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In this Report, when we refer to “Wells Fargo,” “the Company,” “we,” “our” or “us”, we mean Wells Fargo & Company and Subsidiaries (consolidated).

This Report contains forward-looking statements, including projections of our financial results and condition under a hypothetical scenario that incorporates a set of assumed economic and financial conditions defined by us. The projections are not intended to be our forecast of expected future economic or financial conditions or our forecast of the Company’s expected future financial results or condition, but rather reflect possible results under the defined hypothetical scenario. Our future financial results and condition will be influenced by actual economic and financial conditions and various other factors as described in our reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and available at www.sec.gov.

Overview

Wells Fargo & Company is a nationwide, diversified, community-based financial services company with $1.6 trillion in assets. Founded in 1852 and headquartered in San Francisco, Wells Fargo provides banking, insurance, investments, mortgage, and consumer and commercial finance through more than 9,000 locations, 12,500 ATMs and the Internet (wellsfargo.com), and has offices in 36 countries to support Wells Fargo’s customers who conduct business in the global economy. With more than 265,000 active, full-time equivalent team members, Wells Fargo serves one in three households in the United States. Wells Fargo & Company was ranked No. 29 on Fortune’s 2014 rankings of America’s largest corporations. Our vision is to satisfy all our customers’ financial needs, help them succeed financially, be recognized as the premier financial services company in our markets and be one of America’s great companies.

As a large bank holding company, Wells Fargo is subject to the Supervisory and Company-Run Stress Test Requirements for Covered Companies rule issued by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Federal Reserve) to implement the stress testing and disclosure requirements of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Dodd-Frank Act stress tests). A stress test is defined in that rule as “a process to assess the potential impact of scenarios on the consolidated earnings, losses, and capital of a company over the planning horizon, taking into account its current condition, risks, exposures, strategies, and activities.”

Since the 2008 financial crisis, stress testing has evolved as an important analytical tool for evaluating capital adequacy under adverse conditions. Wells Fargo regularly uses such exercises in its capital planning to measure our exposure to material risks and evaluate the adequacy of capital resources available to absorb potential losses arising from those risks and to continue to support lending and other key operations during adverse economic conditions. We conduct multiple stress tests each year under a range of adverse scenarios.

In this Report, we present the results of our 2014 Mid-Cycle Dodd-Frank Act stress test. This test evaluates the potential impact of a Company-defined severely adverse scenario, inclusive of the Company-defined global market shock and the counterparty default components (the Scenario), on the Company’s
consolidated financial position. It is important to note that the severely adverse scenario is not a forecast but rather a hypothetical scenario with assumed economic and financial conditions designed by us to assess our strength and resilience to severely adverse economic environments.

Our stress testing results in pro forma capital ratios that reflect specific assumptions regarding capital actions that are prescribed by the Dodd-Frank Act stress test rule\(^1\) (standardized capital actions). The standardized capital actions assume dividend payments are maintained at the quarterly average dollar amount for the period Q3 2013 through Q2 2014 across the test horizon; while in practice, if this Scenario were to occur, the Company would take capital conservation actions mandated by internal policy, which include changes in dividend distributions.

We performed our stress test by projecting losses and related provision, revenue, expenses and capital ratios under the Scenario using models and methodologies developed or selected by us, except where the assumptions, practices or methodologies were specifically prescribed by rules or instructions published by the Federal Reserve\(^2\). The stress test results summarized in this Report are not comparable to the results of other stress tests performed by the Company due to a number of factors including the uniqueness of the scenarios used to prepare each stress test, differences in market conditions and the Company’s financial positions and exposures at the time each stress test is performed, and the evolving risk quantification methodologies and regulatory capital frameworks that may be applicable to each stress test.

The stress test results summarized in this Report should not be interpreted as expected or likely outcomes for the Company, but rather as a possible result under hypothetical, highly adverse economic conditions.

The results of our 2014 Mid-Cycle stress test suggest the Company’s performance would decline under the assumptions of the Scenario, in response to increased credit-related provision expenses, reduced new business volumes, net interest margin compression, and market-related losses. For the nine quarter test horizon from April 1, 2014 to June 30, 2016, we project a cumulative total net income before tax of $1.0 billion. The cumulative net income before tax reflects projected gross losses of $52.7 billion, including provision for loan losses, trading and counterparty credit losses, and losses on investment securities. It also reflects projected cumulative pre-provision net revenue (PPNR), which is calculated as projected net interest income plus noninterest income minus noninterest expense, for the nine quarters of $53.7 billion.

Our pro forma Common Equity Tier 1 ratio, calculated under the Basel III general approach in 2014 and the standardized approach with transitional arrangements thereafter, estimated under the Scenario assumptions and reflecting the standardized capital actions decreases from 11.4% at March 31, 2014 to 9.7% at June 30, 2016 (see Table 2). Despite projected declines in revenue and significant losses, and the mandated assumption that limited capital conservation actions would be taken, the projected minimum

---

\(^1\) The prescribed Dodd-Frank Act capital actions include estimated Q2 2014 capital actions taken by the Company; and for quarters two through nine of the test horizon, no issuance of regulatory capital other than assumed issuance of common stock for employee compensation; payments of common stock dividends equal to the quarterly average dollar amount paid by the Company in the previous year; payments on all other regulatory capital instruments equal to the stated dividend, interest, or principal due during the quarter; and no capital redemptions or repurchases.

Common Equity Tier 1 ratio during the nine quarter test horizon was 9.1%, well above the 4.5% minimum regulatory ratio.

**Severely Adverse Scenario**

The severely adverse macroeconomic scenario, developed by our internal Corporate Economics Group, combines an extreme economic recession, with features especially damaging to key asset holdings. Policymakers abroad concerned about excessive domestic investment and over-reliance on an export economy attempt to orchestrate a “soft landing” by raising interest rates, selling foreign currency, and accelerating currency appreciation. However, the interest rate hikes are excessive and tip their economy into a mild recession, which rapidly spreads across the globe. The sale of U.S. Treasuries by overseas investors creates a panic in the U.S., causing domestic interest rates to rise abruptly. While the Federal Reserve commits to keep the federal funds rate at current levels, the yield curve steepens sharply, causing further financial market distress.

Rising interest rates diminish home affordability, causing sales and construction to plummet. The combined effects of falling stock and house prices decimates household net worth and takes a severe toll on consumer confidence and spending. Profit margins are squeezed, prompting businesses to defer investment and trim payrolls, creating a vicious cycle of weaker demand and further belt tightening. Commercial property markets suffer falling utilization rates, causing operating income and prices to fall.

Real GDP falls by 4.7% over the first six quarters of the projection horizon. Over the entire nine-quarter horizon, real GDP declines at a rate of 1.1%, which equates to a 1-in-132 probability of occurrence. Economic recovery starts in the last quarter of 2015 before picking up steam by mid-2016. Table 1 summarizes key macroeconomic metrics from the Scenario.

**Table 1 Select Company-Defined Severely Adverse Scenario Macroeconomic Variables (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
<th>Real GDP growth</th>
<th>3-month USD Libor</th>
<th>10-year Treasury yield</th>
<th>Mortgage rate</th>
<th>CoreLogic HPI</th>
<th>CoStar CRE Index</th>
<th>S&amp;P 500 Stock Price Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2014</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>146.6</td>
<td>1,820.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2014</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>166.6</td>
<td>146.7</td>
<td>1,565.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2014</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>145.8</td>
<td>1,315.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2014</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>148.8</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>1,147.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2015</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>133.2</td>
<td>1,073.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2015</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>129.4</td>
<td>123.4</td>
<td>1,028.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2015</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>1,026.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2015</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>124.2</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>1,051.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>1,161.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>127.6</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>1,266.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2016</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>128.8</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>1,355.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2016</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>1,407.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2017</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>130.7</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>1,454.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2017</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>132.0</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>1,501.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) All economic variables listed in Table 1 are quarterly averages except GDP which is presented at an annualized rate. HPI stands for House Price Index with January 2000 = 100 and CRE stands for Commercial Real Estate Price Index with January 2001 = 100.
As designed, the Scenario deliberately stresses key balance sheet positions, including loan and securities portfolios and mortgage servicing rights (MSR) assets. In addition, the Scenario is designed to significantly and immediately curtail meaningful sources of revenue and capital for Wells Fargo, such as mortgage banking fees and trust and investment fees.

Our economics team uses a robust, top-down approach to develop the projected variables in the severely adverse macroeconomic scenario. The Scenario is based upon outputs from a credible, widely-used econometric macro-simulation model that shows an internally consistent evolution of the economy under severely adverse macroeconomic conditions. The variable paths are projected to be consistent and plausible, even in approximating situations that have not occurred previously. The initial set of key variables is selected to ensure the scenario reflects a severe economic downturn which encompasses our idiosyncratic risks, internal policy guidelines for severity and other unique characteristics. Once the macroeconomic forecast summary and the paths of key economic variables are created and internally approved, we use models to develop regional level economic projections to better address credit risks on a geographically granular basis. Specifically, 139 U.S.-level metrics serve as key drivers of the regional economic model, whose output includes regional projections for all 50 states and the District of Columbia and 395 metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), culminating in over 4,500 detailed forecasted variables. In all instances, our methodology to create the detailed variables is performed in a theoretically sound and empirically rigorous way to ensure internal consistency and coherence.

Our severely adverse scenario also incorporates market shock components, which are one-time hypothetical shocks to a large set of risk factors. Generally, these shocks involve large and sudden changes in asset prices, rates, and spreads, reflecting general market dislocation and heightened uncertainty. We utilized market risk factor shocks that replicate the impact of the actual market moves encountered in the fourth quarter of 2008, a period with significant disruption in the capital markets, which experienced credit spreads rising, volatility measures increasing, and equity markets falling. We apply these risk factor shocks to the March 31, 2014 trading portfolio by fully revaluing each position for the entire portfolio except for non-agency securitized products that receive market value based shocks. This is executed by taking the current market data (interest rates, equity prices, volatility measures, etc.) and applying the same market shocks that were observed during the historical stress period (i.e., fourth quarter 2008). The difference between the original market value and the post-shock market value is the amount of gain/loss for the stress scenario. After applying the market shock, we assume an instantaneous and unexpected default of our largest counterparty, which was selected by identifying the counterparty that represents the largest total net stress losses as of the measurement date.

**Summary Results**

Under the Scenario, the Company’s pro forma Common Equity Tier 1 ratio, calculated under Basel III, was projected to decrease from 11.4% at March 31, 2014 to 9.7% at June 30, 2016, the end of the test horizon. The capital ratio projections include the standardized capital actions. The projected minimum Common Equity Tier 1 ratio over the nine quarter test horizon was 9.1%, still significantly above the 4.5%
regulatory benchmark minimum. As shown in Table 2, all capital ratios remain above regulatory minimum ratios throughout the nine quarter test horizon.

Table 2 Projected Capital Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 common equity (2)</td>
<td>11.0 %</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Equity Tier 1 (2)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 risk-based capital</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total risk-based capital</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 leverage</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Memo items - risk-weighted assets (3)

(1) As defined by the regulations issued by the Federal Reserve, OCC and FDIC.
(2) Tier 1 common equity is calculated under Basel I using the general approach and Common Equity Tier 1 is calculated under Basel III using the general approach in 2014 and the standardized approach with transition arrangements thereafter. Both Tier 1 common equity and Common Equity Tier 1 are non-GAAP financial measures that are used by investors, analysts and bank regulatory agencies to assess the capital position of financial services companies.
(3) In accordance with regulatory rules, for each quarter in 2014, risk-weighted assets are calculated using the current general risk-based capital approach. For each quarter in 2015 and the first two quarters in 2016, risk-weighted assets are calculated under Basel III standardized capital risk-based approach with transitional arrangements, except for the Tier 1 common equity ratio which uses the general risk-based capital approach for all quarters.

Table 3 Common Equity Tier 1 Ratio Attribution Analysis

(1) Other incorporates all other adjustments, including mortgage servicing rights, goodwill and other intangibles, income tax and net income attributable to minority interests.
(2) Risk-weighted assets.

Our projected pro forma Common Equity Tier 1 to risk-weighted assets ratio under Basel III with transitional arrangements decreased 1.7% over the nine quarter test horizon and ended the test horizon at 9.7%, after reaching a projected minimum of 9.1%. As shown in Table 3, the material drivers of changes in the projected pro forma Common Equity Tier 1 ratio include projected positive pre-provision net revenue offset by credit losses, the mandated, assumed standardized capital actions and a decline in other comprehensive income. Pro forma Tier 1 and Total risk-based capital ratios were projected to decline
1.5% and 1.8%, respectively, by the end of the nine quarter period due to changes in the level of Common Equity Tier 1 and the amortization of regulatory capital instruments. All three of the risk-based capital ratios under Basel III were affected by an increase in risk-weighted assets (relative to the General RWA) to reflect the implementation of the new guidelines for computing risk-weighted assets under the Basel III standardized approach in 2015, which was only partially offset by a decline in consolidated assets and a shift in asset mix to lower risk-weighted assets. The 1.0% decrease in projected pro forma Tier 1 leverage ratio was due to lower ending Tier 1 capital.

As shown in Table 4, for the nine quarter test horizon we estimated a cumulative pro forma net income before taxes of $1.0 billion.

Table 4 Projected Net Revenue, Losses and Net Income Before Taxes Nine Quarter

Cumulative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(in billions)</th>
<th>Nine quarter cumulative, ending June 30, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-provision net revenue (1)</td>
<td>$ 53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for loan and lease losses (2)</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized losses on investment securities</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading and counterparty losses (3)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal of losses</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net income before taxes</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Memo items**

| Accumulated other comprehensive income included in capital (4) | $ (6.5) |

(1) Pre-provision net revenue includes losses from operational risk events, mortgage repurchase expenses, unreimbursed foreclosure costs, expenses associated with the change in the allowance for unfunded commitments, costs associated with other real estate owned, and changes in fair value of loans held for sale and loans held for investment measured under the fair-value option.

(2) Provision for loan and lease losses is reported in accordance with the reporting instructions for the FR Y-14A.

(3) Trading and counterparty losses include mark-to-market losses, changes in credit valuation adjustments (CVA), incremental default losses, and losses on non-trading related private equity positions that were subject to the global market shock stress.

(4) Reflects projected accumulated other comprehensive income at June 30, 2016, excluding amounts deducted from regulatory capital under final Basel III capital rules, and reflecting the 60% transition provision.

Pre-Provision Net Revenue

The estimated stressed pre-provision net revenue of $53.7 billion reflects projected declining levels of net interest income over the nine quarter test horizon, reduced noninterest income, and higher noninterest expense.

Generally, net interest income benefits from higher interest rates; however, increased revenue from rising rates is more than offset by significantly weakened loan demand and higher cost from debt and other market funding instruments related to liquidity stresses. The lower levels of noninterest income are primarily related to declines in mortgage banking fees and trust and investment fees. Mortgage banking fees fall as rates rise, driving lower origination volume and related production income, reduced mortgage hedge income and a mortgage repurchase liability build associated with the deterioration in the credit environment. Trust and investment fees are lower as a result of the depressed equity market levels.
Income from equity investments and trading in wholesale banking also declines in response to the unfavorable economic environment.

Noninterest expense increases over the nine quarter test horizon driven by higher operating losses, FDIC expenses, and foreclosed asset expenses. Partially offsetting the higher costs are reductions in variable expenses due to reduced revenue-based compensation and volumes.

**Provision for Loan and Lease Losses**

The nine quarter cumulative provision for loan and lease losses was estimated at $44.0 billion and consists of projected loan loss charge-offs of $28.6 billion and an increase in the allowance for loan and lease losses (ALLL) of $15.4 billion. While charge-offs represent the realization of loan losses, an increase in ALLL represents the recognition of the loan loss and occurs in advance of the loan loss realization under generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). Charge-offs increase as a deteriorating economy drives retail losses higher. The ALLL rises with increased forecasted losses, additional impaired reserves resulting from increased modification volume and higher re-default rates, and purchased credit-impaired (PCI) loan impairment. The ALLL is management’s estimate of credit losses inherent in the loan portfolio at a specified point in time. Changes in the ALLL balance are reflected through the provision to ensure adequate coverage of losses inherent in the loan portfolio for each forecasted period. Projected provision expenses associated with the change in the allowance for unfunded credit commitments, which totaled $0.3 billion in this Scenario, is included in pre-provision net revenue. Projected loan losses by type of loan are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5 Projected Loan Losses by Type of Loan under the Severely Adverse Scenario (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(in billions)</th>
<th>Nine quarters cumulative</th>
<th>Cumulative portfolio loss rate (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First lien mortgages, domestic</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>2.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior liens and home equity lines of credit, domestic</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and industrial (3)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial real estate, domestic</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other consumer</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other loans (4)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected loan losses</strong></td>
<td>$28.6</td>
<td>3.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The loan categories presented in Table 5 adhere to FR Y 14A reporting definitions and will not agree to the loan categories presented in our financial reports filed with the SEC.

(2) The portfolio loss rate is calculated by dividing the nine quarter cumulative net losses by the average loan balances over the same period. Average loan balances used to calculate portfolio loss rates exclude loans held for sale and loans held for investment under the fair-value option.

(3) Commercial and industrial (C&I) loans include C&I graded, small business and business card loans.

(4) All other loans are largely commercial loans, and include foreign real estate loans, loans to purchase or hold securities, loans secured by farmland, agriculture loans, loans to various financial institutions, and lease financing receivables.

The commercial loan portfolio consists of commercial real estate (CRE) loans, which include CRE construction loans, and commercial non-real estate loans, which include C&I loans and all other loans. Estimated losses over the nine quarter horizon on the commercial loan portfolio, including all other loans, totaled $8.9 billion or 31% of the total loan losses in the Scenario. The estimated commercial loan losses
were influenced by changes in the projected economic variables, particularly GDP, the unemployment rate, and commercial real estate prices.

The consumer loan portfolio consists of residential real estate loans (first lien, junior lien and home equity lines of credit), credit cards, and other consumer loans (primarily student loans and auto loans). Estimated losses over the nine quarter horizon on the consumer portfolio totaled $19.7 billion or 69% of the total loan losses in the Scenario. The estimated consumer loan losses were influenced by changes in the projected economic variables, notably the unemployment rate and the housing price index (HPI).

**Realized and Unrealized Losses on Investment Securities**

Projected losses on investment securities, referred to as other-than-temporary impairment (OTTI) write-downs, included in the pro forma income statement for the nine quarter test horizon totaled $2.2 billion. OTTI quantifies the risk of credit impairment for both the held-to-maturity (HTM) and the available for sale (AFS) portions of the investment securities portfolio. Securities are identified with estimated market values below amortized cost and all securities with a projected market value below carrying value were evaluated for OTTI. Projected changes in unrealized losses on investment securities are included in other comprehensive income (OCI).

**Trading and Counterparty Losses**

Trading and counterparty credit losses totaled $6.5 billion, which includes mark-to-market losses, changes in credit valuation adjustments (CVA), incremental default losses, losses on non-trading related private equity positions projected under the global market shock, and a large counterparty default. The global market shock factors generally reflect the price and rate movements that occurred in the second half of 2008, a period featuring severe market dislocations. These shocks consist of variations in interest rates, changes in credit spreads, adjustments in credit ratings, and other stressors. The counterparty default component incorporates an instantaneous and unexpected default of the counterparty with the largest net stressed losses within the global market shock environment.

**Stress Testing Methodologies**

The stress test described in this Report provides a forward-looking perspective on the potential risks to the Company’s capital resources under the adverse conditions described previously for the Scenario. This section describes key risks considered in the stress test results and the methodologies applied to translate risk measures into estimates of potential losses over the nine quarter test horizon. Among the key risks considered are credit risk, interest rate risk, market risks, and operational risk. Our Board of Directors and executive management have overall and ultimate responsibility for management of these risks, which they carry out through committees with specific and well-defined risk management functions. Each board committee receives reports and information regarding risk issues directly from management and, in some cases, management committees have been established to inform the risk management framework and
provide governance and advice regarding risk management functions. We established such a management committee, the Stress Testing Oversight Committee, to provide appropriate oversight for the company-wide stress testing process. This committee is responsible for the review and approval of stress testing methodologies, oversight of our stress test framework development, as well as directing, synthesizing and reviewing the results of stress tests.

This section also describes the methodologies applied to estimate capital resources over the nine quarter test horizon. Key outputs from these processes are pro forma balance sheets and income statements, which are used to produce capital projections, including projections of risk-weighted assets, and all regulatory and other capital ratios. In developing pro forma financial statements, the Company applies accounting practices consistent with the Company’s significant GAAP accounting policies, and regulatory capital rules, except where supervisory guidance specifies alternative treatments.

Our stress testing methodologies focus on empirically defining the relationship between macroeconomic variables and business volumes, revenues, and losses in order to estimate outcomes that may result from the specific adverse scenario under study. We use a series of models and estimation methodologies, coupled with management judgment, to produce a comprehensive estimate of future business performance. Stress testing methodologies are subject to considerable uncertainties and modeling limitations, including uncertainty about the extent to which historical relationships between macroeconomic factors and business outcomes will continue to be relevant in a severely stressed economic environment and the potential for changes to customer behavior in response to changes in the environment. We regularly consider uncertainties and the limitations of our estimates when evaluating stress test results.

Pre-Provision Net Revenue

Pre-provision net revenue includes projections of net interest income, noninterest income (other than market risk related losses presented separately in Table 4) and noninterest expense. Each of these components has distinct processes to consider a variety of risks, including interest rate risk, liquidity risk, market risk, mortgage repurchase risk, and operational risk in the generation of stress projections for the given test horizon.

Net Interest Income

Interest rate risk

Interest rate risk, which potentially can have a significant earnings impact, is an integral part of being a financial intermediary. We are subject to interest rate risk because:

- Assets and liabilities may mature or reprice at different times (for example, if assets reprice faster than liabilities and interest rates are generally falling, earnings will initially decline);

---

3 For additional discussion of risk management at Wells Fargo, please refer to our most recent annual and quarterly reports, which are available on the Company’s website at https://www.wellsfargo.com/invest_relations/filings
4 For additional information about Wells Fargo’s significant accounting policies, please refer to Note 1 to Consolidated Financial Statements included in our most recent annual and quarterly reports, which are available on the Company’s website at https://www.wellsfargo.com/invest_relations/filings
• Assets and liabilities may reprice at the same time but by different amounts (for example, when the general level of interest rates is falling, we may reduce rates paid on checking and savings deposit accounts by an amount that is less than the general decline in market interest rates);

• Short-term and long-term market interest rates may change by different amounts (for example, the shape of the yield curve may affect new loan yields and funding costs differently);

• The remaining maturity of various assets or liabilities may shorten or lengthen as interest rates change (for example, if long-term mortgage interest rates decline sharply, mortgage backed securities (MBS) held in the investment securities portfolio may prepay significantly earlier than anticipated, which could reduce portfolio income); and

• Interest rates may also have a direct or indirect effect on loan demand, credit losses, mortgage origination volume, the fair value of mortgage servicing rights (MSRs) and other financial instruments, the value of the pension liability and other items affecting earnings.

The primary method of measuring earnings sensitivity from interest rate risk not associated with mortgage banking is through modeling net interest income. Net interest income is the interest earned on debt securities, loans (including yield-related loan fees), and other interest-earning assets minus the interest paid for deposits, short-term borrowings, and long-term debt. Net interest income is significantly influenced by the mix and overall size of our earning asset portfolio and the cost of funding those assets. In addition, some sources of interest income, such as loan prepayment fees and collection of interest on nonaccrual loans, can vary from period to period. The estimation process for net interest income is built on two fundamental components. The first component is the projection of expected behavior on existing balance sheet portfolios over the test horizon under the given scenario. The second component centers on estimating the expected growth and pricing behavior for new business originated under the given scenario.

To model the expected behavior of the existing balance sheet, instrument details are collected for the Company’s investment, loan, deposit, and debt portfolios. This detailed data is used to project the interest income and expense of existing portfolios specific to the scenario conditions. To a large extent, the estimate of net interest income is driven by the contractual features of the underlying balance sheet instruments. Assumptions are made regarding other drivers of earnings and balance sheet composition such as loan origination demand, prepayment speeds, deposit balances and mix, as well as pricing strategies.

The modeling methodology and management judgment applied to behavioral assumptions varies depending on the product being considered. For example, the modeling approach for loan and investment prepayment projections varies by portfolio and is generally based on historical relationships and drivers specific to each individual portfolio. In the case of estimating administered deposit yields, assumptions made for stress test purposes are consistent with management practices and include the consideration of historical experience and current expectations of strategic actions. New business and origination assumptions incorporate a variety of considerations including historical loan and deposit
growth, economic conditions influencing the business environment, observed spreads on new production, and planned strategic actions. In all cases, the resulting forecast of product behaviors in each scenario is evaluated relative to the Company’s experience in various relevant economic environments and for consistency with business strategy.

**Liquidity Risk**

The objective of effective liquidity risk management is to ensure we can meet customer loan requests, customer deposit maturities/withdrawals and other cash commitments efficiently under both normal operating conditions and under periods of Wells Fargo-specific and/or market stress. Liquidity risk captures the negative impact to capital from actions the Company may take to meet this objective in the Scenario. Accordingly, we perform a comprehensive analysis to determine the specific liquidity events expected to occur under the conditions specified in the Scenario. In our analysis, we quantify the potential outflows of cash and the related impacts to interest income and expense that might arise by considering factors such as the runoff of consumer and commercial deposits, the nonrenewal of maturing wholesale funding sources, the drawdown of committed customer lines of credit, and the need for additional collateral requirements. To gauge the magnitude of these factors, we largely rely on the liquidity experience observed by Wachovia Corporation (Wachovia) during the second half of 2008, including the aftermath of the Lehman Brothers bankruptcy. Much of the data from Wachovia’s crisis period prior to its acquisition by Wells Fargo provided empirical data for our liquidity stress scenario calculations. We also identify the sources needed to satisfy the assumed outflows of cash and quantify the related impacts to interest income and expense as well as the impact of increases in our debt issuance costs.

**Noninterest Income**

Projected noninterest income largely consists of revenue generated from service charges on deposits, trust and investment fees, card fees, mortgage banking, and all other fees. Loss projections for trading and investment securities portfolios are presented separately and discussed in the Market Risk Related Losses section. Trust and investment fees are largely derived from providing services to our brokerage customers, managing and administering assets, and investment banking activities. The estimation process for noninterest income is based on macroeconomic and financial market variable assumptions, as well as key business performance metrics. Methodologies to estimate noninterest income vary across the major noninterest income categories and are tailored to the specific, underlying business activity being considered. In addition to models, the approaches include consideration of historical experience, expectations around new business, impact of regulatory changes, and management judgment. Where possible, specific financial market and macroeconomic variables that have been previously identified as key drivers of revenue, such as the Standard & Poor’s 500 Stock Price Index and GDP, are incorporated into the projections based on their assumed levels.

**Mortgage Banking Interest Rate and Market Risk**

Interest rate and market risk can be substantial in the mortgage business. Changes in interest rates may impact total origination and servicing fees, the fair value of our residential MSRs, the fair value of
mortgages held-for-sale (MHFS) and the associated income and loss reflected in mortgage banking noninterest income, the income and expense associated with instruments used to hedge changes in the fair value of MSRs and MHFS, and the value of derivative loan commitments (interest rate “locks”) extended to mortgage applicants.

Interest rates affect the amount and timing of origination income and net mortgage servicing fees because consumer demand for new mortgages and the level of refinancing activity are sensitive to changes in mortgage interest rates. The earnings sensitivity to interest rates is much greater when prevailing mortgage rates are at or below the average rate on the total mortgage debt outstanding. Conversely, interest rate risk will be significantly reduced as mortgage rates rise to levels above the average rate of the servicing portfolio. Typically, a decline in mortgage interest rates will lead to an increase in mortgage originations and fees, and a decrease in net mortgage servicing fees. The Scenario interest rates drive assumptions around changes in origination market size and loan prepayments. These assumptions are used to project the potential net impact on the Company's balance sheet and income statement.

**Mortgage Repurchase Risk**

Wells Fargo sells mortgage loans to investors under contractual provisions that may include certain representations and warranties. Repurchase risk arises from the potential that a contractual representation or warranty has been breached and the breach is not remedied within a specified period (usually 90 days or less) after receiving notice of the breach. Wells Fargo establishes repurchase liabilities that reflect management’s estimate of losses for loans we have sold for which we could have a repurchase obligation, whether or not we currently service those loans, based on a combination of factors. The repurchase risk typically diminishes over time as customers meet their contractual obligations, gain equity in their home, or both. Our estimates of repurchase risk are projections of repurchase losses by exposure type based on default expectations, estimates of expected investor repurchase demands (influenced by current and expected mortgage loan file requests and mortgage insurance rescission notices, as well as estimated levels of origination defects) and appeals success rates (where the investor rescinds the demand based on a cure of the defect or acknowledges that the loan satisfies the investor’s applicable representations and warranties), reimbursement by correspondent and other third party originators, and projected loss severity. Our estimates also consider settlements made with investors that limit future repurchase risk based on the parameters of the agreements.

**Noninterest Expense**

Estimates of noninterest expense, primarily personnel-related expenses, are closely associated with the projected level of business activity, the overall strength or weakness of the assumed economic environment, or otherwise based on standard, defined calculations. In addition to routine business driven expenses, consideration is also given to expenses that may materialize from other risks in the stress environment such as operational losses or foreclosed asset related expenses. Where noninterest expense relationships are indeterminate with economic drivers or financial market variable assumptions, management judgment is employed.
**Operational Risk**

Operational risk is defined as the risk of loss resulting from inadequate or failed internal processes or systems, or from external events or third parties. Operational risk also includes legal risk and the risk of regulatory fines and penalties. As such, operational risk is broadly defined.

The scope of operational risk includes loss event types that range from highly frequent, but low-impact losses to those that are much less frequent, but which have significant financial impacts. It is not uncommon for a few events to generate the majority of financial impact.

While the drivers of operational risk can vary by business, the most significant financial impacts often relate to products or business practices, resulting in litigation or regulatory actions. Transaction processing errors and fraud events occur much more frequently and can be significant in the aggregate, but generally have less financial impact per event than loss events involving litigation. Lastly, material losses can also arise from rare, externally-driven events such as earthquakes or terrorist attacks.

Operational risk projection is a relatively new discipline. Our operational risk loss forecasting process utilizes statistical techniques to estimate correlation relationships between changes in specific macroeconomic variables on operational losses; this essentially incorporates our historical loss experience along with macroeconomic factors to estimate losses under a variety of economic scenarios. Given the difficulty in applying statistical techniques to a small population of loss events, we benchmark the projections using multiple approaches to assess reasonableness of the loss projection and consistency with the underlying scenario and ascertain whether any adjustments are necessary.

Given the reliance on historical losses across these operational risk methodologies, our operational risk projections do not explicitly incorporate risks or events that have not manifested themselves. However, to ensure a sound projection, we judgmentally assess our operational loss projection for appropriate conservatism and the ability to accommodate events that may potentially occur.

**Provision for Loan and Lease Losses**

**Credit Risk**

Loans represent the largest component of assets on our balance sheet and their related credit risk is among the most significant risks we manage. We define credit risk as the risk of loss associated with a borrower or counterparty default (failure to meet obligations in accordance with agreed upon terms). Loss projections for counterparty credit risk are presented separately and discussed in the Market Risk Related Losses section. Credit risk associated with a borrower default on a loan in the held for investment portfolio is translated to the pro forma income statement through the provision for loan losses reflecting projected loan losses that would be realized as charge-offs in accordance with the scenario and the provision reflecting the change appropriate to ensure adequacy of the ALLL at the end of each period.
Loan Loss Forecasting

When estimating loan losses, probability of default (PD), exposure at default (EAD), and loss severity (referred to as loss given default (LGD)) components are combined to produce loan loss estimates. Loss estimates take into consideration the unique characteristics of our commercial and consumer loan portfolio segments. For each portfolio segment, losses are estimated collectively for groups of loans with similar risk characteristics.

A variety of models are used to project losses on the loans in the held for investment loan portfolio. While we report our loan portfolio by commercial and consumer portfolio segments in our financial reports filed with the SEC, for the purpose of stress testing, we segment our portfolios between individually graded commercial loans (Wholesale) and Retail loans that include both consumer loans and scored small business loans. The methodologies described in this section cover the models developed for the major categories of Wholesale and Retail loans. The loan loss projections take into consideration many factors, including historical performance, the forecasted economic scenarios, current credit characteristics, and for Wholesale loans, loan-level credit quality ratings and related forecasted migrations. Where appropriate, we incorporate state and local economic variables to reflect geographical concentrations within a given loan portfolio. Management adjusts primary modeled results largely based on information provided by alternative models while less significant adjustments based on knowledge of recent trends, considerations related to loan modifications, or other factors not captured by models are also included in the final estimates.

Wholesale Lending: Individually Graded

The Wholesale portfolio is divided into two major segments for loss modeling purposes: Investor/Developer CRE and Corporate loans, which includes C&I, Owner/Occupied CRE, foreign and leasing. Wholesale loans are subject to individual risk assessments using our internal borrower and collateral quality ratings. The primary loss modeling framework relies principally on PD, LGD and EAD. The PD model segments borrowers based on industry, and relies on borrower quality rating migration matrices, where loans migrate between grades and eventually to default, based on changes in economic variables, such as GDP, unemployment rates and asset prices. The LGD model forecasts the loss severity on defaulted loans, which is dependent on the underlying collateral and changes in asset prices. The EAD model forecasts the portion of commitment amount that is funded at the time of default. These three components are combined to calculate the forecasted losses for each quarter in the forecast horizon. The loss forecasts from the primary models are supported or benchmarked by other confirming models. Specifically, a loan level CRE confirming model considers granular MSA commercial real estate movements on loan losses.

Retail Lending: Residential Real Estate (First Lien Mortgages and Home Equity Loans, Junior Liens Loans, and Home Equity Lines of Credit)

Losses on residential first lien mortgages and home equity loans are projected using loss projection models which project both PD and LGD. The loss forecast models for first lien portfolios incorporate a pair of loan-level models that predict the conditional probabilities of reaching loss based on MSA- and
state-level economic variables (including unemployment, home price, foreclosures, gross state product) and borrower attributes (for example, loan-to-value).

Our junior liens loans and home equity lines of credit loss forecasting process leverages a loan-level model which projects PD, LGD, and EAD based on MSA-level variables including unemployment and home prices. Adjustments are made to modeled output for known model limitations and factors not captured in the modeled reference data.

**Retail Lending: Credit Cards**

Projected losses on the credit card portfolio are based upon borrower characteristics and the impact of forecasted macroeconomic variables on the PD. The credit card loss projection process leverages a segment-level, score-based model which assigns each current exposure into a risk tier based on delinquency status and credit score. Loss rates associated with the segments are driven by portfolio-weighted state-level unemployment as well as national personal bankruptcy rates and consumer sentiment.

**Retail Lending: Other**

The other retail lending category includes the auto portfolio, student loan portfolio, personal lines and loans portfolio, the scored small business and business card portfolio, and several other smaller portfolios. A variety of models are used to project losses across this diverse collection of portfolios, and model results are subject to adjustment based on consideration of historical loss experience, alternative modeling approaches, incorporation of current trends in borrower risk, and management judgment.

**Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses**

The Company estimates the ALLL for each period of the nine quarter forecast horizon, using a methodology consistent with the following accounting standards:

- Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) 450-20 governs allowance attributable to non-impaired loans for losses that are probable and estimable
- ASC 310-10-35 and 310-40 governs allowance for impaired loans (nonperforming individually graded commercial loans and loans modified under a troubled debt restructuring)
- ASC 310-30 governs allowance for PCI loans

Our ALLL methodology reflects Wholesale and Retail portfolio segments for stress testing purposes. While we attribute portions of the allowance to our respective wholesale and retail portfolio segments, the entire allowance is available to absorb credit losses inherent in the total loan portfolio.

**Wholesale Portfolio Allowance**

The Wholesale loss forecasting models produce quarterly loan distribution migration matrices to which we then apply commercial loss factors for reserve estimation. Consistent with GAAP, nonperforming loan loss allowance is an estimate of the loss over the life-of-loan.
Retail Portfolio Allowance

The Retail loss forecasting models produce quarterly loss estimates. Loans are pooled generally by product type with similar risk characteristics. The ASC 450 allowance is estimated using forecasted losses to represent our best estimate of inherent loss based on historical experience, utilizing quantitative and other mathematical techniques to translate our stress loss forecast into an appropriate allowance estimate.

Estimated troubled debt restructuring (TDR) volumes and associated life-of-loan losses are stressed throughout the observation period. Cash flow shortfalls from PCI mortgages are estimated by life-of-loan models, and related provision expenses are recognized as applicable to establish an appropriate allowance.

An incremental estimate for imprecision is added to both Wholesale and Retail allowance estimates to reflect inherent uncertainty in the process, judgments and estimates, particularly model risk and unforeseen changes in customer behavior.

Market Risk Related Losses

From a market risk perspective, our net income is exposed to adverse changes in the fair value of our trading portfolios and financial instruments due to changes in factors such as interest rates, credit spreads, foreign exchange rates, equity and commodity prices and their implied volatilities. Market risk related to our investment securities portfolio is reflected in estimates of OTTI and changes in market values. Market risk related to our trading and derivatives portfolios is reflected in estimates of trading and counterparty credit related losses. Counterparty credit risk arises when a trading partner fails to fulfill its obligations on a transaction or portfolio of transactions, and Wells Fargo must terminate the trade or replace the counterparty at a loss. Market risk is also reflected in estimates of losses related to our private equity portfolios.

Investment Securities Portfolio

The investment securities portfolio consists of debt securities and marketable equity securities. Losses on securities held in the investment securities portfolio are projected through OTTI over the stress test horizon. Securities with projected market values below carrying values are evaluated for potential OTTI under the stress scenario. Projected market values were derived using assumptions consistent with the macroeconomic variables.

No future sales of investment securities are assumed to occur over the test horizon. Therefore, in the stress test we recognize OTTI if under scenario conditions we would not expect to recover the entire amortized cost basis of the security. The OTTI write-down is separated into an amount representing the credit loss, which is recognized in earnings, and the amount related to all other factors, which is recognized in OCI. The measurement of the credit loss component is equal to the difference between the debt security's cost basis and the present value of its estimated future cash flows discounted at the security's current effective yield. The remaining difference between the security’s projected fair value and
the present value of future expected cash flows is due to factors that are not credit-related and, therefore, are recognized in OCI.

To project the amount, if any, of the security’s amortized cost basis we would not expect to recover in the stressed environment, we perform a credit analysis to estimate the performance of the underlying credit or collateral positions under the projected economic conditions. In general, the methodology we use to estimate the credit-related component of OTTI varies based on the type of security under evaluation.

- **Assets assumed not to be at risk for OTTI**: We assume projected declines in the market values of U.S. Treasury and federal agency obligations as well as federal agency MBS are not due to credit risk given the implicit or explicit guarantees provided by the U.S. government.

- **Securitized assets**: For securitized assets, detailed cash flow projections are developed for the underlying collateral. The unique credit characteristics of each transaction are analyzed and security-level collateral projections are created factoring in scenario economic conditions. Key assumptions developed for determining the projected cash flows include default rates, loss severities and prepayment rates. The estimated collateral performance is then used to project cash flows to the various tranches in the security structure to create a set of projected bond cash flows. The debt security’s cost basis is compared with the present value of the projected bond cash flows discounted at the security’s effective yield and the difference is recognized in the pro forma income statement as credit related OTTI.

- **Direct obligation assets**: For assets where the credit risk is the direct obligation of the issuer (for example, corporate debt and municipal bonds), for each position we develop projections of credit losses considering the issuer’s credit quality and migration of the credit quality, the type of security (secured or unsecured), and the projected economic conditions. The expected credit losses are compared with the security’s amortized cost to determine OTTI.

- **Market priced assets**: For some assets where detailed econometric modeling is not viable, or where the security is accounted for at fair value, we measure OTTI as the decline in the projected market price of the security which is derived from our global market shock risk factors.

**Trading and Counterparty Credit Risk**

Our approach to projecting market risk trading stress loss estimates is based upon shocking market risk factors and then observing their impact on the firm’s trading and private equity portfolio. The market risk trading stress loss estimate is computed using a full revaluation methodology in which the portfolio is fully re-priced under the stressed market risk factor assumptions. For the specified scenario, the shifts of one or more risk factors are applied simultaneously to the position and the trade is re-valued. The difference between the original trade value and the post shock value is the stress loss or gain estimate. The stress loss and gain estimates of each position are aggregated to determine the stress loss estimate for the entire trading portfolio. Specific shifts in risk factors vary by asset class and related risk driver. For example, the equity asset class has separate shifting methodologies for price and for implied volatility.
Interest rates, credit rates and foreign exchange asset classes have separate shifting methodologies for their respective curves/rates and implied volatility surface.

We estimate counterparty losses arising from two sources: (1) the increase in the CVA, which is a measure of mark-to-market expected credit losses, similar to the ALLL; and (2) the incremental losses associated with counterparty default, which is calculated as the largest counterparty default.

The estimation of counterparty credit risk varies across the different portfolios and is multidimensional in nature to capture the stress of exposures, the stress of credit quality and timing. In general, CVA is calculated either directly in the trading systems or through an expected loss approach. Stressing of exposures predominantly occurs through the application of market shock prescriptions, shifting rates and prices. The method for stressing the credit component of CVA depends upon whether the counterparty has observable market instruments which price credit, either liquid credit default swap (CDS) markets or observable bond prices. Counterparty names which have observable market instruments are referred to as the liquid portfolio, and the liquid portfolio stressed CVA is derived by widening spreads based on ratings-based market proxies for each scenario. Counterparties which do not have observable market instruments are referred to as the illiquid portfolio, and stressing of the credit quality for the illiquid portfolio involves stressing the market based component of the curves by the defined shifts, blended with internal PD based on the Company’s specific stress experience.

For calculating the losses attributed to the counterparty default scenario component, the net stressed losses are calculated by re-pricing collateral and exposures after applying the market shock, then multiplying the resulting stressed net current exposure by LGD of 90%, and subtracting corresponding CVA for the counterparty from the resulting net stressed losses.

**Changes in Capital and Capital Ratios**

Capital estimates are derived from quarterly pro forma financial statements generated through the stress test projection process. The change in equity capital each quarter reflects the after tax net income (loss) estimate for that quarter adjusted for the standardized capital actions assumed to be taken during that quarter as well as the change in other comprehensive income for that quarter. The resulting equity capital balance for each quarter is adjusted for certain regulatory deductions defined by U.S. regulatory capital rules, such as goodwill, to arrive at estimated regulatory capital. The pro forma balance sheet is risk-weighted from one quarter to the next to account for changes in the overall balance sheet size and mix and for changes in off-balance sheet exposures. Assets are categorized and risk-weighted for each quarter of the scenario horizon under general (Basel I) and standardized (Basel III) approaches. Other risk-weighted components (such as market risk and other adjustments) are also projected and included in the risk-weighted calculation process. The resulting regulatory capital estimate and risk-weighted assets, calculated under the general or standardized approach as applicable for the ratio and measurement period, are used to generate pro forma quarterly capital ratios.