Session on Governance of the Regulatory Decision Making Process

Comments by Rafael Repullo

Second Annual Conference on

The Future of Financial Regulation

LSE Financial Markets Group, 6-7 April 2006

Suggested topics for discussion

- Is the Basel II process driven by the interests of G-10 countries?
- Is the Basel Committee "captured" by the largest banks?
- Do smaller banks or smaller countries have "sufficient" input?
- Are these concerns important?

Paper 1

Oliver Baete (McKinsey & Company)

"Understanding Basel II Operational and Strategic Implications"

Paper 2

Richard Herring (University of Pennsylvania)

"Structure and Organization of Cross-Sector Financial Supervision"

Issue: What are the "side effects" of Basel II?

- Improved risk management
- Better risk pricing → end of cross-subsidization
- Substantial new regulatory arbitrage (SA / F-IRB / A-IRB)
- Further consolidation in retail sector
- Impact on systemic risk?

Question

- Why (most) banks waited for the regulator to move?
- Why was the profit motive not enough?

Key result: Basel II implies steeper loan pricing curve

- → Reference: Repullo and Suarez, *JFI* 2004
- → Loan pricing equation (under perfect competition)

$$(1-PD) \times r - PD \times LGD - c \times k = 0$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$r = \frac{PD \times LGD - c \times k}{1 - PD} = f(PD, LGD, c, k(PD))$$

Proposition 3 (Repullo and Suarez, 2004)

- Loan rates of low risk loans determined by IRB capital charges
- Loan rates of high risk loans determined by SA capital charges

→ Concentration of credit risk in smaller SA banks

Prediction: Wave of consolidation in retail banking

- Growing importance of economies of scale
- Credit losses hitting small banks
 - → Lower capabilities to assess and price risks

- Small SA banks will have comparative advantage
 - → lower regulatory capital (in relation to IRB banks)
- Profitability in retail banking need not decrease
 - → fewer competitors

- Small SA banks will have riskier portfolios
 - → but they will have higher margins to cover losses
 - → need not have "lower risk taking capacity"

Final comment

- Small SA banks can specialize in (types of) relationship lending
 - \rightarrow and be able to do very well

Issues

- What will be the future structure of financial supervision?
- Will an integrated supervisor (IS) model emerge?

Pros of IS model

- Efficiency in oversight and compliance
- Level playing field

Cons of IS model

- Conflicts of interest
 - → conduct of business vs micro/macro prudential
- Concentration of (supervisory) power → less innovation

Conclusions

- Alternative models appear to work in normal times
 - → IS model not tested in crisis
- Organization of supervision matters less than
 - → Quality of supervisory staff
 - → Independence (political and financial)
- Rationale for supervisory role of central banks
 - → Especially compelling in emerging markets

- Is there an "optimal" structure of supervision?
 - → Probably not
 - → Depends on how different objectives are traded-off
 - → Political choice

- Should more research be done on this topic?
 - \rightarrow Yes!
 - → Too important to rely on intuitions / fashions / prejudices
- Idea: Changes should move system in the "right" direction

- Many moves towards IS model explained by failures not in the structure of the traditional model, but in its implementation, e.g.
 - → on-site versus off site examinations
 - → statutory versus self-regulation, etc.

Final comment

- Is there a general guiding principle?
 - \rightarrow Yes!
 - \rightarrow IIABDFI

Final comment

- Is there a general guiding principle?
 - \rightarrow Yes!
 - → If It Ain't Broke Don't Fix It