected region.

Our growth, asset quality and profitability in Latin America may be adversely affected by volatile macroeconomic and political conditions

The economies of some of the Latin American countries where we operate experienced significant volatility in recent decades, characterized, in some cases, by slow or regressive growth, declining investment and hyperinflation. This volatility resulted in fluctuations in the levels of deposits and in the relative economic strength of various segments of the economies to which we lend.

Negative and fluctuating economic conditions, such as a changing interest rate environment, impact our profitability by causing lending margins to decrease and leading to decreased demand for higher margin products and services. Negative and fluctuating economic conditions in these Latin American regions could also result in government defaults on public debt. This

could affect us in two ways: directly, through portfolio losses, and indirectly, through instabilities that a default in public debt could cause to the banking system as a whole, particularly since commercial banks' exposure to government debt is high in these Latin American regions.

In addition, our revenues are subject to risk of loss from unfavorable political and diplomatic developments, social instability, and changes in governmental policies, including expropriation, nationalization, international ownership legislation, interest-rate caps and tax policies.

No assurance can be given that our growth, asset quality and profitability will not be affected by volatile macroeconomic and political conditions.

Changes in our pension liabilities and obligations could have a material adverse effect on us.

We provide retirement benefits for many of our former and current employees through a number of defined benefit pension plans. We calculate the amount of our defined benefit obligations using actuarial techniques and assumptions, including mortality rates, the rate of increase of salaries, discount rates, inflation, the expected rate of return on plan assets, or others. These calculations are based on IFRS and on those other requirements defined by the local supervisors. Given the nature of these obligations, changes in the assumptions that support valuations, including market conditions, can result in actuarial losses which would in turn impact the financial condition of our pension funds. Under IFRS, the discount rate is set considering the term and performance of high credit quality corporate bonds with similar maturities in the same currency, and is the assumption that is most vulnerable to market volatility. Because pension obligations are generally long term obligations, fluctuations in interest rates have a material impact on the projected costs of our defined benefit obligations and therefore on the amount of pension expense that we accrue.

Changes in the size of the deficit in our defined benefit pension plans, due to reduction in the value of the pension fund assets (depending on the performance of financial markets) or an increase in the pension fund liabilities due to changes in mortality assumptions, the rate of increase of salaries, discount rate assumptions, inflation, the expected rate of return on plan assets, or other factors, could result in our having to make increased contributions to reduce or satisfy the deficits which would divert resources from use in other areas of our business and reduce our capital resources. While we can control a number of the above factors, there are some over which we have no or limited control. Increases in our pension liabilities and obligations could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Exposure to sovereign debt could have a material adverse effect on us

Like many other European banks, we invest in debt securities of European governments, including debt securities of the countries that have been most affected by the deterioration in economic conditions in Europe, such as Spain, Portugal, Italy and Ireland. A failure by any such government to make timely payments under the terms of these securities, or a significant decrease in their market value, could have a material adverse effect on us. For more information, see Item 4-B. Business overview—Exposure to sovereign counterparties by credit rating.

We depend in part upon dividends and other funds from subsidiaries.

Some of our operations are conducted through our financial services subsidiaries. As a result, our ability to pay dividends, to the extent we decide to do so, depends in part on the ability of our subsidiaries to generate earnings and to pay dividends to us. Payment of dividends, distributions and advances by our subsidiaries will be contingent upon our subsidiaries' earnings and business considerations and is or may be limited by legal, regulatory and contractual restrictions. Additionally, our right to receive any assets of any of our subsidiaries as an equity holder of such subsidiaries, upon their liquidation or reorganization, will be effectively subordinated to the claims of our subsidiaries' creditors, including trade creditors.

Our corporate disclosure may differ from disclosure regularly published by issuers of securities in other countries, including the United States.

Issuers of securities in Spain are required to make public disclosures that are different from, and that may be reported under presentations that are not consistent with, disclosures required in countries with more developed capital markets, including the United States. In particular, for regulatory purposes, we currently prepare and will continue to prepare and make available to our shareholders statutory financial statements in accordance with IFRS-IASB, which differs from U.S. GAAP in a number of respects. In addition, as a foreign private issuer, we are not subject to the same disclosure requirements in the United States as a domestic U.S. registrant under the Exchange Act, including the requirements to prepare and issue quarterly reports, or the proxy rules applicable to domestic U.S. registrants under Section 14 of the Exchange Act or the insider reporting and short-swing profit rules under Section 16 of the Exchange Act. Accordingly, the information about us available to you will not be the same as the information available to shareholders of a U.S. company and may be reported in a manner that you are not familiar with.