



**SEVENTH SUPPLEMENT DATED 21 MARCH 2016
TO THE BASE PROSPECTUS DATED 25 JUNE 2015
AS SUPPLEMENTED BY
THE FIRST SUPPLEMENT DATED 7 AUGUST 2015
THE SECOND SUPPLEMENT DATED 2 OCTOBER 2015
THE THIRD SUPPLEMENT DATED 13 OCTOBER 2015
THE FOURTH SUPPLEMENT DATED 11 NOVEMBER 2015
THE FIFTH SUPPLEMENT DATED 10 DECEMBER 2015 AND
THE SIXTH SUPPLEMENT DATED 4 FEBRUARY 2016**

Deutsche Bank Aktiengesellschaft

(Frankfurt am Main, Germany)

Euro 80,000,000,000 Debt Issuance Programme

This document constitutes a supplement (the “**Supplement**”) to the base prospectus dated 25 June 2015 (the “**Prospectus**”) for the purpose of article 13 of Chapter 1 of Part II of the Luxembourg Law dated 10 July 2005 on prospectuses for securities, as amended (the “**Law**”), and is prepared in connection with the EUR 80,000,000,000 Debt Issuance Programme (the “**Programme**”) established by Deutsche Bank Aktiengesellschaft (the “**Issuer**”). Terms defined in the Prospectus have the same meaning when used in this Supplement.

This Supplement is supplemental to, and should be read in conjunction with, the Prospectus, as supplemented by the first supplement dated 7 August 2015, the second supplement dated 2 October 2015, the third supplement dated 13 October 2015, the fourth supplement dated 11 November 2015, the fifth supplement dated 10 December 2015, and the sixth supplement dated 4 February 2016.

The purpose of this Supplement is to incorporate into the Prospectus the audited annual financial reports as of 31 December 2015 of the Issuer and to amend and update other disclosure on the Issuer.

The Issuer accepts responsibility for the information contained in this Supplement. To the best of the knowledge of the Issuer (which has taken all reasonable care to ensure that such is the case) the information contained in this Supplement is in accordance with the facts and does not omit anything likely to affect the import of such information.

This Supplement and the document incorporated by reference will be published in electronic form on the website of the Luxembourg Stock Exchange (www.bourse.lu) and on the website of the Issuer (www.db.com/ir).

In accordance with Article 13 paragraph 2 of the Law, investors who have already agreed to purchase or subscribe for the Securities before this Supplement is published have the right, exercisable within a time limit of two working days, which is 23 March 2016, after the publication of this Supplement, to withdraw their acceptances.

The Issuer has requested the *Commission de Surveillance du Secteur Financier* (the “**CSSF**”) to provide the competent authorities in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, with a certificate of approval (a “**Notification**”) attesting that this Supplement has been drawn up in accordance with the Law. The Issuer may request the CSSF to provide competent authorities in additional Member States within the European Economic Area with a Notification.

Table of Contents

A.	Financial Reports for the financial year 2015	3
I.	SUMMARY.....	3
II.	DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUER – TREND INFORMATION.....	4
III.	DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUER – FINANCIAL INFORMATION CONCERNING DEUTSCHE BANK'S ASSETS AND LIABILITIES, FINANCIAL POSITION AND PROFITS AND LOSSES.....	4
IV.	DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE	5
B.	Amendment of other disclosure on the Issuer	6
I.	SUMMARY.....	6
II.	RISK FACTORS – RISK FACTORS IN RESPECT OF THE ISSUER.....	8
III.	DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUER – TREND INFORMATION.....	10
IV.	DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUER – FINANCIAL INFORMATION CONCERNING DEUTSCHE BANK'S ASSETS AND LIABILITIES, FINANCIAL POSITION AND PROFITS AND LOSSES.....	18

A. Financial Reports for the financial year 2015

On 11 March 2016, the Issuer published its audited annual financial reports as of 31 December 2015 (together the “Financial Reports”).

Accordingly, the Prospectus shall be amended as follows:

I. SUMMARY

1. The section on “Profit forecasts or estimate” on page 10 of the Prospectus in Element B.9 of the Summary shall be replaced by the following:

“Not applicable. No profit forecast or estimate is made.”

2. The section on “Selected historical key financial information” on page 11 of the Prospectus in Element B.12 of the Summary shall be replaced by the following:

“The following table shows an overview from the balance sheet of Deutsche Bank AG which has been extracted from the respective audited consolidated financial statements prepared in accordance with IFRS as of 31 December 2014 and 31 December 2015.

	31 December 2014 (IFRS, audited)	31 December 2015 (IFRS, audited)
Share capital (in EUR)	3,530,939,215.36	3,530,939,215.36*
Number of ordinary shares	1,379,273,131	1,379,273,131*
Total assets (in million Euro)	1,708,703	1,629,130
Total liabilities (in million Euro)	1,635,481	1,561,506
Total equity (in million Euro)	73,223	67,624
Core Tier 1 capital ratio / Common Equity Tier 1 capital ratio ^{1,2}	15.2%	13.2% ³
Tier 1 capital ratio ²	16.1%	14.7% ⁴

* Source: Issuer’s website under <https://www.db.com/ir/en/share-information.htm>; date: 16 March 2016.

¹ The CRR/CRD 4 framework replaced the term Core Tier 1 by Common Equity Tier 1.

² Capital ratios for 2014 and 2015 are based upon transitional rules of the CRR/CRD 4 capital framework; prior periods are based upon Basel 2.5 rules excluding transitional items pursuant to the former section 64h (3) of the German Banking Act.

³ The Common Equity Tier 1 capital ratio as of 31 December 2015 on the basis of CRR/CRD 4 fully loaded was 11.1%.

⁴ The Tier 1 capital ratio as of 31 December 2015 on the basis of CRR/CRD 4 fully loaded was 12.3%.

”

3. The section on “No material adverse change in the prospects” on page 11 of the Prospectus in Element B.12 of the Summary shall be replaced by the following:

“There has been no material adverse change in the prospects of Deutsche Bank since 31 December 2015.”

4. The section on “Significant changes in the financial or trading position” on page 11 of the Prospectus in Element B.12 of the Summary shall be replaced by the following:

“Not applicable. There has been no significant change in the financial position or trading position of Deutsche Bank since 31 December 2015.”

5. The section on “Recent events material to the Issuer’s solvency” on page 11 of the Prospectus in Element B.13 of the Summary shall be replaced by the following:

“Not applicable. There are no recent events (since 31 December 2015) particular to the Issuer which are to a material extent relevant to the evaluation of the Issuer’s solvency.”

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUER – TREND INFORMATION

The text of the subsection “Statement of no Material Adverse Change” on page 79 of the Prospectus shall be replaced by the following:

“There has been no material adverse change in the prospects of Deutsche Bank since 31 December 2015.”

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUER – FINANCIAL INFORMATION CONCERNING DEUTSCHE BANK’S ASSETS AND LIABILITIES, FINANCIAL POSITION AND PROFITS AND LOSSES

1. The text of the subsection “Historical Financial Information / Financial Statements” on page 86 of the Prospectus shall be replaced by the following:

“Deutsche Bank’s consolidated financial statements for the financial years 2013, 2014 and 2015 are incorporated by reference in, and form part of, this Prospectus (see section “Documents Incorporated by Reference” on page 899).

Pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1606/2002 and accompanying amendments to the HGB, the consolidated financial statements for the years ended 31 December 2013 and 2014 and 2015 were prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) and endorsed by the European Union.”

2. The text of the subsection “Auditing of Historical Annual Financial Information” on page 86 of the Prospectus shall be replaced by the following:

“KPMG audited Deutsche Bank's non-consolidated and consolidated financial statements for the fiscal years 2013, 2014 and 2015. In each case an unqualified auditor's certificate has been provided.”

3. The text of the subsection “Significant Change in Deutsche Bank Group's Financial Position” on page 98 of the Prospectus shall be replaced by the following:

“There has been no significant change in the financial position of Deutsche Bank Group since 31 December 2015.”

IV. DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

1. The following text shall be added on page 899 of the Prospectus in the subsection “Documents Incorporated by Reference” after “(e) the Q3 Interim Report of the Issuer as of 30 September 2015”:

“(f) the Financial Report of the Issuer as of 31 December 2015”

2. The first paragraph of the subsection “Cross-Reference List of Documents Incorporated by Reference” on page 899 of the Prospectus shall be replaced by the following:

“Page 86 – Description of the Issuer – Historical Financial Information / Financial Statements: reference is made to the Financial Report of the Issuer as of 31 December 2013, 2014 and 2015.”

3. The following text and the following table shall be added on page 900 of the Prospectus after table (5) of the subsection “Cross-Reference List of Documents Incorporated by Reference”:

“(6) *The following information is set forth in the Financial Report of the Issuer as of 31 December 2015:*

Audited Consolidated Financial Statements 2015	Page(s)
Consolidated Statement of Income	245
Consolidated Statement of Comprehensive Income	246
Consolidated Balance Sheet	247
Consolidated Statement of Changes in Equity	248-249
Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows	250

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements	251-282
Notes to the Consolidated Income Statement	283-288
Notes to the Consolidated Balance Sheet	289-352
Additional Notes	353-414
Independent Auditors' Report	415-416

”

B. Amendment of other disclosure on the Issuer

I. SUMMARY

The section on “Key information on the key risks that are specific to the issuer” on pages 25 to 29 of the Prospectus in Element D.2 of the Summary shall be replaced by the following:

“Investors will be exposed to the risk of the Issuer becoming insolvent as result of being overindebted or unable to pay debts, i.e. to the risk of a temporary or permanent inability to meet interest and/or principal payments on time. The Issuer’s credit ratings reflect the assessment of these risks.

Factors that may have a negative impact on Deutsche Bank’s profitability are described in the following:

- Recent tepid economic growth, and uncertainties about prospects for growth going forward, have affected and continue to negatively affect Deutsche Bank’s results of operations and financial condition in some of its businesses, while a continuing low interest environment and competition in the financial services industry have compressed margins in many of its businesses. If these conditions persist or worsen, Deutsche Bank’s business, results of operations or strategic plans could be adversely affected.
- An elevated level of political uncertainty and the increasing attractiveness to voters of populist parties in a number of countries in the European Union could lead to a partial unwinding of European integration. Furthermore, anti-austerity movements in some member countries of the eurozone could undermine confidence in the continued viability of those countries’ participation in the euro. An escalation of political risks could have unpredictable political consequences as well as consequences for the financial system and the greater economy, potentially leading to declines in business levels, write-downs of assets and losses across Deutsche Bank’s businesses. Deutsche Bank’s ability to protect itself against these risks is limited.
- Deutsche Bank may be required to take impairments on its exposures to the sovereign debt of European or other countries if the European sovereign debt crisis reignites. The credit default swaps into which Deutsche Bank has entered to manage sovereign credit risk may not be available to offset these losses.
- Deutsche Bank has a continuous demand for liquidity to fund its business activities. It may suffer during periods of market-wide or firm-specific liquidity constraints, and liquidity may not be available to it even if its underlying business remains strong.
- Regulatory reforms enacted and proposed in response to weaknesses in the financial sector, together with increased regulatory scrutiny more generally, have created significant uncertainty for Deutsche Bank and may adversely affect its business and ability to execute its strategic plans.

- Legislation regarding the recovery and resolution of banks and investment firms could, if competent authorities impose resolution measures upon Deutsche Bank, significantly affect Deutsche Bank's business operations, and lead to losses for its shareholders and creditors.
- Regulatory and legislative changes require Deutsche Bank to maintain increased capital and may significantly affect its business model, financial condition and results of operations as well as the competitive environment generally. Any perceptions in the market that Deutsche Bank may be unable to meet its capital requirements with an adequate buffer, or that Deutsche Bank should maintain capital in excess of these requirements, could intensify the effect of these factors on its business and results.
- Legislation in the United States and in Germany as well as proposals in the European Union regarding the prohibition of proprietary trading or its separation from the deposit-taking business may materially affect Deutsche Bank's business model.
- Other regulatory reforms adopted or proposed in the wake of the financial crisis – for example, extensive new regulations governing Deutsche Bank's derivatives activities, bank levies, deposit protection or a possible financial transaction tax – may materially increase its operating costs and negatively impact its business model.
- Adverse market conditions, historically low prices, volatility and cautious investor sentiment have affected and may in the future materially and adversely affect Deutsche Bank's revenues and profits, particularly in its investment banking, brokerage and other commission- and fee-based businesses. As a result, Deutsche Bank has in the past incurred and may in the future incur significant losses from its trading and investment activities.
- Deutsche Bank announced the next phase of its strategy, Strategy 2020, in April 2015 and gave further details on it in October 2015. If Deutsche Bank is unable to implement its strategic plans successfully, it may be unable to achieve its financial objectives, or it may incur losses or low profitability or erosions of its capital base, and its financial condition, results of operations and share price may be materially and adversely affected.
- As part of Strategy 2020, Deutsche Bank announced its intention to dispose of Deutsche Postbank AG (together with its subsidiaries, "Postbank"). Deutsche Bank may have difficulties disposing of Postbank at a favourable price or on favourable terms, or at all, and may experience material losses from its holding or disposition of Postbank. Deutsche Bank may remain subject to the risks of or other obligations associated with Postbank following a disposal.
- Deutsche Bank may have difficulties selling non-core assets at favourable prices or at all and may experience material losses from these assets and other investments irrespective of market developments.
- Deutsche Bank operates in a highly and increasingly regulated and litigious environment, potentially exposing it to liability and other costs, the amounts of which may be substantial and difficult to estimate, as well as to legal and regulatory sanctions and reputational harm.
- Deutsche Bank is currently subject to a number of investigations by regulatory and law enforcement agencies globally as well as associated civil actions relating to potential misconduct. The eventual outcomes of these matters are unpredictable, and may materially and adversely affect Deutsche Bank's results of operations, financial condition and reputation.
- Deutsche Bank's non-traditional credit businesses materially add to its traditional banking credit risks.
- Deutsche Bank has incurred losses, and may incur further losses, as a result of changes in the fair value of its financial instruments.
- Deutsche Bank's risk management policies, procedures and methods leave it exposed to unidentified or unanticipated risks, which could lead to material losses.

- Operational risks may disrupt Deutsche Bank's businesses.
- Deutsche Bank's operational systems are subject to an increasing risk of cyber attacks and other internet crime, which could result in material losses of client or customer information, damage Deutsche Bank's reputation and lead to regulatory penalties and financial losses.
- The size of Deutsche Bank's clearing operations exposes it to a heightened risk of material losses should these operations fail to function properly.
- Deutsche Bank may have difficulty in identifying and executing acquisitions, and both making acquisitions and avoiding them could materially harm Deutsche Bank's results of operations and its share price.
- Intense competition, in Deutsche Bank's home market of Germany as well as in international markets, could materially adversely impact Deutsche Bank's revenues and profitability.
- Transactions with counterparties in countries designated by the U.S. State Department as state sponsors of terrorism or persons targeted by U.S. economic sanctions may lead potential customers and investors to avoid doing business with Deutsche Bank or investing in its securities, harm its reputation or result in regulatory action which could materially and adversely affect its business."

II. RISK FACTORS – RISK FACTORS IN RESPECT OF THE ISSUER

The text of the subsection "Factors that may adversely affect Deutsche Bank's financial strength" on pages 39 to 42 of the Prospectus shall be replaced by the following:

"Deutsche Bank's financial strength, which is also reflected in its ratings described above, depends in particular on its profitability. The following describes factors which may adversely affect Deutsche Bank's profitability:

- Recent tepid economic growth, and uncertainties about prospects for growth going forward, have affected and continue to negatively affect Deutsche Bank's results of operations and financial condition in some of its businesses, while a continuing low interest environment and competition in the financial services industry have compressed margins in many of its businesses. If these conditions persist or worsen, Deutsche Bank's business, results of operations or strategic plans could be adversely affected.
- An elevated level of political uncertainty and the increasing attractiveness to voters of populist parties in a number of countries in the European Union could lead to a partial unwinding of European integration. Furthermore, anti-austerity movements in some member countries of the eurozone could undermine confidence in the continued viability of those countries' participation in the euro. An escalation of political risks could have unpredictable political consequences as well as consequences for the financial system and the greater economy, potentially leading to declines in business levels, write-downs of assets and losses across Deutsche Bank's businesses. Deutsche Bank's ability to protect itself against these risks is limited.
- Deutsche Bank may be required to take impairments on its exposures to the sovereign debt of European or other countries if the European sovereign debt crisis reignites. The credit default swaps into which Deutsche Bank has entered to manage sovereign credit risk may not be available to offset these losses.
- Deutsche Bank has a continuous demand for liquidity to fund its business activities. It may suffer during periods of market-wide or firm-specific liquidity constraints, and liquidity may not be available to it even if its underlying business remains strong.
- Regulatory reforms enacted and proposed in response to weaknesses in the financial sector, together with increased regulatory scrutiny more generally, have created significant uncertainty for Deutsche Bank and may adversely affect its business and ability to execute its strategic plans.

- Legislation regarding the recovery and resolution of banks and investment firms could, if competent authorities impose resolution measures upon Deutsche Bank, significantly affect Deutsche Bank's business operations, and lead to losses for its shareholders and creditors. [Comment: Please include a bail-in risk factor, which is provided separately, in information on key risks specific to the securities.]
- Regulatory and legislative changes require Deutsche Bank to maintain increased capital and may significantly affect its business model, financial condition and results of operations as well as the competitive environment generally. Any perceptions in the market that Deutsche Bank may be unable to meet its capital requirements with an adequate buffer, or that Deutsche Bank should maintain capital in excess of these requirements, could intensify the effect of these factors on its business and results.
- Legislation in the United States and in Germany as well as proposals in the European Union regarding the prohibition of proprietary trading or its separation from the deposit-taking business may materially affect Deutsche Bank's business model.
- Other regulatory reforms adopted or proposed in the wake of the financial crisis - for example, extensive new regulations governing Deutsche Bank's derivatives activities, bank levies, deposit protection or a possible financial transaction tax - may materially increase its operating costs and negatively impact its business model.
- Adverse market conditions, historically low prices, volatility and cautious investor sentiment have affected and may in the future materially and adversely affect Deutsche Bank's revenues and profits, particularly in its investment banking, brokerage and other commission- and fee-based businesses. As a result, Deutsche Bank has in the past incurred and may in the future incur significant losses from its trading and investment activities.
- Deutsche Bank announced the next phase of its strategy, Strategy 2020, in April 2015 and gave further details on it in October 2015. If Deutsche Bank is unable to implement its strategic plans successfully, it may be unable to achieve its financial objectives, or it may incur losses or low profitability or erosions of its capital base, and its financial condition, results of operations and share price may be materially and adversely affected.
- As part of Strategy 2020, Deutsche Bank announced its intention to dispose of Deutsche Postbank AG (together with its subsidiaries, "Postbank"). Deutsche Bank may have difficulties disposing of Postbank at a favourable price or on favourable terms, or at all, and may experience material losses from its holding or disposition of Postbank. Deutsche Bank may remain subject to the risks of or other obligations associated with Postbank following a disposal.
- Deutsche Bank may have difficulties selling non-core assets at favourable prices or at all and may experience material losses from these assets and other investments irrespective of market developments.
- Deutsche Bank operates in a highly and increasingly regulated and litigious environment, potentially exposing it to liability and other costs, the amounts of which may be substantial and difficult to estimate, as well as to legal and regulatory sanctions and reputational harm.
- Deutsche Bank is currently subject to a number of investigations by regulatory and law enforcement agencies globally as well as associated civil actions relating to potential misconduct. The eventual outcomes of these matters are unpredictable, and may materially and adversely affect Deutsche Bank's results of operations, financial condition and reputation.
- Deutsche Bank's non-traditional credit businesses materially add to its traditional banking credit risks.
- Deutsche Bank has incurred losses, and may incur further losses, as a result of changes in the fair value of its financial instruments.

- Deutsche Bank's risk management policies, procedures and methods leave it exposed to unidentified or unanticipated risks, which could lead to material losses.
- Operational risks may disrupt Deutsche Bank's businesses.
- Deutsche Bank's operational systems are subject to an increasing risk of cyber attacks and other internet crime, which could result in material losses of client or customer information, damage Deutsche Bank's reputation and lead to regulatory penalties and financial losses.
- The size of Deutsche Bank's clearing operations exposes it to a heightened risk of material losses should these operations fail to function properly.
- Deutsche Bank may have difficulty in identifying and executing acquisitions, and both making acquisitions and avoiding them could materially harm Deutsche Bank's results of operations and its share price.
- Intense competition, in Deutsche Bank's home market of Germany as well as in international markets, could materially adversely impact Deutsche Bank's revenues and profitability.
- Transactions with counterparties in countries designated by the U.S. State Department as state sponsors of terrorism or persons targeted by U.S. economic sanctions may lead potential customers and investors to avoid doing business with Deutsche Bank or investing in its securities, harm its reputation or result in regulatory action which could materially and adversely affect its business.”

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUER – TREND INFORMATION

1. The text of the subsection on “Recent developments” on page 80 of the Prospectus shall be replaced by the following:

“On 18 October 2015, Deutsche Bank announced that it would fundamentally change its group and leadership structure. At an extraordinary meeting on the same day in Frankfurt, the Supervisory Board of Deutsche Bank resolved to restructure the Bank’s business divisions. This was supplemented by a reorganization of executive committees and senior management changes. The Supervisory Board’s guiding principle, in light of the Bank’s Strategy 2020, was to reduce complexity of the Bank’s management structure enabling it to better meet client demands and requirements of supervisory authorities.

The Corporate Banking & Securities (CB&S) business division was a main focus of the organizational restructuring and was split into two business divisions. Effective January 1, 2016, a business division called Corporate & Investment Banking was created by combining the Corporate Finance business in CB&S and Global Transaction Banking (GTB).

CB&S’s sales and trading activities were combined in a newly created business division called Global Markets. The name “CB&S” ceased to exist.

Additional changes affected Deutsche Asset & Wealth Management. High net worth clients are served by Private Wealth Management which is run as an independent business unit within the Private & Business Clients business division. Deutsche Asset Management became a stand-alone business division and focuses exclusively on institutional clients and the funds business.

Together with the organizational restructuring there is a broad-based change of key management roles. The Group Executive Committee (GEC) has been abolished, as are ten of the current 16 Management Board committees. Since January 1, 2016, all four core business divisions are represented directly on the Management Board. A ten-person Management Board is supplemented by four General Managers (“Generalbevollmächtigte”).

As of January 1, 2016, Jeff Urwin, former Co-Head of CB&S together with Colin Fan, joined the Management Board. Urwin is responsible for Corporate & Investment Banking. As a result of this reorganization, Stefan Krause, a long-term Management Board member with responsibility for GTB and the Non-Core Operations Unit (NCOU), resigned with effect of October 31, 2015.

Werner Steinmueller remains Head of GTB, and will report to Urwin. He succeeded Krause as Chairman of the Supervisory Board of Postbank AG.

Colin Fan, former Co-Head of CB&S, resigned with effect of October 19, 2015. He was succeeded by Garth Ritchie who is responsible for Global Markets on the Management Board as of January 1, 2016. Ritchie was formerly Head of Equities.

Quintin Price, most recently Global Executive Committee member and Head of Alpha Strategies at BlackRock, took on Management Board responsibility for Deutsche Asset Management as of January 1, 2016. Michele Faissola, Head of Deutsche Asset & Wealth Management, will leave the Bank after a transition period.

Christian Sewing, Head of Private & Business Clients, also assumed responsibility for high net worth clients on the Management Board. Fabrizio Campelli, former Head of Group Strategy, runs this business and reports to Sewing.

With effect of October 31, 2015, Stephan Leithner had requested to resign as a member of the Management Board in order to assume a new role in the private equity industry. The Supervisory Board accepted his request. Leithner was CEO Europe and was responsible for Human Resources, Government & Regulatory Affairs (GRAD), and Anti-Financial Crime on the Management Board.

Krause's and Leithner's Management Board responsibilities have been divided as follows:

Sylvie Matherat, former Head of Government & Regulatory Affairs at Deutsche Bank and a former Member of the Board of Directors of Banque de France, became Chief Regulatory Officer and assumed Management Board responsibility for Regulation, Compliance and Anti-Financial Crime. The General Manager ("Generalbevollmächtigte") Nadine Faruque, who is Global Head of Compliance, reports to Matherat.

Karl von Rohr, former Chief Operating Officer for global Regional Management, became Chief Administrative Officer and assumed Management Board responsibility for Corporate Governance, Human Resources, and Legal. In his new position, he also became Labour Relations Director ("Arbeitsdirektor") of Deutsche Bank. Legal was formerly represented on the Management Board by Co-Chief Executive Officer John Cryan.

Cryan assumed Management Board responsibility for the NCOU.

Separately, Kim Hammonds, Global Chief Information Officer and Co-Head of Group Technology & Operations at Deutsche Bank and formerly Chief Information Officer (CIO) of Boeing, became Chief Operating Officer. She oversees the re-engineering of the Bank's information technology (IT) systems and operations. To acquire the relevant experience in credit assessment in accordance with the German Banking Act (KWG), Hammonds started her role as General Manager ("Generalbevollmächtigte") at the beginning of 2016. She is expected to join the Management Board in no later than one year.

Henry Ritchotte, former Chief Operating Officer, left the Management Board at the end of 2015 and will set up a new digital bank for Deutsche Bank. The Management Board will communicate further details about this project at a later point in time.

In addition to Faruque and Hammonds, Jacques Brand became a General Manager ("Generalbevollmächtigte") reporting to the Co-CEOs John Cryan and Juergen Fitschen, with effect of November 1, 2015. Brand was formerly Chief Executive Officer for North America and will become Chairman of the newly created Intermediate Holding Company for the US business. Fitschen will remain responsible for global Regional Management.

On 28 December 2015, Deutsche Bank announced that it has agreed to sell its entire 19.99% stake in Hua Xia Bank to PICC Property and Casualty Company Limited for a consideration of RMB 23.0 to 25.7bn subject to final price adjustment at closing (approximately EUR 3.2 to 3.7 billion, based on current exchange rates). The completion of the transaction is subject to customary closing conditions and regulatory approvals including that of the China Banking Regulatory Commission. The sale will have a positive financial impact and, on a pro-forma basis, would have improved Deutsche Bank's Common Equity Tier 1 capital ratio (CRR/CRD 4 fully loaded) as of 30 September 2015 by approximately 30-40 basis points.

On 8 February 2016, based on preliminary and unaudited figures, Deutsche Bank published updated information relating to its capacity to pay in 2016 and 2017 coupons on its Additional Tier 1 (AT1) notes. The 2016 payment capacity is estimated to be approximately EUR 1 billion, sufficient to pay AT1 coupons of approximately EUR 0.35 billion on 30 April 2016. The estimated pro-forma 2017 payment capacity is approximately EUR 4.3 billion before impact from 2016 operating results. This is driven in part by an expected positive impact of approximately EUR 1.6 billion from the completion of the sale of 19.99% stake in Hua Xia Bank and further HGB 340e/g reserves of approximately EUR 1.9 billion available to offset future losses. The final AT1 payment capacity will depend on 2016 operating results under German GAAP (HGB) and movements in other reserves.

On 23 February 2016, Deutsche Bank announced the successful completion of the tender offer to repurchase up to EUR 3 billion of five Euro-denominated issues of senior unsecured debt securities. Against the spread / price targets communicated on 12 February 2016, Deutsche Bank decided to further increase the purchase price by 1.50-2.60 percentage points or respectively lower the spreads by 20-25 bps at which it accepts bonds within this tender offer. The resulting accepted total volume amounts to EUR 1.27 billion of the total tendered amount of EUR 1.75 billion. Securities with a notional value of EUR 0.48 billion were tendered at levels tighter than the final purchase spreads / higher than the final purchase prices and were not accepted. The tender offer had been announced on 12 February 2016. With this transaction, Deutsche Bank managed its overall wholesale funding levels and simultaneously provided liquidity to holders of the debt securities listed in the tender offer. Deutsche Bank expects to record a positive income in the first quarter of 2016 related to this transaction of approximately EUR 40 million.

On 25 February 2016, Deutsche Bank announced that it had been informed by the German Federal Financial Supervisory Authority (Bundesanstalt für Finanzdienstleistungsaufsicht or "BaFin") that it has closed several major special audits of the Bank. The special audits include those on interbank offered rates (IBOR), Monte dei Paschi di Siena and precious metals. Accordingly, BaFin does not see the need to take further action against the Bank or former and current members of the Management Board with respect to the closed special audits. The regulator cited the changes already implemented and further measures already taken or planned by the Bank as reasons for this decision.

On 14 March 2016, Deutsche Bank announced the successful completion of the tender offers to repurchase up to EUR 3 billion of five euro-denominated and up to USD 2 billion of eight US dollar-denominated senior unsecured debt securities. Deutsche Bank had launched the tender offers on 12 February 2016. The two tender offers resulted in a repurchase of euro-denominated bonds with a notional value of EUR 1.27 billion and of US dollar-denominated bonds with a notional value of USD 0.74 billion, equating to a total volume of EUR 1.94 billion. During the last ten working days of the offer period for US dollar-denominated bonds investors tendered securities with a notional value of less than USD 1 million US dollars. Deutsche Bank expects to record a gain in the first-quarter 2016 of approximately EUR 55 million from the repurchase of the securities."

2. The text of the subsection “Outlook” on pages 80 to 83 of the Prospectus shall be replaced by the following:

“In October 2015, the next phase of the strategy called “Strategy 2020” was introduced with four main aims: First to make Deutsche Bank simpler and more efficient; second to reduce risk; third to strengthen the capital position and fourth to execute in a more disciplined manner. From 2016 onwards, the Bank’s core divisions are being restructured along the client lines that it serves - Institutions, Corporates, Fiduciaries and Private Clients. This is intended to reduce complexity and better enable the Bank to better meet client demands.

In order to highlight the financial objectives of Strategy 2020 two sets of financial targets were announced by the Group. The first set of financial targets is expected to be completed by 2018. It primarily covers disposals, headcounts, cost savings and risk-weighted assets. The second set relates to the leverage ratio, cost savings, dividend payout ratio and CET 1 capital ratio are set to be achieved by 2020. The most important financial Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) of the Group are detailed in the table below.

Group Key Performance Indicators	Status end of 2015	Target for 2018	Target for 2020
CRR/CRD 4 Common Equity Tier 1 capital ratio (fully loaded) ¹	11.1 %	At least 12.5 %	At least 12.5 %
CRR/CRD 4 leverage ratio (fully loaded)	3.5 %	At least 4.5 %	At least 5.0 %
Post-tax Return on Average Tangible Equity ²	(12.3) %	Greater than 10.0 %	Greater than 10.0 %
Adjusted costs ³	EUR 26.5 bn	Less than EUR 22 bn per annum	Less than EUR 22 bn per annum
Cost-income ratio ⁴	115.3 %	~ 70.0 %	~ 65.0 %
Risk-weighted assets ⁵	EUR 397 bn	EUR 320 bn	EUR 310 bn

Note: Comparison of the KPIs with prior year plan/forecast not meaningful, as in 2015 a new strategy was formulated.

¹ The CRR/CRD 4 fully loaded Common Equity Tier 1 ratio represents our calculation of our Common Equity Tier 1 ratio without taking into account the transitional provisions of CRR/CRD 4.

² Based on Net Income attributable to Deutsche Bank shareholders. Calculation is based on an effective tax rate of (11) % for year ended December 31, 2015.

³ Total noninterest expense excluding restructuring & severance, litigation, impairment of goodwill and other intangibles and policyholder benefits and claims.

⁴ Total noninterest expenses as a percentage of total net interest income before provision for credit losses plus noninterest income.

⁵ Excluding expected regulatory inflation.

Within the Bank's strategic plan, it used underlying foreign exchange rates of EUR/USD at 1.07 and EUR/GBP at 0.72 in setting the financial targets for 2018 and 2020.

For 2016, Deutsche Bank expects revenues to be impacted by the low interest rate environment and challenging trading conditions. In addition, the impact of restructuring activities across country, client and product portfolio reductions are likely to impact the Bank's revenue generation capacity however, at the same time it will be investing into growth areas of Transaction Banking, Asset Management, Wealth Management and Equities. The Bank expects the majority of its restructuring costs to be incurred by end of 2016 with restructuring activities to be completed in 2017. The total costs will continue to be burdened by litigation and restructuring charges in 2016.

Capital management remains focused on keeping the CRR/CRD 4 fully loaded Common Equity Tier 1 capital ratio (CET 1 ratio) on track to reach the Strategy 2020 target level of minimum 12.5 % by 2018. In 2016, the Bank expects the fully loaded CET 1 ratio to remain broadly flat so that the Bank would remain capitalized well above regulatory minimum and SREP requirements. The Bank expects CET 1 capital to remain relatively flat as capital building is impacted by restructuring cost, litigation, and NCOU de-risking.

Deutsche Bank stays committed to reaching a fully loaded CRR/CRD 4 Leverage Ratio of at least 4.5 % in 2018 and at least 5 % in 2020 per Strategy 2020. The tight leverage exposure management stabilized the leverage ratio at 3.5 % by the end of 2015. In 2016, the Bank will continue its active CRD 4 exposure management. The CRR/CRD 4 Leverage Ratio is expected to remain broadly flat in 2016.

2016 will be a year of focused Strategy 2020 implementation. The Bank expects further restructuring and severance expenses of approximately EUR 1.0 billion, a continued burden from litigation, continued pressure from regulatory induced costs, bank levy charges and challenging market conditions. The Bank is committed to work towards its target of 10 % Post-tax Return on Average Tangible Equity, when Strategy 2020 is to be fully implemented. The measures planned for implementation in 2016, whilst a burden in that year, are key elements to progress towards that target. Overall the Bank expects a partial improvement of its Post-tax Return on Average Tangible Equity in 2016.

Achieving a structurally affordable cost base is one of Deutsche Bank's top priorities. The Bank remains committed to its Strategy 2020 target of an adjusted cost base of less than EUR 22 billion and a cost-income ratio of approximately 70 % by 2018. However, 2016 will remain a difficult year for the Bank as it will take some time for the restructuring program to become visible in the cost base. The Bank intends to continue to identify cost savings and efficiencies, but at the same time it will invest in technology and regulatory compliance programs, and it will face higher costs from software amortisation. The Bank therefore expects its adjusted costs to be broadly flat in 2016 compared to 2015. In addition, the total costs will continue to be burdened by litigation and restructuring charges in 2016. As a result the Bank expects its cost-income ratio to improve, but remain at an elevated level in 2016 as it also expects challenges on the revenue side driven by the low interest rate environment and continued market volatility.

Risk-weighted assets are expected to increase slightly in 2016, mainly driven by an increase of Operational Risk related risk-weighted assets and planned business growth. This will be partly offset by a decrease in riskweighted assets resulting from the planned acceleration of the Bank's NCOU de-risking program.

In order to support the Bank's overall capitalization, the Management Board proposed to the Supervisory Board to recommend no common share dividend for the fiscal years 2015 and 2016. In its Strategy 2020 announcement, the Bank articulated that it aspires to pay a competitive common share dividend payout ratio in the medium term.

By the nature of its business, Deutsche Bank is involved in litigation, arbitration and regulatory proceedings and investigations in Germany and in a number of jurisdictions outside Germany, especially in the U.S. Such matters are subject to many uncertainties. While the Bank has resolved a number of important legal matters and made progress on others, it expects the litigation and enforcement environment to continue to be challenging.

The Business Segments

From 2016 onwards and in accordance with the Bank's Strategy 2020, the business operations are organized under a new structure with the segments Global Markets (GM), Corporate & Investment Banking (CIB), Private, Wealth and Commercial Clients (PW&CC), Postbank, Deutsche Asset Management (AM) and Non-Core Operations Unit (NCOU). The following paragraphs contain the outlook of the business segments still in their organisational set-up that was effective until the end of 2015. More details regarding the new structure are also provided in the descriptions of the respective business segments which follow.

Corporate Banking & Securities

For Corporate Banking & Securities (CB&S), the business environment is highly challenging in 2016. Since the beginning of 2016, Deutsche Bank has already seen financial markets fall significantly, reflecting concerns on multiple fronts. Ongoing risks and uncertainties include exposure of global macroeconomic growth to event risks, evolution of central bank policies, the impact of low oil prices on the energy sector, ongoing regulatory developments, effects of further balance sheet de-leveraging, litigation charges and expenditures related to platform enhancements and regulatory requirements.

In 2016, the Bank sees various headwinds which may impact investment banking industry revenues. Challenges, including financial market turbulence slowing down client activity, ongoing regulatory pressure, continued pressure on resources and the potential impact of geo-political events will remain. The Bank expects continued global economic growth in 2016 although differences in regional growth rates are expected to result in increasing divergence in monetary policy.

Deutsche Bank expects 2016 industry Debt Sales & Trading revenues to be slightly lower, as an increase in Macro revenues due to monetary policy divergence will be more than offset by lower Credit revenues. Industry Equity Sales & Trading revenues are also expected to be moderately lower in 2016. The Bank expects Corporate Finance industry fee pools to be lower in 2016 due to a decline in Advisory deal flow.

In light of the challenging operating environment and increasing pressure on its balance sheet and capital, the Bank laid out a detailed bank-wide reorganisation plan as a part of Strategy 2020 aimed at increasing efficiency and generating sustainable returns. As part of this, starting in 2016 Corporate Banking & Securities is reorganised into two business divisions: Sales and Trading activities have been combined in a newly created division called Global Markets and a division called Corporate & Investment Banking has been created by combining the Corporate Finance business from CB&S and Global Transaction Banking.

For Global Markets, the implementation of Strategy 2020 will entail a reduction in CRD 4 leverage exposure and a reduction in RWA consumption to partly offset increases driven by Operational Risk and Basel 4 regulatory changes. This will require a reshaping of the Bank's business portfolio – by reducing its product, country and client perimeter. The Bank will also focus on reducing costs, driving platform efficiency and at the same time, enhancing regulatory compliance, control and conduct. The next two years will continue to see pressure on returns, as the Bank continues to face RWA increases (mainly driven by Operational Risk RWA), reduce its business perimeter and make progress on outstanding issues.

In Corporate Finance, the Bank will continue to focus on enhancing its client relationships, with the target of being a top three bank for its key corporate clients. The Bank will continue to invest in higher returning products and relationships while rationalising lower-return and higher risk clients.

Despite challenging market conditions in recent years, and the continued uncertain outlook, Deutsche Bank believes that the announced strategic priorities will position it favourably to face potential challenges and capitalise on future opportunities.

Private & Business Clients

The Strategy 2020 foresees several transformation measures regarding Private & Business Clients (PBC) including measures to streamline the Bank's organisation, to optimize its branch network in Germany and to invest in digitalization. PBC's transformation also includes portfolio measures, mainly the sale of the Bank's stake in Hua Xia Bank Co. Ltd (Hua Xia) and the separation of Postbank.

In the first quarter of 2016, Postbank will become a separate segment and the remainder of PBC, which will be called Private & Commercial Clients (PCC), will be combined with Wealth Management (WM) into the new segment "Private, Wealth & Commercial Clients (PW&CC)".

PCC aims to be a leading, digitally enabled advisory bank with a strong focus on growth in private banking and commercial banking. The Bank's objectives include the offering of a seamless private client coverage approach in Germany, a strengthened European presence, as well as a focus on entrepreneurs in Germany and across Europe. Furthermore, the Bank intends to invest in digitalization and aims to generate synergies from optimizing and streamlining product offerings, operations as well as overhead and support functions. It also plans to improve capital efficiency by further strengthening advisory capabilities and by emphasising less capital-intensive products.

In 2016, the Bank expects revenues from deposit products to continue to suffer from the low interest rate environment while revenues from credit products are expected to grow, reflecting continued customer demand as well as the strategy to selectively expand the loan book. The Bank will also continue its focus on investment and insurance products but revenue dynamics in this business will highly depend on the impact of the current challenging macroeconomic environment on customer confidence. Loan loss provisions were on very low levels in 2015 and the Bank currently does not expect them to decline further from these levels. Both the revenues and noninterest expenses could be impacted by further regulatory requirements, and noninterest expenses in 2016 will include charges and investment spend related to the execution of the above-mentioned transformation measures. The aforementioned expectations regarding PCC apply for Postbank accordingly. Particularly, revenues are expected to be impacted by the low interest environment.

Global Transaction Banking

The ongoing low interest rate levels with even negative rates in key markets, volatile stock markets, the highly competitive environment and challenges from geopolitical events are expected to continue to put downward pressure on business for Global Transaction Banking (GTB) in 2016.

In particular, the Bank expects adverse impacts on its Cash Management business. Building on the strong result in 2015 and planned investments into the transaction banking business in light of Strategy 2020, the Bank anticipates overall stable developments of volumes in 2016. With its continued focus on building and deepening client relationships, its comprehensive suite of products and its renowned service excellence, the Bank believes it is well-placed to cope with the challenging environment. The Bank will continue to invest in its businesses, notably its processes and IT platforms, while maintaining strict risk, cost and capital discipline to further enhance the resilience of the business model. The focus for 2016 will continue to be on regulatory compliance, control and conduct along with system stability. This will provide a strong foundation for future growth of GTB. As of January 1, 2016, GTB together with Corporate Finance is part of the business division called Corporate & Investment Banking.

Deutsche Asset & Wealth Management

Asset and wealth managers face numerous challenges in 2016, including an uncertain economic outlook, volatile equity and credit markets and continued low interest rates, combined with fierce competition and rising costs associated with regulation. Growth in most developed economies is likely to remain relatively flat,

however many emerging countries may see slower growth and increased volatility, impacting investor risk appetite and potentially impacting asset flows. Turbulent conditions create opportunities for active investment management across traditional and alternative assets, as well as for trusted financial advice and guidance. As a result, Deutsche Bank believes diversified, solutions-oriented asset and wealth managers that can leverage scale and intellectual capital to support their clients will fare better than most.

In 2016, Deutsche Bank will restructure Asset & Wealth Management. High net worth clients will be served by Deutsche Bank Wealth Management, a distinct business within the Private, Wealth & Commercial Clients division. Deutsche Asset Management will become a stand-alone division focused on providing investment solutions to institutions and intermediaries that serve individual clients.

In Asset Management, Deutsche Bank expects a further shift in investor preferences toward alternatives (including hedge funds, private equity, real estate, and infrastructure) and passive products (including index and exchange-traded products). As a result, the Bank anticipates asset inflows in alternatives and passive products to outpace other asset classes in 2016. Additionally, it expects continued growth of retirement solutions and demand for outcome-oriented solutions, particularly in developed markets as a result of ageing demographics. Together, these trends align with the Bank's investments to strengthen capabilities across products, channels and regions. With existing products and new launches planned, Deutsche Asset Management aims to grow its share in the market. As new structural changes are implemented, the Bank intended to streamline front-to-back investment processes to serve its clients.

In Wealth Management, the Bank expects Ultra-High Net Worth (UHNW) individuals to remain the wealth industry's fastest growing client segment. It intends to drive growth through a targeted regional coverage model and by delivering crossasset class, cross-border investment opportunities and solutions, as well as access to the broader capabilities of Deutsche Bank. The Bank has designed segment-specific strategies, improved client analytics and deepened client relationships to help it achieve its aim to become the advisor of choice for UHNW individuals and a top five wealth manager globally. Delivery of this ambition will be underpinned by the Bank's product suite and expertise in managed solutions, lending and capital markets.

Despite anticipated growth of the global asset and revenue pools, revenue performance remains dependent on market levels due to the high level of recurring fee revenue. The current level of markets would indicate downward revenue pressure despite various strategic growth initiatives. Fee compression and heightened competition require a dynamic and cost efficient operating model. In 2016, additional technology and operations improvements will continue to be implemented, equipping both Asset Management and Wealth Management with adequate IT infrastructure to serve their clients. Further initiatives will be launched to streamline the Bank's geographic and operational footprint to support Group simplification efforts.

Non-Core Operations Unit

The Non-Core Operations Unit (NCOU) will focus on reducing leverage and risk-weighted assets with an ambition to materially unwind the remaining positions by the end of 2016, such that residual risk-weighted assets are less than EUR 10 billion in aggregate. Challenges in the overall market environment may impact the execution of NCOU's strategy, specifically in terms of the associated timeline and financial impact. This uncertainty covers a number of factors that can impact the de-risking activity, however this accelerated wind down is estimated to be accretive to the Group's capital ratios. In addition, the cost of servicing high interest rate liabilities currently included in NCOU revenues will be allocated to a new Postbank segment in 2016. The Bank expects the litigation and enforcement environment to remain challenging for the foreseeable future."

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUER – FINANCIAL INFORMATION CONCERNING DEUTSCHE BANK'S ASSETS AND LIABILITIES, FINANCIAL POSITION AND PROFITS AND LOSSES

The subsection on “Legal and Arbitration Proceedings” on pages 86 to 98 of the Prospectus shall be replaced by the following:

“Deutsche Bank Group operates in a legal and regulatory environment that exposes it to significant litigation risks. As a result, Deutsche Bank Group is involved in litigation, arbitration and regulatory proceedings and investigations in Germany and in a number of jurisdictions outside Germany, including the United States, arising in the ordinary course of business.

Other than set out herein, Deutsche Bank is not involved (whether as defendant or otherwise) in, nor does it have knowledge of, any pending or threatened legal, arbitration, administrative or other proceedings that may have, or have had in the recent past, a significant effect on the financial position or profitability of the Bank or Deutsche Bank Group. Furthermore, other than as set out herein, there have been no legal, arbitration, administrative or other proceedings within the last twelve months and no such proceedings have been concluded during such period which may have, or have had in the recent past, a significant effect on the financial position or profitability of the Bank or Deutsche Bank Group.

Charter/BMY Matter

On 8 December 2014, the United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”) filed a civil complaint against, among others, Deutsche Bank, alleging that the bank owes more than U.S.\$ 190 million in taxes, penalties, and interest relating to two transactions that occurred between March and May 2000. The DOJ’s complaint arises out of Deutsche Bank’s March 2000 acquisition of Charter Corp. (“Charter”) and its subsequent sale in May 2000 of Charter to an unrelated entity, BMY Statutory Trust (the “Trust”). Charter’s primary asset, both at the time of purchase by Deutsche Bank and sale to the Trust, was appreciated Bristol-Myers Squibb Company (“BMY”) stock. When the BMY stock was sold by the Trust, the Trust offset its gain with a loss from an unrelated transaction. The Internal Revenue Service subsequently disallowed the loss on audit exposing the BMY gain to taxation. The IRS assessed additional tax, penalties and interest against the Trust, which have not been paid. Relying on certain theories, including fraudulent conveyance, the DOJ is now seeking to recoup from Deutsche Bank the taxes, plus penalties and interest, owed by the Trust. On 24 September 2015, the court denied Deutsche Bank’s motion to dismiss. Discovery on plaintiff’s claims is ongoing.

Corporate Securities Matters

Deutsche Bank and Deutsche Bank Securities Inc. (“DBSI”) regularly act in the capacity of underwriter and sales agent for debt and equity securities of corporate issuers and are from time to time named as defendants in litigation commenced by investors relating to those securities.

Deutsche Bank and DBSI, along with numerous other financial institutions, was sued in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in various actions in their capacity as underwriters and sales agents for debt and equity securities issued by American International Group, Inc. (“AIG”) between 2006 and 2008. The complaint alleged, among other things, that the offering documents failed to reveal that AIG had substantial exposure to losses due to credit default swaps, that AIG’s real estate assets were overvalued, and that AIG’s financial statements did not conform to GAAP. On 20 March 2015, the court approved a settlement, funded by AIG, and releasing Deutsche Bank and DBSI from all claims.

DBSI, along with numerous other financial institutions, was named as a defendant in a putative class action lawsuit pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York relating to alleged misstatements and omissions in the registration statement of General Motors Company (“GM”) in connection with GM’s 18 November 2010 initial public offering (“IPO”). DBSI acted as an underwriter for the offering. On

4 September 2014, the court dismissed all of the plaintiffs' claims with prejudice. The court also denied plaintiffs' request for leave to further amend the complaint. On 28 May 2015, the Second Circuit affirmed the dismissal, and on 9 July 2015 the Second Circuit denied en banc review of plaintiffs' appeal. The time allowed for plaintiffs to further appeal has expired. The underwriters, including DBSI, received a customary indemnification agreement from GM as issuer in connection with the offering.

CO2 Emission Rights

The Frankfurt am Main Office of Public Prosecution (the "OPP") is investigating alleged value-added tax (VAT) fraud in connection with the trading of CO2 emission rights by certain trading firms, some of which also engaged in trading activity with Deutsche Bank. The OPP alleges that certain employees of Deutsche Bank knew that their counterparties were part of a fraudulent scheme to avoid VAT on transactions in CO2 emission rights, and it searched Deutsche Bank's head office and London branch in April 2010 and issued various requests for documents. In December 2012, the OPP widened the scope of its investigation and again searched Deutsche Bank's head office. It alleges that certain employees deleted e-mails of suspects shortly before the 2010 search and failed to issue a suspicious activity report under the Anti-Money Laundering Act which, according to the OPP, was required. It also alleges that Deutsche Bank filed an incorrect VAT return for 2009, which was signed by two members of the Management Board, and incorrect monthly returns for September 2009 to February 2010. Deutsche Bank is cooperating with the OPP. On 15 February 2016, a criminal trial began in the Frankfurt regional court of seven current and former Deutsche Bank employees who are accused of VAT evasion or of aiding and abetting VAT evasion due to their involvement in CO2 emissions trading.

Credit Correlation

On 26 May 2015, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) issued a cease and desist order in a settled administrative proceeding against Deutsche Bank AG. The matter related to the manner in which Deutsche Bank valued "gap risk" associated with certain Leveraged Super Senior (LSS) synthetic CDO positions during the fourth quarter of 2008 and the first quarter of 2009, which was the height of the financial crisis. Gap risk is the risk that the present value of a trade could exceed the value of posted collateral. During the two quarters at issue, Deutsche Bank did not adjust its value of the LSS trades to account for gap risk, essentially assigning a zero value for gap risk. The SEC found that although there was no standard industry model to value gap risk and the valuation of these instruments was complex, Deutsche Bank did not reasonably adjust the value of the LSS trades for gap risk during these periods, resulting in misstatements of its financial statements for the two quarters at issue. The SEC also found that Deutsche Bank failed to maintain adequate systems and controls over the valuation process. The SEC found violations of Sections 13(a) (requirement to file accurate periodic reports with the SEC), 13(b)(2)(A) (requirement to maintain accurate books and records), and 13(b)(2)(B) (requirement to maintain reasonable internal accounting controls) of the U.S. Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Deutsche Bank paid a U.S.\$ 55 million penalty, for which it had previously recorded a provision, and neither admitted nor denied the findings.

Credit Default Swap Antitrust Investigations and Litigation

As previously disclosed, on 1 July 2013, the European Commission (EC) issued a Statement of Objections (the "SO") against Deutsche Bank, Markit Group Limited (Markit), the International Swaps and Derivatives Association, Inc. (ISDA), and twelve other banks alleging anti-competitive conduct under Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) and Article 53 of the European Economic Area Agreement (the "EEA Agreement"). The SO alleged that attempts by certain entities to engage in exchange trading of unfunded credit derivatives were foreclosed by improper collective action in the period from 2006 through 2009, which constituted a single and continuous infringement of Article 101 of the TFEU and Article

53 of the EEA Agreement. Deutsche Bank contested the EC's preliminary conclusions during 2014 and on 4 December 2015, the EC announced the closure without action of its investigation of Deutsche Bank and the twelve other banks (but not Markit or ISDA).

A multi-district civil class action was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York against Deutsche Bank and numerous other credit default swap (CDS) dealer banks, as well as Markit and ISDA. Plaintiffs filed a second consolidated amended class action complaint on 11 April 2014 alleging that the banks conspired with Markit and ISDA to prevent the establishment of exchange-traded CDS, with the effect of raising prices for over-the-counter CDS transactions. Plaintiffs represent a class of individuals and entities located in the United States or abroad who, during a period from 1 January 2008 through 31 December 2013, directly purchased CDS from or directly sold CDS to the dealer defendants in the United States. The second amended class action complaint did not specify the damages sought. Defendants moved to dismiss the second consolidated amended class action complaint on 23 May 2014. On 4 September 2014, the court granted in part and denied in part the motion to dismiss. On 30 September 2015, Deutsche Bank executed a settlement agreement to resolve the matter for U.S.\$ 120 million, which is subject to court approval.

Dole Food Company

DBSI and Deutsche Bank AG New York Branch ("DBNY") were named as co-defendants in a class action pending in Delaware Court of Chancery that was brought by former stockholders of Dole Food Company, Inc. ("Dole"). Plaintiffs alleged that defendant David H. Murdock and certain members of Dole's board and management (who are also named as defendants) breached their fiduciary duties, and that DBSI and DBNY aided and abetted in those breaches, in connection with Mr. Murdock's privatization of Dole, which closed on 1 November 2013 (the "Transaction"). Trial in this matter concluded on 9 March 2015. On 27 August 2015, the court issued its post-trial decision, which found that (i) DBSI and DBNY were not liable for aiding and abetting breaches of fiduciary duties, and (ii) Mr. Murdock and Dole's former President, Michael Carter, breached their fiduciary duties to Dole's stockholders, holding them responsible for damages of approximately U.S.\$ 148 million, prior to the application of interest.

On 7 December 2015, Mr. Murdock and the plaintiffs filed with the court a stipulation of settlement, pursuant to which, among other things, (i) Mr. Murdock agreed to make a payment of damages to Dole's stockholders consistent with the court's decision and (ii) the defendants in the litigation will receive a release from liability with respect to the Transaction, including DBSI and DBNY. In filings dated 25 and 27 January 2016, three purported Dole stockholders objected to the settlement, although two of the three subsequently withdrew their objections. The remaining objector asserted that stockholders who sold their Dole shares after the announcement of the Transaction on 10 June 2013 but prior to the closing of the Transaction on 1 November 2013 should be considered part of the class for purposes of distributing the settlement proceeds. A fairness hearing took place on 10 February 2016 to determine whether the court would approve the stipulation of settlement. At the hearing on 10 February 2016, the court approved the settlement and entered a final order terminating the litigation.

Esch Funds Litigation

Sal. Oppenheim jr. & Cie. AG & Co. KGaA ("Sal. Oppenheim") was prior to its acquisition by Deutsche Bank in 2010 involved in the marketing and financing of participations in closed end real estate funds. These funds were structured as Civil Law Partnerships under German law. Usually, Josef Esch Fonds-Projekt GmbH performed the planning and project development. Sal. Oppenheim held an indirect interest in this company via a joint-venture. In relation to this business a number of civil claims have been filed against Sal. Oppenheim. Some but not all of these claims are also directed against former managing partners of Sal. Oppenheim and other individuals. The claims brought against Sal. Oppenheim relate to investments of originally approximately €1.1 billion. After certain claims have either been dismissed in court or were settled to the effect that no further action will be taken, claims relating to investments of originally approximately €500 million are still pending.

Currently, the aggregate amounts claimed in the pending proceedings are approximately € 640 million. The investors are seeking to unwind their fund participation and to be indemnified against potential losses and debt related to the investment. The claims are based in part on an alleged failure of Sal. Oppenheim to provide adequate information on related risks and other material aspects important for the investors' decision. Based on the facts of the individual cases, some courts have decided in favor and some against Sal. Oppenheim. Appeals are pending. The Group has recorded provisions and contingent liabilities with respect to these cases but has not disclosed the amounts thereof because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously their outcome.

EVAF Matter

RREEF European Value Added Fund I, L.P. (the "Fund" or "EVAF") is a fund managed by Deutsche Bank's subsidiary, Deutsche Alternative Asset Management (UK) Limited (the "Manager"). In March 2008, the Fund committed to invest in Highstreet Investment, a consortium that acquired a 49 % stake in the landlord that owned a German department store property portfolio. On 4 September 2015, the Fund (acting through a committee of independent advisers of the General Partner of the Fund, which is also a Deutsche Bank subsidiary) filed (in the English High Court) a claim against the Manager claiming that the Manager's decision to make the Highstreet Investment had been grossly negligent, based in part on an allegation that the investment exceeded the concentration limits set out in the Fund's Investment Guidelines, and had caused the Fund losses of at least € 158.9 million (plus interest), for which the Manager was liable in damages. The parties have filed and served their statements of case setting out their formal pleaded positions. The Manager has denied acting in a grossly negligent manner and has disputed the Fund's calculation of alleged losses. A case management conference (CMC) hearing took place on 12 February 2016. The CMC set the timetable for the remainder of the proceedings, up to and including trial (which the court has determined will not take place before 25 April 2017).

FX Investigations and Litigations

Deutsche Bank has received requests for information from certain regulatory and law enforcement agencies globally who are investigating trading in, and various other aspects of, the foreign exchange market. Deutsche Bank is cooperating with these investigations. Relatedly, Deutsche Bank is conducting its own internal global review of foreign exchange trading and other aspects of its foreign exchange business.

Deutsche Bank also has been named as a defendant in multiple putative class actions brought in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York alleging antitrust and U.S. Commodity Exchange Act claims relating to the alleged manipulation of foreign exchange rates. The complaints in the class actions do not specify the damages sought. On 28 January 2015, the federal court overseeing the class actions granted the motion to dismiss with prejudice in two actions involving non-U.S. plaintiffs while denying the motion to dismiss in one action involving U.S. plaintiffs then pending. Additional actions have been filed since the court's 28 January 2015 order. There are now three actions pending. The pending consolidated action is brought on behalf of a putative class of over-the-counter traders and a putative class of central-exchange traders, who are domiciled in or traded in the United States or its territories, and alleges illegal agreements to restrain competition with respect to and to manipulate both benchmark rates and spot rates, particularly the spreads quoted on those spot rates; the complaint further alleges that those supposed conspiracies, in turn, resulted in artificial prices on centralized exchanges for foreign exchange futures and options. A second action tracks the allegations in the consolidated action and asserts that such purported conduct gave rise to, and resulted in a breach of, defendants' fiduciary duties under the U.S. Employment Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA). The third putative class action was filed in the same court on 21 December 2015, by Axiom Investment Advisors, LLC alleging that Deutsche Bank rejected FX orders placed over electronic trading platforms through the application of a function referred to as "Last Look" and that these orders were later filled at prices less favorable to putative class members. Plaintiff has asserted claims for breach of contract, quasi-contractual claims, and claims under New York statutory law. Deutsche Bank has moved to dismiss the

consolidated action and intends to move to dismiss the ERISA and Last Look actions in their entirety. The motion to dismiss in the Last Look case is due 7 March 2016, while there is no schedule yet for the ERISA action. Discovery has commenced in the consolidated and ERISA actions. Discovery has not yet commenced in the Last Look action.

Deutsche Bank also has been named as a defendant in two Canadian class proceedings brought in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Filed on 10 September 2015, these class actions assert factual allegations similar to those made in the consolidated action in the United States and seek damages pursuant to the Canadian Competition Act as well as other causes of action.

The Group has not disclosed whether it has established a provision or contingent liability with respect to these matters because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously their outcome.

High Frequency Trading/Dark Pool Trading

Deutsche Bank has received requests for information from certain regulatory authorities related to high frequency trading and the operation of Deutsche Bank's alternative trading system ("ATS" or "Dark Pool"), SuperX. The Bank is cooperating with these requests. The Group has recorded a provision with respect to this matter. The Group has not disclosed the amount of this provision because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously the outcome of this matter.

Deutsche Bank was initially named as a defendant in putative class action complaints alleging violations of U.S. securities laws related to high frequency trading, but in their consolidated amended complaint filed 2 September 2014, the plaintiffs did not include Deutsche Bank as a defendant.

Interbank Offered Rates Matters

Regulatory Enforcement Matters. Deutsche Bank has received subpoenas and requests for information from various regulatory and law enforcement agencies in Europe, North America and Asia/Pacific, including various U.S. state attorneys general, in connection with industry-wide investigations concerning the setting of London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR), Euro Interbank Offered Rate (EURIBOR), Tokyo Interbank Offered Rate (TIBOR) and other interbank offered rates. Deutsche Bank is cooperating with these investigations.

As previously reported, Deutsche Bank reached a settlement with the European Commission on December 4, 2013 as part of a collective settlement to resolve the European Commission's investigations in relation to anticompetitive conduct in the trading of Euro interest rate derivatives and Yen interest rate derivatives. Under the terms of the settlement agreement, Deutsche Bank agreed to pay €725 million in total. This fine has been paid in full and does not form part of the Bank's provisions.

Also as previously reported, on 23 April 2015, Deutsche Bank entered into separate settlements with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), the U.K. Financial Conduct Authority (FCA), and the New York State Department of Financial Services (NYSDFS) to resolve investigations into misconduct concerning the setting of LIBOR, EURIBOR, and TIBOR. Under the terms of these agreements, Deutsche Bank agreed to pay penalties of U.S.\$ 2.175 billion to the DOJ, CFTC and NYSDFS and GBP 226.8 million to the FCA. These fines have been paid in full and do not form part of the Bank's provisions, save for U.S.\$150 million that is payable to the DOJ following the sentencing of DB Group Services (UK) Ltd. as described below. The agreements also contained provisions requiring various undertakings with respect to Deutsche Bank's benchmark rate submissions in the future, as well as provisions requiring the appointment of an independent corporate monitor. Deutsche Bank was also required to take further disciplinary action against certain employees who were working at the Bank at the time of the agreements.

As part of the resolution with the DOJ, Deutsche Bank entered into a Deferred Prosecution Agreement with a three-year term pursuant to which it agreed (among other things) to the filing of a two-count criminal Information in the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut charging Deutsche Bank with one count of wire fraud and one count of price-fixing, in violation of the Sherman Act. As part of the agreement, DB Group Services (UK) Ltd. (an indirectly held, wholly-owned subsidiary of Deutsche Bank) entered into a Plea Agreement with the DOJ, pursuant to which the company pled guilty to a one-count criminal Information filed in the same court and charging the company with wire fraud. Deutsche Bank has made provision for a U.S.\$ 150 million fine, which (subject to court approval) is expected to be paid by Deutsche Bank pursuant to the Plea Agreement within ten business days of when DB Group Services (UK) Ltd. is sentenced. (The U.S.\$ 150 million fine is included in the U.S.\$ 2.175 billion in total penalties referenced in the immediately preceding paragraph.) DB Group Services (UK) Ltd. currently has a sentencing date of 7 October 2016.

Other regulatory investigations of Deutsche Bank concerning the setting of various interbank offered rates remain ongoing, and Deutsche Bank remains exposed to further regulatory action. The Group has recorded a provision with respect to certain of the regulatory investigations. The Group has not disclosed the amount of this provision because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously the outcome of these regulatory investigations.

Overview of Civil Litigations. Deutsche Bank is party to 47 civil actions concerning manipulation relating to the setting of various Interbank Offered Rates which are described in the following paragraphs. Most of the civil actions, including putative class actions, are pending in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York (SDNY), against Deutsche Bank and numerous other banks. All but six of the civil actions were filed on behalf of parties who allege losses as a result of manipulation relating to the setting of U.S. dollar LIBOR. The six civil actions pending against Deutsche Bank that do not relate to U.S. dollar LIBOR are also pending in the SDNY, and include two actions concerning Yen LIBOR and Euroyen TIBOR, one action concerning EURIBOR, two actions concerning Pound Sterling (GBP) LIBOR and one action concerning Swiss franc (CHF) LIBOR.

With one exception, all of the civil actions pending in the SDNY concerning U.S. dollar LIBOR are being coordinated as part of a multidistrict litigation (the "U.S. dollar LIBOR MDL"). This U.S. dollar LIBOR MDL includes 33 actions against Deutsche Bank and others: ten class actions and 23 individual actions. One of these individual actions includes ten actions for which the plaintiffs submitted one consolidated complaint, and is therefore discussed here as one action. Six actions originally part of the U.S. dollar LIBOR MDL were dismissed and a consolidated appeal is pending in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Several other actions that are part of the U.S. dollar LIBOR MDL were dismissed in part and also are part of the consolidated appeal. There is one non-MDL class action concerning U.S. dollar LIBOR that was dismissed and for which an appeal is pending in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Claims for damages for all 47 of the civil actions discussed have been asserted under various legal theories, including violations of the U.S. Commodity Exchange Act (CEA), federal and state antitrust laws, the U.S. Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), and other federal and state laws. In all but five cases, the amount of damages has not been formally articulated by the counterparty. The five cases that allege a specific amount of damages are individual actions consolidated in the U.S. dollar LIBOR MDL and seek a minimum of more than U.S.\$ 1.25 billion in damages in the aggregate from all defendants including Deutsche Bank. The Group has not disclosed whether it has established a provision or contingent liability with respect to these matters because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously their outcome.

U.S. dollar LIBOR. In three rulings between March 2013 and June 2014, the court in the U.S. dollar LIBOR MDL granted in part and denied in part motions to dismiss addressed to the six first-filed complaints (three class actions and three individual actions). The court issued decisions permitting certain CEA claims and state law contract and unjust enrichment claims to proceed, while dismissing certain CEA claims as time-barred and dismissing all of plaintiffs' federal and state law antitrust claims and claims asserted under RICO. This resulted in the dismissal of four cases in their entirety (one class action and three individual actions) and the partial dismissal of two cases (both class actions). One of the four cases dismissed in its entirety is being appealed as part of the consolidated appeal discussed below. In the other three cases dismissed in their entirety, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit denied plaintiffs' efforts to appeal as untimely, and in October

2015, the U.S. Supreme Court denied plaintiffs' petition to have it review the Second Circuit's denial. Separately, and prior to the Supreme Court's October 2015 denial, on 10 February 2015, the plaintiffs in those three cases filed a second notice of appeal, which defendants have moved to dismiss.

Various additional plaintiffs proceeding in their individual capacities have brought actions against Deutsche Bank. On 4 August 2015, the court issued an opinion concerning some of the 23 individual actions consolidated in the U.S. dollar LIBOR MDL. Deutsche Bank is a defendant in 17 of those cases. Several claims have been dismissed against certain parties, including a subsidiary of Deutsche Bank, based on lack of jurisdiction. Other claims were dismissed against all parties, including claims for antitrust, RICO, conspiracy, consumer protection, unfair business practices, and state law claims for injunctive and equitable relief. Contract, fraud and other tort claims from certain counterparties with whom Deutsche Bank had direct dealings remain pending against Deutsche Bank. For some claims, the court described legal principles and directed the parties in the first instance to attempt to reach agreement on which claims survive. On 21 January 2016, the parties filed a response to the court's request.

Some of the plaintiffs in these individual actions were permitted by the lower court to pursue appeals on their federal antitrust claims. These plaintiffs, along with plaintiffs in one of the first-filed class actions discussed above, are pursuing appeals to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Also part of the consolidated appeal are two class actions involving only federal antitrust claims, which were dismissed upon the plaintiffs' request so that they could become part of the appeal. The Second Circuit granted a motion by defendants to consolidate these appeals, and briefing was completed on 17 August 2015. Oral argument was held on 13 November 2015. Certain other class actions with federal antitrust claims are stayed pending resolution of this appeal.

Plaintiffs representing putative classes of homeowners and lenders also have brought actions against Deutsche Bank, which have been consolidated in the U.S. dollar LIBOR MDL. On 3 November 2015, the court issued an opinion dismissing all lender plaintiffs' claims except those by one plaintiff. The court ordered the parties to confer in the first instance to discuss which claims in the action are within the court's jurisdiction. The court also dismissed all claims by homeowner plaintiffs for lack of jurisdiction. On 17 November 2015, the lender plaintiffs filed an amended complaint and an accompanying letter regarding additional amendments. Defendants opposed the filings.

Plaintiffs representing a putative class of plaintiffs who allegedly transacted in exchange-traded financial instruments referencing U.S. dollar LIBOR (the "exchange-based plaintiffs") also have brought an action against Deutsche Bank, which has been consolidated in the U.S. dollar LIBOR MDL. On 29 June 2015, the exchange-based plaintiffs requested leave to move to amend their complaint to include new allegations relating to Deutsche Bank's 23 April 2015 IBOR settlements with the DOJ, CFTC, NYSDFS, and FCA. The proposed amended complaint also would add two Deutsche Bank subsidiaries, DB Group Services (UK) Ltd. and Deutsche Bank Securities Inc., as named defendants. In December 2015, several defendants, including Deutsche Bank, opposed the proposed amendments. On 29 October 2015, the court denied a request by the exchange-based plaintiffs for leave to file a motion to reconsider aspects of its earlier opinions, and denied their request for certification of an interlocutory appeal. On 3 November 2015, the court issued an opinion regarding defendants' motion to dismiss exchange-based plaintiffs' claims for lack of jurisdiction, but ordered the parties to confer in the first instance to discuss which claims survive on jurisdiction grounds. This ruling does not bear directly on exchange-based plaintiffs' proposed amended complaint. Discovery is ongoing.

Plaintiffs representing a putative class of plaintiffs who allegedly transacted in U.S. dollar LIBOR-referencing over-the-counter financial instruments (the "OTC plaintiffs") filed a proposed third amended complaint on 23 November 2015. Defendants opposed plaintiffs' proposed amendments on 18 December 2015.

The court in an additional action concerning U.S. dollar LIBOR that was independently pending in the SDNY, outside of the U.S. dollar LIBOR MDL, has granted defendants' motions to dismiss. The plaintiff has filed a motion to amend its complaint, which is pending.

Deutsche Bank also was named as a defendant in a civil action in the Central District of California concerning U.S. dollar LIBOR. The court granted Deutsche Bank's motion to dismiss. The plaintiff is currently pursuing an appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and briefing was completed on 8 January 2016.

Yen LIBOR and Euroyen TIBOR. A putative class action was filed in the SDNY against Deutsche Bank and other banks concerning the alleged manipulation of Yen LIBOR and Euroyen TIBOR. On 31 March 2015, the court denied in part and granted in part a motion by the plaintiff to amend his complaint. The court denied plaintiff's requests to assert RICO claims against Deutsche Bank and to add two new named plaintiffs. On 18 December 2015, plaintiff served a third amended complaint. On 8 January 2016, the court struck the third amended complaint as going beyond the amendments the court authorized in its 31 March 2015 decision. On 28 January 2016, plaintiffs requested permission to file a new proposed third amended complaint. Defendants opposed this request on 18 February 2016.

A second putative class action alleging manipulation of Yen LIBOR and Euroyen TIBOR and naming Deutsche Bank and a subsidiary, DB Group Services (UK) Ltd., as defendants, along with other banks and inter-dealer brokers, was filed in the SDNY on 24 July 2015. On 18 December 2015, plaintiffs served an amended complaint. Motions to dismiss the complaint were filed on 1 February 2016.

EURIBOR. Deutsche Bank and a subsidiary, DB Group Services (UK) Ltd., are also named as defendants in a putative class action concerning the alleged manipulation of EURIBOR, pending in the SDNY. A motion to dismiss plaintiffs' further amended complaint was filed in October 2015 and is pending.

Pound Sterling (GBP) LIBOR. On 6 May 2015, Deutsche Bank was named as a defendant in a putative class action in the SDNY concerning the alleged manipulation of Pound Sterling (GBP) LIBOR. Defendants' motions to dismiss were filed on 13 November 2015.

On 21 January 2016, Deutsche Bank was named as a defendant in an additional putative class action in the SDNY concerning the alleged manipulation of Pound Sterling (GBP) LIBOR. On 11 February 2016, the court consolidated these two actions.

Swiss Franc (CHF) LIBOR. On 19 June 2015, Deutsche Bank and a subsidiary, DB Group Services (UK) Ltd., were named as defendants in a putative class action in the SDNY concerning the alleged manipulation of Swiss Franc (CHF) LIBOR. Motions to dismiss were filed in August 2015 and are pending.

ISDAFIX

Deutsche Bank has received requests for information from certain regulatory authorities concerning the setting of ISDAFIX benchmarks, which provide average mid-market rates for fixed interest rate swaps. The Bank is cooperating with these requests. In addition, the Bank has been named as a defendant in five putative class actions that were consolidated in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York asserting antitrust, fraud, and other claims relating to an alleged conspiracy to manipulate the U.S. dollar ISDAFIX benchmark. Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on 12 February 2015. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the amended complaint on 13 April 2015, which was fully briefed as of 15 July 2015.

Kaupthing CLN Claims

In June 2012, Kaupthing hf, an Icelandic stock corporation, acting through its winding-up committee, issued Icelandic law clawback claims for approximately €509 million (plus interest calculated on a damages rate basis and penalty rate basis) against Deutsche Bank in both Iceland and England. The claims relate to leveraged credit linked notes ("CLNs"), referencing Kaupthing, issued by Deutsche Bank to two British Virgin Island special purpose vehicles ("SPVs") in 2008. The SPVs were ultimately owned by high net worth individuals. Kaupthing claims to have funded the SPVs and alleges that Deutsche Bank was or should have been aware

that Kaupthing itself was economically exposed in the transactions. Kaupthing claims that the transactions are voidable by Kaupthing on a number of alternative grounds, including the ground that the transactions were improper because one of the alleged purposes of the transactions was to allow Kaupthing to influence the market in its own CDS (credit default swap) spreads and thereby its listed bonds. Additionally, in November 2012, an English law claim (with allegations similar to those featured in the Icelandic law claims) was commenced by Kaupthing against Deutsche Bank in London. Deutsche Bank filed a defense in the Icelandic proceedings in late February 2013 and continues to defend the claims. In February 2014, proceedings in England were stayed pending final determination of the Icelandic proceedings. Additionally, in December 2014, the SPVs and their joint liquidators served Deutsche Bank with substantively similar claims arising out of the CLN transactions against Deutsche Bank and other defendants in England. The SPVs are also claiming approximately €509 million (plus interest), although the amount of that interest claim is less than in Iceland. Deutsche Bank has filed a defense in these proceedings and continues to defend them. The SPVs' claims are not expected to increase Deutsche Bank's overall potential liability in respect of the CLN transactions beyond the amount already claimed by Kaupthing. The Group has not disclosed whether it has established a provision or contingent liability with respect to these matters because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously their outcome.

Kirch

The public prosecutor's office in Munich (Staatsanwaltschaft München I) has conducted and is currently conducting criminal investigations in connection with the Kirch case with regard to former Management Board members as well as the current Management Board member Jürgen Fitschen. The Kirch case involved several civil proceedings between Deutsche Bank AG and Dr. Leo Kirch as well as media companies controlled by him. The key issue was whether an interview given by Dr. Rolf Breuer, then Spokesman of Deutsche Bank's Management Board, in 2002 with Bloomberg television, during which Dr. Breuer commented on Dr. Kirch's (and his companies') inability to obtain financing, caused the insolvency of the Kirch companies. In February 2014, Deutsche Bank and the Kirch heirs reached a comprehensive settlement, which has ended all legal disputes between them.

The main investigation involving Mr. Fitschen and several former Management Board members has been concluded and an indictment against all accused was filed on 6 August 2014. Trial started on 28 April 2015 and court dates are currently scheduled until April 2016, generally one day per week. The court ordered the secondary participation of Deutsche Bank AG, which could result in the imposition of a monetary fine on the Bank.

The investigation involving former Management Board member Dr. Stephan Leithner is ongoing.

The allegations of the public prosecutors are that Mr. Fitschen and former Management Board member Dr. Stephan Leithner failed to correct in a timely manner factual statements made by Deutsche Bank's litigation counsel in submissions filed in one of the civil cases between Kirch and Deutsche Bank AG before the Munich Higher Regional Court and the Federal Court of Justice, after allegedly having become aware that such statements were not correct. Under German law, a party in a civil litigation is under a statutory duty to make sure all factual statements made by it in court are accurate. The indictment of Mr. Fitschen and the ongoing investigation of Dr. Leithner are based on the allegation that (unlike the other Management Board members) they had special knowledge or responsibility in relation to the Kirch case. The indictment regarding other former Management Board members is based on the allegation that they gave incorrect testimony to the Munich Higher Regional Court.

The Supervisory Board and the Management Board of Deutsche Bank have obtained opinions from an international law firm and a retired president of one of the leading courts of appeal in Germany to the effect that there is no basis for the accusation of criminal wrongdoing made by the public prosecutors against Mr. Fitschen and Dr. Leithner. Deutsche Bank is fully cooperating with the Munich public prosecutor's office.

The Group does not expect these proceedings to have significant economic consequences for it and has not recorded a provision or contingent liability with respect thereto.

KOSPI Index Unwind Matters

Following the decline of the Korea Composite Stock Price Index 200 (the "KOSPI 200") in the closing auction on 11 November 2010 by approximately 2.7 %, the Korean Financial Supervisory Service ("FSS") commenced an investigation and expressed concerns that the fall in the KOSPI 200 was attributable to a sale by Deutsche Bank of a basket of stocks, worth approximately €1.6 billion, that was held as part of an index arbitrage position on the KOSPI 200. On 23 February 2011, the Korean Financial Services Commission, which oversees the work of the FSS, reviewed the FSS' findings and recommendations and resolved to take the following actions: (i) to file a criminal complaint to the Korean Prosecutor's Office for alleged market manipulation against five employees of the Deutsche Bank group and Deutsche Bank's subsidiary Deutsche Securities Korea Co. (DSK) for vicarious corporate criminal liability; and (ii) to impose a suspension of six months, commencing 1 April 2011 and ending 30 September 2011, of DSK's business for proprietary trading of cash equities and listed derivatives and DMA (direct market access) cash equities trading, and the requirement that DSK suspend the employment of one named employee for six months. There was an exemption to the business suspension which permitted DSK to continue acting as liquidity provider for existing derivatives linked securities. On 19 August 2011, the Korean Prosecutor's Office announced its decision to indict DSK and four employees of the Deutsche Bank group on charges of spot/futures linked market manipulation. The criminal trial commenced in January 2012. On 25 January 2016, the Seoul Central District Court rendered a guilty verdict against a DSK trader and a guilty verdict against DSK. A criminal fine of KRW 1.5 billion (less than €2.0 million) was imposed on DSK. The Court also ordered forfeiture of the profits generated on the underlying trading activity. The Group disgorged the profits on the underlying trading activity in 2011. The criminal trial verdict is subject to appeal by both the prosecutor and the defendants.

In addition, a number of civil actions have been filed in Korean courts against Deutsche Bank and DSK by certain parties who allege they incurred losses as a consequence of the fall in the KOSPI 200 on 11 November 2010. First instance court decisions were rendered against the Bank and DSK in some of these cases starting in the fourth quarter of 2015. The outstanding known claims have an aggregate claim amount of less than € 80 million (at present exchange rates). The Group has recorded a provision with respect to these outstanding civil matters. The Group has not disclosed the amount of this provision because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously the outcome of these matters.

Monte Dei Paschi

In February 2013 Banca Monte Dei Paschi Di Siena ("MPS") issued civil proceedings in Italy against Deutsche Bank alleging that Deutsche Bank assisted former MPS senior management in an accounting fraud on MPS, by undertaking repo transactions with MPS and "Santorini", a wholly owned SPV of MPS, which helped MPS defer losses on a previous transaction undertaken with Deutsche Bank. Subsequently, in July 2013, the Fondazione Monte Dei Paschi, MPS' largest shareholder, also issued civil proceedings in Italy for damages based on substantially the same facts. In December 2013, Deutsche Bank reached an agreement with MPS on the grounds of which the civil proceedings were settled and the transactions were unwound at a discount for MPS. The civil proceedings by the Fondazione Monte Dei Paschi, in which damages of between € 120 million and € 307 million are claimed, remain pending.

A criminal investigation was launched by the Siena Public Prosecutor into the transactions and certain unrelated transactions entered into by a number of other international banks with MPS. Such investigation was moved in September 2014 from Siena to the Milan Public Prosecutors as a result of a change in the alleged charges being investigated. On 16 February 2016, the Milan Public Prosecutors issued a request of committal to trial against Deutsche Bank AG and six current and former employees. The preliminary hearing before the judge for the preliminary investigation phase (who has to decide whether to adhere to the request of committal

to trial or not) is scheduled to take place in March 2016. Separately, Deutsche Bank has also received requests for information from certain regulators relating to the transactions, including with respect to Deutsche Bank's accounting for the transactions and alleged failures by Deutsche Bank's management adequately to supervise the individuals involved in the matter. Deutsche Bank is cooperating with these regulators.

Mortgage-Related and Asset-Backed Securities Matters and Investigation

Regulatory and Governmental Matters. Deutsche Bank, along with certain affiliates (collectively referred in these paragraphs to as "Deutsche Bank"), have received subpoenas and requests for information from certain regulators and government entities, including members of the Residential Mortgage-Backed Securities Working Group of the U.S. Financial Fraud Enforcement Task Force, concerning its activities regarding the origination, purchase, securitization, sale and/or trading of mortgage loans, residential mortgage-backed securities (RMBS), commercial mortgage-backed securities (CMBS), collateralized debt obligations, other asset-backed securities and credit derivatives. Deutsche Bank is cooperating fully in response to those subpoenas and requests for information. The Group has recorded provisions with respect to some of the regulatory investigations but not others. The Group has not disclosed the amount of these provisions because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously the outcome of these regulatory investigations.

Deutsche Bank was named as a defendant in a civil action brought by the Commonwealth of Virginia asserting claims for fraud and breach of the Virginia Fraud Against Taxpayers Act as a result of purchases by the Virginia Retirement System (VRS) of RMBS issued or underwritten by Deutsche Bank. This matter was settled in the fourth quarter of 2015 for an amount that was not material to Deutsche Bank.

Issuer and Underwriter Civil Litigation. Deutsche Bank has been named as defendant in numerous civil litigations brought by private parties in connection with its various roles, including issuer or underwriter, in offerings of RMBS and other asset-backed securities. These cases, described below, include putative class action suits, actions by individual purchasers of securities and actions by trustees on behalf of RMBS trusts. Although the allegations vary by lawsuit, these cases generally allege that the RMBS offering documents contained material misrepresentations and omissions, including with regard to the underwriting standards pursuant to which the underlying mortgage loans were issued, or assert that various representations or warranties relating to the loans were breached at the time of origination. The Group has recorded provisions with respect to several of these civil cases, but has not recorded provisions with respect to all of these matters. The Group has not disclosed the amount of these provisions because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously the outcome of these matters.

Deutsche Bank was a defendant in putative class action relating to its role, along with other financial institutions, as underwriter of RMBS issued by IndyMac MBS, Inc. On 8 September 2014, Deutsche Bank, certain other financial institution defendants and lead plaintiffs executed a stipulation to settle the action. On 30 September 2014, the court issued an order certifying the class for settlement and approving notice to the class. On 23 February 2015, the court issued an order approving the settlement and dismissing the action. Under the settlement, all settling defendants paid a total of U.S.\$ 340 million. Deutsche Bank's portion of the settlement is not material to it. On 25 March 2015, Pacific Investment Management Company, LLC (PIMCO) filed a notice of appeal of the court's 23 February 2015 order, but withdrew the appeal on 11 June 2015.

Deutsche Bank is a defendant in a putative class action relating to its role, along with other financial institutions, as underwriter of RMBS issued by Novastar Mortgage Corporation. No specific damages are alleged in the complaint. On 5 February 2015, the court issued an order vacating its prior decision that had dismissed five of six RMBS offerings from the case. The court ordered the plaintiffs to amend the operative complaint to include the previously dismissed offerings. On 9 March 2015, the lead plaintiff filed its third amended complaint pursuant to the court's 5 February 2015 order. Discovery in the action is ongoing.

Deutsche Bank currently is a defendant in various non-class action lawsuits by alleged purchasers of, and counterparties involved in transactions relating to, RMBS, and their affiliates, including: (1) Aozora Bank, Ltd. (alleging U.S.\$ 61 million in damages attributable to Deutsche Bank); (2) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) as receiver for: (a) Colonial Bank (in one of two separate actions, alleging no less than U.S.\$ 189 million in damages in the aggregate against all defendants), (b) Franklin Bank S.S.B. and Guaranty Bank (alleging no less than U.S.\$ 901 million in damages in the aggregate against all defendants), and (c) Citizens National Bank and Strategic Capital Bank (in one of two separate actions, alleging no less than U.S.\$ 66 million in damages in the aggregate against all defendants); (3) the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco; (4) Phoenix Light SF Limited (as purported assignee of claims of special purpose vehicles created and/or managed by former WestLB AG); and (5) Royal Park Investments (as purported assignee of claims of a special-purpose vehicle created to acquire certain assets of Fortis Bank). Unless otherwise indicated, the complaints in these matters did not specify the damages sought.

On 14 January 2015, the court granted Deutsche Bank's motion to dismiss the action brought against it by Aozora Bank, Ltd., relating to a collateralized debt obligation identified as Blue Edge ABS CDO, Ltd. On 31 March 2015, the court denied Aozora Bank, Ltd.'s motion to reargue, or, in the alternative, to file an amended complaint. On 29 April 2015, Aozora Bank, Ltd. filed a notice of appeal and the appeal commenced on 5 October 2015. The appeal is pending. Deutsche Bank also is a defendant, along with UBS AG and affiliates, in an action brought by Aozora Bank, Ltd. On 14 October 2015, the court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motions to dismiss the complaint. On 30 October 2015, defendants filed notices of appeal. Discovery has not yet commenced.

In 2012, the FDIC, as receiver for Colonial Bank, Franklin Bank S.S.B., Guaranty Bank, Citizens National Bank and Strategic Capital Bank, commenced several actions in different federal courts asserting claims under Sections 11 and 12(a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933, as well as Article 581-33 of the Texas Securities Act, against several underwriters, including Deutsche Bank. Each of these actions has been dismissed as time-barred. The FDIC has appealed these rulings to the Second, Fifth and Ninth Circuits Courts of Appeal. The appeals in the Second and Ninth Circuits Courts of Appeal are pending. On 10 August 2015, the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit reversed the district court's dismissal of the FDIC's claims as time-barred. On 24 August 2015, Deutsche Bank and the other defendants filed a petition for rehearing en banc in that action. On 11 September 2015, the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit denied that petition. On 10 December 2015, Deutsche Bank and other defendants filed a petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Supreme Court challenging the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit's reversal of the district court's dismissal of the case.

On 22 January 2015, pursuant to a confidential settlement agreement with Deutsche Bank, the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco dismissed with prejudice claims that it had filed against Deutsche Bank relating to seven RMBS offerings. On 26 January 2015, pursuant to a confidential agreement between the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco and Countrywide, the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco entered an order dismissing with prejudice claims brought against Deutsche Bank by the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco relating to 15 offerings issued by entities affiliated with Countrywide. Deutsche Bank's understanding is that the dismissal with respect to these 15 offerings was pursuant to a confidential settlement agreement to which Deutsche Bank was not a party. Deutsche Bank remains a defendant in the case with respect to one RMBS offering and two offerings described as resecuritizations of RMBS certificates. No specific damages are alleged in the complaint. The case is in discovery.

Residential Funding Company has brought a repurchase action against Deutsche Bank for breaches of representations and warranties on loans sold to Residential Funding Company and for indemnification for losses incurred as a result of RMBS-related claims and actions asserted against Residential Funding Company. The complaint did not specify the amount of damages sought. On 8 June 2015, the court denied Deutsche Bank's motion to dismiss certain of the claims. Also on 8 June 2015, Deutsche Bank moved to dismiss other claims. On 29 September 2015, the court denied Deutsche Bank's second motion to dismiss. Discovery is ongoing.

On 19 December 2014, a stipulation was filed dismissing with prejudice claims brought against Deutsche Bank by Mass Mutual Life Insurance Company relating to offerings issued by entities affiliated with Countrywide. Deutsche Bank's understanding is that the dismissal with respect to these offerings was pursuant to a

confidential settlement agreement to which Deutsche Bank was not a party. Deutsche Bank was a defendant in separate litigation brought by Mass Mutual Life Insurance Company relating to certificates not issued by entities affiliated with Countrywide. On 22 July 2015, Deutsche Bank and Mass Mutual Life Insurance Company entered into a settlement agreement to resolve all pending claims against Deutsche Bank. On 11 August 2015, Deutsche Bank paid the settlement amount and on 15 August 2015, the court dismissed the actions. The economic impact of the settlement was not material to Deutsche Bank.

On 20 April 2011, the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston filed a complaint against dozens of entities, including Deutsche Bank, alleging a variety of claims under the Massachusetts Uniform Securities Act and various other Massachusetts statutory and common laws. The complaint did not specify the amount of damages sought. On 16 October 2015, the parties signed a settlement agreement to resolve the matter. On 27 October 2015, the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston filed a stipulation of voluntary dismissal with prejudice. The financial terms of the settlement are not material to Deutsche Bank.

On 22 September 2015, Deutsche Bank and the Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, as successor to the Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, executed a settlement agreement resolving all claims related to the single bond at issue. On 12 October 2015, the court entered the parties' stipulation dismissing the matter. The financial terms of the settlement are not material to Deutsche Bank.

Deutsche Bank and Monarch Alternative Capital LP and certain of its advisory clients and managed investments vehicles (Monarch) reached an agreement on 18 December 2014 to propose a settlement agreement to HSBC Bank USA, National Association (HSBC) to resolve litigation relating to three RMBS trusts. After receiving approval from a majority of certificate holders, on 13 July 2015, HSBC executed the settlement agreements, and on 27 July 2015, the actions were dismissed. A substantial portion of the settlement funds were paid by a non-party to the litigation. The net economic impact of the settlements was not material to Deutsche Bank. On 17 June 2015, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the RMBS-related claims brought by Commerzbank AG against Deutsche Bank and several other financial institutions. Commerzbank AG filed a notice to appeal on 24 July 2015, but withdrew that appeal on 17 August 2015.

In March 2012, RMBS Recovery Holdings 4, LLC and VP Structured Products, LLC brought an action in New York state court against Deutsche Bank alleging breaches of representations and warranties made by Deutsche Bank concerning the mortgage loans in the ACE Securities Corp. 2006-SL2 RMBS offering. The complaint did not specify the amount of damages sought. On 13 May 2013, the court denied Deutsche Bank's motion to dismiss the action as time-barred. On 19 December 2013, the appellate court reversed the lower court's decision and dismissed the case. On 11 June 2015, the New York Court of Appeals affirmed the appellate court's dismissal of the case. The court found that plaintiff's cause of action accrued more than six years before the filing of the complaint and was therefore barred by the statute of limitations.

Deutsche Bank was named as a defendant in a lawsuit filed by Sealink Funding Ltd., an entity established as part of the bailout of Sachsen Landesbank to function as purported assignee of claims of special purpose vehicles created and/or managed by Sachsen Landesbank and its subsidiaries. In the third and fourth quarters of 2015, Sealink Funding Ltd. unsuccessfully appealed an order dismissing its claims against Morgan Stanley in another similar action for lack of standing. In denying Sealink Funding Ltd.'s appeal, the appellate court found that the sales and purchase agreements through which Sealink Funding Ltd. acquired the at-issue securities did not validly transfer tort claims. The appellate court's decision was dispositive of Sealink Funding Ltd.'s claims against Deutsche Bank, as Sealink Funding Ltd. acquired the at-issue securities in the Deutsche Bank action through the same sales and purchase agreements involved in the Morgan Stanley case. On 21 December 2015, Sealink Funding Ltd. voluntarily dismissed its claims with prejudice.

Deutsche Bank was a defendant in a civil action brought by Texas County & District Retirement System alleging fraud and other common law claims in connection with Texas County & District Retirement System's purchase of four RMBS bonds underwritten by Deutsche Bank. On 18 November 2015, Deutsche Bank and Texas County & District Retirement System reached an agreement to settle the latter's claims against Deutsche Bank. On 3 December 2015, the district court entered an order dismissing the action with prejudice. The financial terms of the settlement are not material to Deutsche Bank.

Deutsche Bank was named as a defendant in a civil action brought by the Charles Schwab Corporation seeking rescission of its purchase of a single Countrywide-issued RMBS certificate. In the fourth quarter of 2015, Bank of America, which indemnified Deutsche Bank in the case, reached an agreement to settle the action with respect to the single certificate at issue for Deutsche Bank. On 25 January 2016, the Charles Schwab Corporation filed a request for dismissal with prejudice as to Deutsche Bank Securities Inc.

Deutsche Bank was named as a defendant in a FINRA arbitration brought by the Knights of Columbus (“Knights”) alleging fraud, negligence, violation of state securities law, and violations of industry rules and practice in connection with six third-party offerings underwritten by Deutsche Bank. On 22 February 2016, Deutsche Bank and Knights executed an agreement to settle the matter. The financial terms of the settlement are not material to Deutsche Bank.

Deutsche Bank and Amherst Advisory & Management LLC (Amherst) reached an agreement on 12 February 2016 to propose settlement agreements to HSBC Bank USA, National Association (HSBC) to resolve breach of contract actions relating to five RMBS trusts. Pursuant to the agreements with Amherst, on 17 February 2016 Amherst requested that HSBC conduct a vote of certificateholders for each of the trusts concerning the approval or rejection of the proposed settlements. A substantial portion of the settlement funds that would be paid by Deutsche Bank with respect to one of the five trusts, if the proposed settlement is consummated as to that trust, would be reimbursed by a non-party to that litigation. The net economic impact of the settlements was already reflected in prior periods.

On 3 February 2016, Lehman Brothers Holding, Inc. instituted an adversary proceeding in United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York against, among others, MortgageIT, Inc. (MIT) and Deutsche Bank AG, as alleged successor to MIT, asserting breaches of representations and warranties set forth in certain 2003 and 2004 loan purchase agreements concerning 63 mortgage loans that MIT sold to Lehman, which Lehman in turn sold to the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac). The complaint seeks indemnification for losses incurred by Lehman in connection with settlements entered into with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac as part of the Lehman bankruptcy proceedings to resolve claims concerning those loans. No specific damages are alleged in the complaint. The time to respond to the complaint has not yet expired.

In the actions against Deutsche Bank solely as an underwriter of other issuers’ RMBS offerings, Deutsche Bank has contractual rights to indemnification from the issuers, but those indemnity rights may in whole or in part prove effectively unenforceable where the issuers are now or may in the future be in bankruptcy or otherwise defunct.

Deutsche Bank has entered into agreements with certain entities that have threatened to assert claims against Deutsche Bank in connection with various RMBS offerings and other related products to toll the relevant statutes of limitations. It is possible that these potential claims may have a material impact on Deutsche Bank. In addition, Deutsche Bank has entered into settlement agreements with some of these entities, the financial terms of which are not material to Deutsche Bank.

Trustee Civil Litigation. Deutsche Bank National Trust Company (“DBNTC”) and Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas (“DBTCA”) have been sued by investors in civil litigation concerning their role as trustees of certain RMBS trusts.

On 18 June 2014, a group of investors, including funds managed by Blackrock Advisors, LLC, PIMCO-Advisors, L.P., and others, filed a derivative action against DBNTC and DBTCA in New York State Supreme Court purportedly on behalf of and for the benefit of 544 private-label RMBS trusts asserting claims for alleged violations of the U.S. Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (TIA), breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty and negligence based on DBNTC and DBTCA’s alleged failure to perform their duties as trustees for the trusts. Plaintiffs subsequently dismissed their state court complaint and filed a derivative and class action complaint in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York on behalf of and for the benefit of 564 private-label RMBS trusts, which substantially overlapped with the trusts at issue in the state court action. The complaint alleges that the trusts at issue have suffered total realized collateral losses of U.S.\$ 89.4 billion, but the complaint does not include a demand for money damages in a sum certain. DBNTC and DBTCA filed a

motion to dismiss, and on 19 January 2016, the court partially granted the motion on procedural grounds: as to the 500 trusts that are governed by Pooling and Servicing Agreements, the court declined to exercise jurisdiction. The court did not rule on substantive defenses asserted in the motion to dismiss. The court further ordered plaintiffs to file an amended complaint consistent with its ruling as to the remaining 64 trusts governed by indentures. DBNTC and DBTCA will have an opportunity to file new defensive motions with respect to the amended complaint after it is filed.

On 18 June 2014, Royal Park Investments SA/NV filed a class and derivative action complaint on behalf of investors in ten RMBS trusts against DBNTC in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York asserting claims for alleged violations of the TIA, breach of contract and breach of trust based on DBNTC's alleged failure to perform its duties as trustee for the trusts. Royal Park's complaint alleges that the total realized losses of the ten trusts amount to over U.S.\$ 3.1 billion, but does not allege damages in a sum certain. On 3 February 2016, the court granted in part and dismissed in part plaintiffs' claims: the court dismissed plaintiff's TIA claim and its derivative theory and denied DBNTC's motion to dismiss the breach of contract and breach of trust claims. Discovery is ongoing.

On 7 November 2014, the National Credit Union Administration Board ("NCUA"), as an investor in 121 RMBS trusts, filed a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York against DBNTC as trustee of those trusts, alleging violations of the TIA and the New York Streit Act for DBNTC's alleged failure to perform certain purported statutory and contractual duties. On 5 March 2015, NCUA amended its complaint to assert claims as an investor in 97 of the 121 RMBS trusts that were the subject of its first complaint. The amended complaint alleges violations of the TIA and Streit Act, as well as breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, negligence, gross negligence, negligent misrepresentation, and breach of the covenant of good faith. NCUA's complaint alleges that the trusts at issue have suffered total realized collateral losses of U.S.\$ 17.2 billion, but the complaint does not include a demand for money damages in a sum certain. DBNTC filed a motion to dismiss that is fully briefed but not yet decided. Discovery is stayed.

On 23 December 2014, certain CDOs (collectively, "Phoenix Light SF Limited") that hold RMBS certificates issued by 21 RMBS trusts filed a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York against DBNTC as trustee of the trusts, asserting claims for violation of the TIA and the Streit Act, breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, negligence, gross negligence, and negligent misrepresentation, based on DBNTC's alleged failure to perform its duties as trustee for the trusts. On 10 April 2015, the CDOs filed an amended complaint relating to an additional 34 trusts (for a total of 55 trusts) and amended their complaint for a second time on 15 July 2015 to include additional allegations. The CDOs allege that DBNTC is liable for over U.S.\$ 527 million of damages. DBNTC filed a motion to dismiss that is fully briefed but not yet decided. Discovery is stayed. On 2 February 2016, the court entered a stipulation signed by the parties to dismiss with prejudice claims relating to four of the 55 trusts.

On 24 March 2015, the Western and Southern Life Insurance Company and five related entities (collectively "Western & Southern"), as investors in 18 RMBS trusts, filed a complaint in the Court of Common Pleas, Hamilton County, Ohio, against DBNTC as trustee for 12 of those trusts, asserting claims for violation of the TIA and the Streit Act, breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, negligence, gross negligence, negligent misrepresentation, and breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, based on DBNTC's alleged failure to perform its duties as trustee for the trusts. Western & Southern alleges that it purchased certificates of the trusts with a face value of more than U.S.\$ 220 million and that the trusts at issue have suffered total realized collateral losses of U.S.\$ 1 billion, but the complaint does not include a demand for money damages in a sum certain. DBNTC filed a motion to dismiss based upon lack of personal jurisdiction and forum non conveniens; a motion to stay the case pending the resolution of similar actions in New York against DBNTC; and a motion to sever the claims against DBNTC from those against its co-defendant. On 5 November 2015, the Court denied DBNTC's motion to dismiss and motion to stay the case but granted DBNTC's motion to sever. After DBNTC's first motion to dismiss was decided, DBNTC filed another motion to dismiss, this time for failure to state a claim. Discovery is ongoing.

On 23 December 2015, Commerzbank AG ("Commerzbank"), as an investor in 50 RMBS trusts, filed a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York against DBNTC as trustee of the trusts, asserting claims for violations of the TIA and New York's Streit Act, breach of contract, breach of

fiduciary duty, negligence, and breach of the covenant of good faith, based on DBNTC's alleged failure to perform its duties as trustee for the trusts. Commerzbank alleges that DBNTC caused it to suffer "hundreds of millions of dollars in losses," but the complaint does not include a demand for money damages in a sum certain. This case and the Phoenix Light case were assigned to the same judge. The judge stayed this case until after he adjudicates DBNTC's motion to dismiss in the Phoenix Light action, at which time Commerzbank will be given an opportunity to amend its complaint. Discovery has not yet commenced.

On 30 December 2015, IKB International, S.A. in Liquidation and IKB Deutsche Industriebank A.G. (collectively, "IKB"), as an investor in 37 RMBS trusts, filed a summons with notice in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, against DBNTC and DBTCA as trustees of the trusts. It appears that IKB may assert claims for violation of the TIA, violation of New York's Streit Act, breach of contract, fraud, fraudulent and negligent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, negligence, and unjust enrichment. IKB appears to allege that DBNTC and DBTCA are liable for over U.S.\$ 274 million of damages. Discovery has not yet commenced.

The Group believes a contingent liability exists with respect to these seven cases, but at present the amount of the contingent liability is not reliably estimable.

Ocala Litigation

Deutsche Bank is a secured creditor of Ocala Funding LLC ("Ocala"), a commercial paper vehicle sponsored by Taylor Bean & Whitaker Mortgage Corp. ("Taylor Bean"), which ceased mortgage lending operations and filed for bankruptcy protection in August 2009. Bank of America is the trustee, collateral agent, custodian and depository agent for Ocala. Deutsche Bank commenced a civil litigation in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York against Bank of America resulting from Bank of America's failure to secure and safeguard cash and mortgage loans that secured Deutsche Bank's commercial paper investment. On 31 March 2015, pursuant to the terms of a confidential settlement agreement, Deutsche Bank dismissed the action.

Parmalat Litigation

Following the bankruptcy of the Italian company Parmalat, prosecutors in Parma conducted a criminal investigation against various bank employees, including employees of Deutsche Bank, and brought charges of fraudulent bankruptcy against a number of Deutsche Bank employees and others. The trial commenced in September 2009 and is ongoing, although it is in its final stages and is anticipated will conclude in the course of 2016, possibly in the next few months.

Certain retail bondholders and shareholders have alleged civil liability against Deutsche Bank in connection with the above-mentioned criminal proceedings. Deutsche Bank has made a formal settlement offer to those retail investors who have asserted claims against Deutsche Bank. This offer has been accepted by some of the retail investors. The outstanding claims will be heard during the criminal trial process.

In January 2011, a group of institutional investors (bondholders and shareholders) commenced a civil claim for damages, in an aggregate amount of approximately € 130 million plus interest and costs, in the Milan courts against various international and Italian banks, including Deutsche Bank and Deutsche Bank S.p.A., on allegations of cooperation with Parmalat in the fraudulent placement of securities and of deepening the insolvency of Parmalat. On 26 January 2015, the court in Milan dismissed the claim on the merits and awarded costs to the banks. Deutsche Bank has subsequently entered into settlement agreements with the claimants and no further action will be taken.

Pas-de-Calais Habitat

On 31 May 2012, Pas-de-Calais Habitat ("PDCH"), a public housing office, initiated proceedings before the Paris Commercial Court against Deutsche Bank in relation to four swap contracts entered into in 2006, restructured on 19 March 2007 and 18 January 2008 and subsequently restructured in 2009 and on 15 June 2010. PDCH asks the Court to declare the 19 March 2007 and 18 January 2008 swap contracts null and void, or terminated, or to grant damages to PDCH in an amount of approximately € 170 million on the grounds, inter alia, that Deutsche Bank committed fraudulent and deceitful acts, manipulated the LIBOR and EURIBOR rates which are used as a basis for calculating the sums due by PDCH under the swap contracts and has breached its obligations to warn, advise and inform PDCH. A decision on the merits is not expected until the second quarter of 2016 at the earliest.

Postbank Voluntary Public Takeover Offer

On 12 September 2010, Deutsche Bank announced the decision to make a takeover offer for the acquisition of all shares in Deutsche Postbank AG. On 7 October 2010, the Bank published the official offer document. In its takeover offer, Deutsche Bank offered to Postbank shareholders a consideration of € 25 for each Postbank share.

In November 2010, a former shareholder of Postbank, Effecten-Spiegel AG, which had accepted the takeover offer, brought a claim against Deutsche Bank alleging that the offer price was too low and was not determined in accordance with the applicable law of the Federal Republic of Germany. The plaintiff alleges that Deutsche Bank had been obliged to make a mandatory takeover offer for all shares in Deutsche Postbank AG in 2009 already. The plaintiff avers that, in 2009, the voting rights of Deutsche Post AG in Deutsche Postbank AG had to be attributed to Deutsche Bank AG pursuant to Section 30 of the German Takeover Act.

The Cologne regional court dismissed the claim in 2011 and the Cologne appellate court dismissed the appeal in 2012. The Federal Court set aside the Cologne appellate court's judgment and referred the case back to the appellate court. In its judgment, the Federal Court stated that the appellate court had not sufficiently considered the plaintiff's allegation of an "acting in concert" between Deutsche Bank AG and Deutsche Post AG in 2009. The Cologne appellate court heard the chairman of Deutsche Post's management board as a witness on February 24, 2016. The appellate court will grant the parties the opportunity to comment on the testimony in writing. Thereafter, there will be an additional hearing which is expected to occur in the second quarter of 2016 depending on the availability of the appellate court.

Starting in 2014, some further former shareholders of Deutsche Postbank AG, who accepted the 2010 tender offer, brought similar claims as Effecten-Spiegel AG against Deutsche Bank. The Bank is of the opinion that all these actions, including the action by Effecten-Spiegel AG, are without merit and is defending itself against the claims.

Precious Metals Investigations and Litigations

Deutsche Bank has received inquiries from certain regulatory and law enforcement authorities, including requests for information and documents, pertaining to investigations of precious metals trading and related conduct. Deutsche Bank is cooperating with these investigations and engaging with relevant authorities, as appropriate. Relatedly, Deutsche Bank has been conducting its own internal review of Deutsche Bank's historic participation in the precious metals benchmarks and other aspects of its precious metals trading and precious metals business.

Deutsche Bank is also named as a defendant in several putative class action complaints, which have been consolidated in two lawsuits pending in the U. S. District Court for the Southern District of New York. The U.S. suits allege violations of U.S. antitrust law, the U.S. Commodity Exchange Act, and related state law arising

out of the alleged manipulation of gold and silver prices through participation in the Gold and Silver Fixes, but do not specify the damages sought. The U.S. class action complaints are in the early stages. Deutsche Bank has filed motions to dismiss the U.S. complaints, which are still pending. In addition, Deutsche Bank has been named as a defendant in a Canadian class action proceeding in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice concerning gold. The Ontario statement of claim was issued on January 15, 2016, and plaintiffs seek damages for alleged violations of the Canadian Competition Act as well as other causes of action.

The Group has recorded provisions with respect to certain of these matters. The Group has not disclosed the amount of these provisions, nor has it disclosed whether it has established provisions with respect to others of these matters or any contingent liability with respect to any of these matters, because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously their outcome.

Referral Hiring Practices Investigations

Certain regulators are investigating, among other things, Deutsche Bank's compliance with the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and other laws with respect to the Bank's hiring practices related to candidates referred by clients, potential clients and government officials, and its engagement of consultants in the Asia/Pacific region. Deutsche Bank is responding to and continuing to cooperate with these investigations. The Group has recorded a provision with respect to certain of these regulatory investigations. The Group has not disclosed the amount of this provision because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously the outcome of these regulatory investigations.

Russia/UK Equities Trading Investigation

Deutsche Bank is investigating the circumstances around equity trades entered into by certain clients with Deutsche Bank in Moscow and London that offset one another. The total volume of the transactions under review is significant. Deutsche Bank's internal investigation of potential violations of law, regulation and policy and into the related internal control environment remains ongoing; to date it has identified certain violations of Deutsche Bank's policies and deficiencies in Deutsche Bank's control environment. Deutsche Bank has advised regulators and law enforcement authorities in several jurisdictions (including Germany, Russia, the U.K. and U.S.) of this investigation. Deutsche Bank has taken disciplinary measures with regards to certain individuals in this matter and will continue to do so with respect to others as warranted. The Group has recorded a provision with respect to this matter. The Group has not disclosed the amount of this provision because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously the outcome of this matter.

Sebastian Holdings Litigation

Deutsche Bank is in litigation in New York with Sebastian Holdings Inc. ("SHI") in respect of claims arising from FX trading activities in 2008. SHI seeks damages of at least U.S.\$ 2.5 billion in an amended complaint filed on 10 January 2011. SHI's claims and Deutsche Bank's defences are substantially similar to those in litigation concluded in the UK Commercial Court in November 2013 arising from the same circumstances in which Deutsche Bank was awarded approximately U.S.\$ 236 million plus interest and all of SHI's claims were dismissed. On 27 January 2016, the New York court granted Deutsche Bank's motion for summary judgment dismissing SHI's action based on the UK Commercial Court's judgment. The New York court also denied SHI's motion for leave to file an amended complaint.

In June 2014, Mr. Alexander Vik (SHI's sole shareholder and director) was ordered by the UK Commercial Court personally to pay GBP 34 million by way of an interim award in respect of Deutsche Bank's costs in the UK litigation, plus a further GBP 2 million in accrued interest. Such sums were paid by Mr. Vik who has since sought to appeal this decision in the UK Court of Appeal, which dismissed his application and refused him permission to appeal.

Trust Preferred Securities Litigation

Deutsche Bank and certain of its affiliates and officers are the subject of a consolidated putative class action, filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, asserting claims under the federal securities laws on behalf of persons who purchased certain trust preferred securities issued by Deutsche Bank and its affiliates between October 2006 and May 2008. The district court dismissed the plaintiffs' second amended complaint with prejudice, which dismissal was affirmed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. On 30 July 2014, the plaintiffs filed a petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc with the Second Circuit. On 16 October 2014, the Second Circuit denied the petition. In February 2015, the plaintiffs filed a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review by the United States Supreme Court. On 8 June 2015, the Supreme Court granted plaintiffs' petition, vacated judgment, and remanded the case to the Second Circuit for further consideration in light of its recent decision in *Omnicare, Inc. v. Laborers District Council Construction Industry Pension Fund*. On 16 June 2015, Deutsche Bank filed a motion with the Second Circuit requesting leave to submit briefing on the question of whether the Second Circuit's prior decision in this case is consistent with the Supreme Court's *Omnicare* decision. On 21 July 2015, the Court of Appeals remanded the action to the district court for further consideration in light of the *Omnicare* decision, and denied Deutsche Bank's motion as moot. Deutsche Bank renewed its motion in the district court. The district court denied Deutsche Bank's motion as premature and granted plaintiffs leave to file a third consolidated amended complaint by 15 October 2015, with no further extensions. On 15 October 2015, plaintiffs filed their third consolidated amended complaint, wherein plaintiffs allege unquantified but substantial losses in connection with alleged class-member purchases of trust preferred securities. On 14 December 2015, defendants moved to dismiss the third consolidated amended complaint. The motion remains pending.

U.S. Embargoes-Related Matters

Deutsche Bank has received requests for information from certain U.S. regulatory and law enforcement agencies concerning its historical processing of U.S. dollar payment orders through U.S. financial institutions for parties from countries subject to U.S. embargo laws. These agencies are investigating whether such processing complied with U.S. federal and state laws. In 2006, Deutsche Bank voluntarily decided that it would not engage in new U.S. dollar business with counterparties in Iran, Sudan, North Korea and Cuba and with certain Syrian banks, and to exit existing U.S. dollar business with such counterparties to the extent legally possible. In 2007, Deutsche Bank decided that it would not engage in any new business, in any currency, with counterparties in Iran, Syria, Sudan and North Korea and to exit existing business, in any currency, with such counterparties to the extent legally possible; it also decided to limit its non-U.S. dollar business with counterparties in Cuba. On 3 November 2015, Deutsche Bank entered into agreements with the New York State Department of Financial Services and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to resolve their investigations of Deutsche Bank. Deutsche Bank paid the two agencies U.S.\$ 200 million and U.S.\$ 58 million, respectively, and agreed to terminate certain employees, not rehire certain former employees and install an independent monitor for one year. In addition, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York ordered certain remedial measures, specifically, the requirement to ensure an effective OFAC compliance program and an annual review of such program by an independent party until the Federal Reserve Bank of New York is satisfied as to its effectiveness. The investigations of the U.S. law enforcement agencies remain ongoing.

The Group has not disclosed whether it has established a provision or contingent liability with respect to this matter because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously its outcome.

U.S. Treasury Securities Investigations and Litigations

Deutsche Bank has received inquiries from certain regulatory and law enforcement authorities, including requests for information and documents, pertaining to U.S. Treasuries auctions, trading, and related market activity. Deutsche Bank is cooperating with these investigations.

Deutsche Bank Securities Inc. has been named as a defendant in several putative class action complaints filed in the U.S. District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Northern District of Illinois, the Southern District of Alabama, and the District of the Virgin Islands alleging violations of U.S. antitrust law, the U.S. Commodity Exchange Act and common law related to the alleged manipulation of the U.S. Treasury securities market. These cases are in their early stages. The Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation has centralized these cases in the Southern District of New York.

The Group has not disclosed whether it has established a provision or contingent liability with respect to these matters because it has concluded that such disclosure can be expected to prejudice seriously their outcome.

ZAO FC Eurokommerz

On 17 December 2013, the liquidator of ZAO FC Eurokommerz commenced proceedings in the Arbitrazh Court of the City of Moscow against Deutsche Bank. The claim amounts to approximately €210 million and relates to the repayment of a RUB 6.25 billion bridge loan facility extended to ZAO FC Eurokommerz on 21 August 2007. The bridge loan was repaid in full on 21 December 2007. LLC Trade House, a creditor of ZAO FC Eurokommerz, filed for bankruptcy on 31 July 2009. The liquidator alleges, among other things, (i) that Deutsche Bank must have known that ZAO FC Eurokommerz was in financial difficulties at the time of repayment and (ii) that the bridge loan was repaid from the proceeds of a securitization transaction which was found to be invalid and consequently the proceeds should not have been available to repay the bridge loan. The first instance hearing on the merits of the claim took place on 23 December 2014. The judge found in favor of Deutsche Bank on the basis of the statute of limitations and the absence of evidence to prove that ZAO FC Eurokommerz was in financial difficulties at the time the loan was repaid and that an abuse of rights was committed by Deutsche Bank when accepting the contested repayment. The liquidator did not file a notice of appeal with the court by the applicable deadline and accordingly Deutsche Bank regard this matter as closed.”

TO THE EXTENT THAT THERE IS ANY INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN (A) ANY STATEMENT IN THIS SUPPLEMENT AND (B) ANY STATEMENT IN, OR INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE IN, THE PROSPECTUS, THE STATEMENTS IN (A) ABOVE SHALL PREVAIL.