



One Lincoln Street
Boston, MA 02111
United States of America

October 2017

Disclosure of Company-Run Stress Test Results

State Street Corporation (State Street or the Company), like other “covered companies” governed by the provisions of Section 165 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the Dodd-Frank Act), is required to conduct company-run stress tests semi-annually (an “annual stress test” and a “mid-cycle stress test”) and disclose the results under the severely adverse scenario. Under the “Supervisory and Company-Run Stress Test Requirements for Covered Companies” Final Rule, and as applied by State Street, a stress test represents a process to assess the potential impact of scenarios (representing hypothetical economic conditions) on State Street’s consolidated financial position and consolidated results of operations and regulatory capital over a defined period (known as a “planning horizon”), taking into account State Street’s current financial condition, risks, exposures, strategies and activities.

The annual stress test differs from the mid-cycle stress test in several principal ways. The annual stress test is conducted in coordination with the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review (CCAR) conducted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Federal Reserve), and the mid-cycle stress test is conducted two quarters later, or between each annual CCAR exercise, utilizing a different as-of-date. In addition, the annual stress test disclosures by the Federal Reserve and each covered company represent the results of the supervisory severely adverse scenario while the mid-cycle stress test reflects the results of an internally-developed severely adverse scenario. State Street’s stress test disclosures can be found in the Investor Relations section of its website, at <http://investors.statestreet.com/>.

The results of a stress test represent estimates of potential outcomes based on hypothetical economic and business conditions. State Street’s stress testing efforts seek to incorporate loss events tailored to its unique risk profile, which differs from that of a traditional commercial bank due to the nature of the business model and consolidated statement of condition. The hypothetical economic conditions applied during any stress test do not represent State Street’s projections of expected economic conditions, and the estimates representing the results of the stress test are not forecasts of expected revenues, expenses, losses or other results, or of State Street’s financial condition or regulatory capital ratios or levels for any future period. Furthermore, because the methodologies, models and tools used by State Street to project estimates of revenues, expenses, losses, regulatory capital ratios and other results under stress tests are proprietary to State Street, the results of company-run stress tests may differ in material respects from the results of stress tests performed on State Street by other parties, including the Federal Reserve in its annual supervisory stress test conducted in coordination with CCAR.

Additional financial and other information about State Street and its principal business activities can be found in its 2016 Annual Report on Form 10-K (the 2016 Form 10-K) and subsequent Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, Current Reports on Form 8-K and other filings (collectively, SEC filings) with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the SEC), which are made available on the Investor Relations section of State Street’s corporate website at <http://investors.statestreet.com/>. All stakeholders are encouraged to review these SEC filings. The information presented below may differ, in presentation, form, content or otherwise, from similar information, or disclosures on similar topics, presented in SEC filings. Differences could occur, for example, because SEC filings are based on applicable SEC rules and U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), which may differ from the regulatory standards or requirements for company-run stress tests under Section 165 of the Dodd-Frank Act. In addition, the information presented in this disclosure may also differ, and would not be comparable to, similar disclosures made by other companies.

Stress Testing Framework

State Street has a robust company-wide stress testing program that executes multiple stress tests each year and is overseen by management and its Board of Directors (*the Board*). The stress testing program is structured around what State Street determines to be its key risks. These key risks serve as an organizing principle for much of State Street's risk management framework, as well as its reporting. In connection with the focus on these key risks, State Street's stress tests that are internally-developed incorporate idiosyncratic loss events tailored to its unique risk profile. Due to the nature of State Street's business model and consolidated statement of condition, these key risks differ from those of a traditional commercial bank.

In the normal course of our global business activities, we are exposed to a variety of risks, some inherent in the financial services industry, others more specific to our business activities. State Street's risk management framework focuses on material risks, which include the following:

- credit and counterparty risk;
- liquidity risk, funding and management;
- operational risk;
- information technology risk;
- market risk associated with our trading activities;
- market risk associated with our non-trading activities, which we refer to as asset-and-liability management, and which consists primarily of interest rate risk;
- strategic risk;
- model risk; and
- reputational, fiduciary and business conduct risk.

Many of these risks, as well as certain of the factors underlying each of these risks that could affect our businesses and our consolidated financial statements, are discussed in detail under Item 1A, "Risk Factors" and "Risk Management" under Item 7, "Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations," included in our 2016 Form 10-K.

For the 2017 mid-cycle stress test, State Street executed company-run tests incorporating stress impacts to estimates of its revenues, expenses, losses, and provisions for loan losses, and the resultant changes in regulatory capital and related capital ratios, over the nine quarter planning horizon commencing July 1, 2017. To execute the stress tests, State Street applied multiple, internally-defined macroeconomic scenarios and parameters to its internal stress testing methodologies, models, and tools.

General Description of the Internally-Developed Severely Adverse Scenario

Consistent with Section 165 of the Dodd-Frank Act, the following results are based on the company-run internally-developed severely adverse scenario for the period beginning on July 1, 2017 and ending on September 30, 2019.

Upon review of its material risk inventory, State Street developed a severely adverse scenario which reflects macroeconomic, market-wide, and firm-specific events tailored to specifically stress State Street's business activities, operations, financial profile and condition, and regulatory characteristics. The hypothetical stress environment presented by this scenario was designed to explore the trend of rising risks predicated on a theme of rising populism, which drives two key jointly occurring events:

1. A "Hard Brexit" as the UK disengages from the EU that leads to negative trade and market shocks in the UK and EU; and
2. A US government resurrection of subsidies to domestic sectors which leads to global trade wars and pushes global economies into recession


These events are assumed to push the US into a prolonged recession with severe macroeconomic effects, including a decline in equity markets of over 50%, an increase in unemployment to 10%, a sharp decline in consumer sentiment, a sharp reversal in the US housing market, and a spike in the Chicago Board Options Exchange Volatility Index (VIX) amidst the global uncertainty and constraints to long-run potential GDP growth.

In addition to this significant macroeconomic downturn, several idiosyncratic elements were included in this scenario. These elements are comprised of the default of State Street's largest counterparty, impacts from a

scenario-consistent student loan asset backed security market crisis, bank-wide impacts from a severe cyber-attack on critical systems, and losses associated with potential litigation from operational and reputational risks.

The charts below reflect material macroeconomic parameters used in the mid-cycle stress test that particularly impact State Street. All macroeconomic factors shown below are representative of the severely adverse scenario.

Figure: Summary of Material Macroeconomic Parameters under the Company-Defined Severely Adverse Scenario



General Description of Methodologies

Pre-Provision Net Revenue

Pre-provision net revenue (*PPNR*) is calculated as net interest income (*NII*) plus non-interest revenue minus non-interest expense. The following is a description of the methodologies used to calculate the components of *PPNR* under the internally developed severely adverse scenario.

State Street's *NII* is sensitive to changes in the balance sheet due to economic conditions or business actions, movements in interest rates and foreign exchange rates, and changes in spreads earned on interest earning assets or paid on interest bearing liabilities, among other factors. Under the internally developed severely adverse scenario in the 2017 mid-cycle stress test, the interest rate paths across the nine-quarter planning horizon were the primary macroeconomic drivers used to estimate *NII*. In addition, State Street used projections of short-term interest rates, and market volatility to forecast deposit volumes across the planning horizon. Scenario-specific decisions on investment portfolio reinvestment and loan growth assumptions were also applied to the stressed scenarios.

State Street also stressed non-interest revenue, which includes servicing fees, management fees, securities finance, trading services, and processing fees and other revenue. In most cases, macroeconomic factors (*e.g.*, equities, fixed income, gross domestic product (*GDP*), currencies, volatility) identified in the scenario were linked to asset and activity levels through regression based analysis. In cases where fee revenue lacked sensitivity to the macroeconomic factors, State Street used empirical analysis in conjunction with qualitative assessments to determine the impact of stress. Non-Interest revenue also reflected reduced revenue due to client attrition associated with operational and other idiosyncratic events.

State Street's *PPNR* projections of non-interest expense incorporated a reduction to incentive compensation, salaries & benefits, transaction processing, and professional services expense due to the impacts of lower activity levels and/or lower performance. Offsetting these reductions to expenses, State Street projected incremental costs related to severance and operational risk events such as increased litigation expenses.

Loan Loss Provisions

Loan losses under the internally developed severely adverse scenario represent the sum of the provisions associated with State Street's lending portfolio, including corporate and insurance lending, leveraged loans, and other loan types. For the 2017 mid-cycle stress test, State Street stressed its loan losses using a stressed expected loss framework. Expected loss can be expressed as the product of the probability of default (*PD*), the loss given default (*LGD*), and the dollar exposure at the time of default (*EAD*) for a given lending exposure. To capture the stress impacts to each of the components of expected loss, State Street stressed the *PD*, *LGD*, and *EAD* parameters through macroeconomic factor regression or other models which allowed State Street to capture the projected impacts of the scenario on each parameter. In addition, to account for limitations inherent in such models, State Street applied a multi-tier credit expert assessment of the modeled outcomes and recommended overlays in the limited instances where such limitations were more acute, in particular for portfolios with limited internal and/or external loss history.

For the purpose of determining the evolution of the allowance for loan and lease losses, State Street assumed that the defaulted loan losses experienced during the planning horizon would be charged off from the balance sheet.

Realized Gains/Losses on Securities (Available for Sale/Held to Maturity)

Pursuant to GAAP, other-than-temporary impairment (*OTTI*) projections incorporate projected other-than temporary changes in credit expectations. For the internally developed severely adverse scenario, *OTTI* was projected for structured securities using forecasts from externally sourced econometric models. These models utilized relevant stressed macroeconomic factors (*e.g.*, *GDP* growth, unemployment, housing price index) together with loan- and pool-level collateral characteristics to generate prepayment rates, recovery rates, and default rates, which were used as inputs in generating bond-specific cash flows. For non-structured securities, State Street utilized loss rates that were derived from the stressed expected credit loss approach described in the preceding section. Additionally, State Street applied quantitative overlays at the bond level for structured securities where the models did not forecast underlying collateral performance, as well as for non-structured securities deemed to exhibit increased risk of loss based on expert assessment.

Trading and Counterparty Losses

For the 2017 mid-cycle stress test, State Street evaluated the potential consequences for exposures to financial institutions (FIs). As part of this analysis, State Street assumed an idiosyncratic default of its largest counterparty as calculated by stressed credit and non-credit exposure. The assessment of the largest FI counterparty was tailored to State Street's specific profile and encompassed State Street's direct credit (e.g., securities financing activities, derivatives, nostro accounts, placements) and indirect (other State Street relationships) exposures.

In addition to the largest counterparty default, a stressed expected credit loss approach was applied to estimate trading book exposure losses, as well as all other credit-generating products not otherwise applicable for loan loss provisioning or OTTI.

Available for sale (AFS) Mark-to-Market (MTM) on the Investment Portfolio

AFS MTM is the unrealized gain or loss composed of the difference between the fair value and amortized cost of AFS securities. Under the Basel III final rule, the AFS MTM, which is a component of accumulated other comprehensive income (AOCI) within shareholders' equity, is reflected in regulatory capital according to a phase-in schedule which began on January 1, 2014. For the 2017 mid-cycle stress test, State Street derived the stressed AOCI using forecasts from externally sourced econometric models consistent with those utilized in the OTTI projections. The models were linked to the same set of macroeconomic factors, including GDP growth, housing price index, and unemployment, in addition to other financial indicators, like interest rates and credit spreads. The estimated impact to AOCI as a result of non-credit OTTI on held-to-maturity (HTM) securities was also included in the AOCI projections.

For the 2017 mid-cycle stress test 80% of AOCI is reflected in capital calculations for 2017, and 100% of AOCI is reflected in capital calculations for 2018 and 2019.

Risk-Weighted Assets

For the 2017 mid-cycle stress test, BHCs were required to calculate risk-weighted assets (RWA) under the Basel III standardized approach throughout the entire nine quarter planning horizon. Under this approach, stressed RWA were primarily impacted by RWA from investment portfolio securities, balance sheet growth relative to baseline expectations for other assets such as loans, securities finance, and derivatives exposures. Investment portfolio securities are made up of securitizations, which use the Simplified Supervisory Formula Approach (SSFA), and non-structured securities. In applying the SSFA, State Street utilized the macroeconomic factors and externally sourced econometric models consistent with those used in the approaches for OTTI and AOCI. The impacts to State Street's RWA associated with other on-balance sheet items such as loans, securities finance and derivatives were applied consistent with changes in PPNR and balance sheet positions underlying the various exposures.

State Street also estimated the stress impact on market risk RWA in accordance with the market risk capital rule issued by the Federal Reserve in 2012, which requires banking organizations with significant trading activities, including State Street, to explicitly incorporate the market risks of those activities into determination of the capital requirements. This approach incorporated market risk factors, including interest rates, foreign exchange (FX) rates, and the Chicago Board Options Exchange Volatility Index (VIX).

Impact to Regulatory Capital Ratios

Impacts to regulatory capital ratios incorporated the capital actions prescribed by Section 165 of the Dodd-Frank Act (*Dodd-Frank prescribed capital actions*), including:

- For the third quarter of 2017, the actual capital actions (e.g., stock dividends and stock repurchases) occurring during that period; and
- For each of the second through ninth quarters of the planning horizon:
 - common stock dividends equal to the quarterly average dollar amount of common stock dividends paid in the previous year (including the first quarter in the planning horizon) plus common stock dividends attributable to issuances related to expensed employee compensation or in connection with a planned merger or acquisition to the extent that the merger or acquisition is reflected in the *pro forma* balance sheet estimates;
 - payments on any other instrument that is eligible for inclusion in the numerator of a regulatory capital ratio equal to the stated dividend, interest, or principal due on such instrument during the quarter;

- an assumption of no redemption or repurchase of any capital instrument that is eligible for inclusion in the numerator of a regulatory capital ratio; and
- an assumption of no issuances of common stock or preferred stock, except for issuances related to expensed employee compensation or in connection with a planned merger or acquisition to the extent that the merger or acquisition is reflected in the *pro forma* balance sheet estimates.

Under the internally developed severely adverse scenario, the stress projections resulted in a decline in the regulatory capital ratios, which utilized Basel III standardized RWA and leverage assets. However, State Street exceeded all Basel III minimum regulatory capital ratio requirements throughout the nine-quarter horizon. Changes in regulatory capital were primarily driven by the stressed declines in revenue relative to baseline expectations, counterparty losses, legal and operational losses, decline in AFS securities mark-to-market, and the phase-in impacts for Basel III capital.

Summary of Stressed Capital Ratio Results in the Company-Run 2017 Mid-Cycle Stress Test under the Internally Developed Severely Adverse Scenario with Dodd-Frank Act Prescribed Capital Actions

Projected stressed capital ratios through Q3 2019				
Severely Adverse Scenario				
	Regulatory Minimums ¹	Actual Q2 2017	Stressed Capital Ratios	
			Ending	Minimum ²
CET 1 capital ratio	4.5%	11.2%	8.6%	7.1%
Tier 1 capital ratio	6.0%	14.2%	11.4%	10.3%
Total capital ratio	8.0%	15.2%	11.9%	11.3%
Tier 1 leverage ratio	4.0%	7.0%	6.1%	4.8%
Supplementary leverage ratio ³	3.0%	6.2%	5.4%	4.4%

¹ Regulatory minimum ratio requirements as prescribed by the Federal Reserve

² Represents the projected minimum quarter-end ratio at any point during the nine quarter planning horizon of the internally developed severely adverse scenario

³ The Q2 2017 supplementary leverage ratio is considered pro forma, given that it is not a requirement until Q1 2018

Projected losses, revenue, and net income before taxes through Q3 2019 under the Severely Adverse Scenario		
	Billions of dollars ¹	Percent of avg. assets ²
Pre-provision Net Revenue	3.2	1.3%
Other Revenue	—	
<i>Less</i>		
Provisions	0.3	
Realized Gains/Losses on Securities	0.1	
Trading and Counterparty Losses	1.9	
Other Losses/Gains	0.2	
<i>Equals</i>		
Net Income Before Taxes	0.7	0.3%

¹ Due to rounding, the calculation for the net income before taxes utilizing the results above may not equal the total presented.

² Assets are averaged over the nine quarter planning horizon

Projected loan losses, by type of loan, Q3 2017 - Q3 2019 under the Severely Adverse Scenario		
	Billions of dollars ¹	Percent of avg. assets ²
Loan losses	0.2	1.1%
First Lien Mortgages, Domestic	-	N/M
Junior Liens/ HELOCs, Domestic	-	N/M
Commercial and Industrial	0.2	4.5%
Commercial Real Estate	—	0.3%
Credit Cards	-	N/M
Other Consumer	—	0.6%
Other Loans	0.1	0.4%

¹ Due to rounding, the sum of the projected loan losses by asset type may not equal the total presented.

² Percentage of average balance of the identified type of loans represented by projected aggregate loan losses. Loan balances are averaged over the nine-quarter planning horizon.