



Whitepaper

JUNE 2019

Final Basel III Reforms: How Can Banks Prepare for the 'Basel IV'

Highlights

- » In finalizing its Basel III supervisory framework, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) is implementing new rules for measuring credit, operational, and market risk.
- » These rules bring major changes in risk management and also require all banks to use standardized approaches, which might run in parallel to their internal models.
- » The new requirements usher in a period of relative stability in the regulatory landscape, but banks cannot easily or cost-effectively meet them with existing software tools.
- » Moody's Analytics recommends that banks act now to apply the latest industry and regulatory technology trends to get ready for quantitative impact studies and the final implementation of the new rules.

Finalization of Basel III

In December 2017, after many months of stalled negotiations, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) announced an agreement to complete the “finalized Basel III rules” (also known as “Basel IV”).

The final agreement introduces an output capital floor, one of the key elements of the negotiations. Another sticking point of contention—primarily between the United States and Europe—was the extent to which banks can use internal models to determine their capital requirements. This issue was resolved by reducing the risk weights for mortgages and certain other loan categories in the standardized approach.

The main points of the package that apply as of January 2022 include:

- » Revised credit risk standardized approach (CR SA)
- » Revised credit risk IRB approach (CR IRB)
- » Revised CVA (basic and standardized, no more advanced)
- » Revised operational Risk (standardized, no more advanced measurement approaches [AMA])
- » Revised leverage ratio (exposure measure)
- » Revised leverage ratio (G-SIB buffer)
- » Output standardized approach floor (commencing at 50% in 2022, phase in to final 72.5%)

However, no consensus was achieved on the treatment of sovereign risk, and more time was allowed for the review of the market risk framework.

In January 2019 (with a further update in February), the BCBS published the “finalized rules” for market risk. This Fundamental Review of the Trading Book also applies as of January 2022.

Why the standardized output floor?

A key objective of the revisions is to reduce excessive variability of risk-weighted assets (RWA).

At the peak of the global financial crisis, many market participants lost faith in banks’ reported risk-weighted capital ratios. The Basel Committee’s own empirical

analyses also highlighted a worrying degree of variability in banks’ calculation of RWA. The Basel Committee believes that revisions to the regulatory framework help restore credibility in the calculation of RWA by:

- » Enhancing the robustness, granularity, and risk sensitivity of the standardized approaches for credit risk and operational risk, which facilitate the comparability of banks’ capital ratios. For example, mortgage risk weights depend on the loan-to-value (LTV) ratio of the mortgage.
- » Reducing mechanistic reliance on credit ratings by requiring banks to conduct sufficient due diligence, and by developing a granular non-ratings based approach for jurisdictions that cannot or do not want to rely on external credit ratings.
- » Complementing the risk-weighted capital ratio with a finalized leverage ratio and a revised and robust capital floor to internally modeled capital requirements with related disclosure. This revision enhances comparability between banks and restores a level playing field. Hence, banks using internal models should apply an aggregated capital output floor based on the standardized approaches. The final agreement proposes to phase in the standardized output floor for risk-weighted assets up to 72.5% between 2022 and 2027.

Major changes to credit risk rules

The finalized Basel III mandates changes to credit risk rules in two major areas:

Standardized approach to credit risk (SACR): The final document proposes revisions to the calculation of risk weights for corporate, bank, covered bond, retail, residential, and commercial real estate exposures and specialized lending. The Committee has created alternative risk weight look-up tables for assets where external ratings are not permitted; banks using external ratings need to complement this approach with adequate due diligence. In the SACR approach, the risk weight applied to real estate exposures is more sensitive and determined by the LTV ratio. For off-balance sheet items, the credit conversion factors (CCFs), which are used to determine the amount of an exposure to be risk-weighted, have been made more risk-sensitive, including the introduction of positive CCFs for unconditionally cancelable commitments (UCCs). Revised regulatory haircuts are defined for security used as collateral

and the exposure formula if there is repos netting rules has been updated.

Internal ratings-based approach (IRBCR): The revised IRB framework removes the use of the Advanced IRB (A-IRB) approach for asset classes that cannot be modeled in a robust and prudent manner. These include exposures to large and mid-sized corporates, and exposures to banks and other financial institutions. As a result, banks with supervisory approval must use the Foundation IRB (F-IRB) approach, which removes the two important sources of RWA variability as it applies fixed values to the loss given default (LGD) and exposure on default (EAD) parameters. In addition, all IRB approaches can no longer be applied to equity exposures that now have to be processed in a standardized approach. Revised LGD and LGD floors are defined in F-IRB. Revised CCFs apply to off-balance sheet items in F-IRB and a new EAD floor in A-IRB. Given the enhancements to the IRB framework and the introduction of an aggregate output floor, the 1.06 scaling factor that is currently applied to RWAs determined by the IRB approach to credit risk has been removed.

Revised operational risk framework

The Basel Committee has also revised the operational risk framework. The advanced measurement approaches (AMA) for calculating operational risk capital requirements (which are based on banks' internal models) and the existing three standardized approaches have been replaced with a single risk-sensitive standardized approach that all banks must use. From now on, operational risk capital requirements are based on two components: the bank's income (BIC) and a measure of the bank's historical losses (ILM). ILM is a function of BIC and the Loss Component (LC), where the latter is equal to 15 times a bank's average historical losses over the preceding 10 years.

Revised CVA risk framework

The initial phase of Basel III reforms introduced a capital charge for potential mark-to-market losses of derivative instruments because of the deterioration in the creditworthiness of a counterparty. This risk—known as credit valuation adjustment (CVA) risk—is a form of market risk and was a major source of losses for banks during the global financial crisis, exceeding losses arising from outright defaults in some instances.

The new framework includes the exposure component of CVA risk together with its associated hedges. Similarly to the internal models review, if the approach is not considered prudent enough the BCBS aims to restrain the use of internal models. Hence, the option to use an internally modeled approach has been removed. Banks can use either the standardized approach (SA-CVA), which now requires a supervisor's authorization, or the basic approach (BA-CVA).

Leverage ratio and G-SIB buffer

The G-SIB leverage ratio buffer has been set at 50% of the G-SIB's risk-based capital buffer (namely, if a G-SIB is subject to a 2% risk-weighted capital buffer, its leverage ratio buffer is set at 1%). The Committee has introduced constraints on dividend distributions for G-SIBs that do not comply with the leverage ratio buffer requirement according to a five-range scale.

The framework also includes changes to the exposure measure of the leverage ratio. These include adjustments to the treatment of derivatives in the exposure measure, and updates to the treatment of off-balance sheet exposures for consistency with the standardized approach to credit risk.

Impact for banks

In October 2018, the European Banking Authority (EBA) published the preliminary impact of the Basel reforms on EU banks' capital. Overall, the results show that European banks' minimum Tier 1 capital requirement would increase by 16.7% at the full implementation date. Moreover, to comply with the new framework, EU banks would need EUR 24.5 billion of total capital, of which EUR 6.0 billion is extra CET1 capital. The EBA is working on a more detailed report on the impact of these reforms in response to the European Commission's Call for Advice.

Beyond the capital costs, the implementation of the new standards is challenging for banks as they entail significant changes in their internal processes. Furthermore, the introduction of the standardized output floor, with the need to calculate and disclose capital requirements under the standardized approach, results in operating model changes and raising compliance costs for banks:

- » Operating models and processes must shift from model-driven to standardized approaches.
- » Banks' systems must align with the new operating model

to support comparisons of multiple calculations and floors.

» New data attributes might be necessary to estimate RWA under the new approaches.

» Because of increased regulatory reporting requirements, banks need to disclose their RWA calculations under the standardized

approach.

Options for meeting these challenges

Banks have various options to address these regulatory compliance challenges while improving their profits and competitiveness. The real question, however, is how to do this sustainably and within the context of broader transformation strategies. Options include:

1. Business model revision. Banks could make strategic decisions to exit certain businesses and geographies, closing accounts and selling off high-risk exposures and consolidating business units. However, this decision is likely to have an impact on revenues and profitability.

2. Traditional cost optimization. Alternatively, banks could reach for the usual levers: centralization, functional consolidation, labor arbitrage, automation, and process re-engineering. However, such measures often create unexpected costs, and at best they deliver diminishing returns.

3. Technology-driven transformative investments. Finally, banks might look at solutions that can provide long-term benefits such as cloud computing and new data-intensive technologies such as big data, artificial intelligence, machine learning, and robotics. These investments have an effect beyond regulatory compliance; they generate fundamental changes in banks' businesses by improving operational efficiency and incentivizing innovation.

Four things banks should be doing now

The latest technology offers real opportunities. With the regulatory landscape getting clearer, there has never been a better time to explore them.

1. The cloud is a good place to start. By migrating to the cloud, financial institutions become more agile thanks to the flexibility and scalability that cloud offers. Cloud also brings more transparency in terms of their IT costs. Moreover,

most financial institutions seek to reduce maintenance and upgrade-related work. By using the cloud, and Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) in particular, financial institutions can achieve greater efficiencies and outsource a significant part of their compliance burden, ultimately becoming more competitive and better serving customers.

2. Adopt a comprehensive and standard approach to regulatory compliance to overcome the fragmented "silo" approach for regulatory compliance, which causes inefficiencies and unnecessary costs. There are an increasing number of data points shared by the various regulatory frameworks that require global consistency in the attributes that are reported. If a bank makes adjustments in a particular transaction in its portfolio, it can be difficult to ensure that there is consistency across all silo-based applications. As long as reports draw on different data sources for each framework, getting them to match will be a serious challenge, and supervisors are increasingly alert to discrepancies. In addition, the silo approach implies many heavy IT cycles (ETL and datamart updates) each time a regulation changes and the requirements become more complex and granular, and demand higher frequency. This challenge is another reason to move to a more elastic cloud-based IT infrastructure.

3. The latest technologies such as Hadoop, Spark, and YARN now enable firms to tackle big data challenges with distributed storage and processing, together with efficient resource management. These technologies can be deployed on-premises and in the cloud, but cloud deployments give greater opportunities to optimize run-time performance and reduce costs. Open source software is affordable at scale over the cloud and offers great support. Firms are not locked in to a vendor's pricing model.

4. Logical data models can put power-users—the people who understand the regulatory frameworks and who anticipate future changes—in the driver's seat. As data is not physically transformed from source systems, power-users can calculate outputs for regulatory analytics more simply and directly with logical data preparation and configuration without the constant need for ETL development, which shortens IT project cycles. They rely less on the V-model of system lifecycles (specification by users, development by IT, IT tests, user tests, and user acceptance) whereby the business does not see the output until the end of the cycle, which generally needs more

than one iteration. Instead, firms can transition toward incremental rolling configuration, where the power-user plays the key role of identifying data in the logical data model, and configuring and testing outputs for specific reporting requirements and scenarios. The European Central Bank (ECB)'s Banks Integrated Reporting Dictionary (BIRD), which is designed to address the misalignment between banks about the meaning of specific sections within various regulatory frameworks, provides an opportunity to implement standardized logical data models integrating a bank's risk, treasury, and finance functions.

ConclusionAs the post-crisis surge in regulation comes to an end, costs will decrease, though still remain at the current high level, for the next few years. Between now and 2022, project teams will be busy implementing the latest proposals from the Basel Committee and the new accounting regimes such as IFRS 9 and current expected credit loss (CECL). We are already noticing a cultural shift as enterprise risk management project teams turn their attention toward integrated solutions that lead to cost reduction and better process efficiency. New technologies will certainly provide a boost in years to come with the adoption of new solutions to deliver Regulatory-Compliance-as-a-Service.

© 2018 Moody's Corporation, Moody's Investors Service, Inc., Moody's Analytics, Inc. and/or their licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC. AND ITS RATINGS AFFILIATES ("MIS") ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY INCLUDE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MOODY'S DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL, FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY ALSO INCLUDE QUANTITATIVE MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CREDIT RISK AND RELATED OPINIONS OR COMMENTARY PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ANALYTICS, INC. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. NEITHER CREDIT RATINGS NOR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS AND PUBLISHES MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL, WITH DUE CARE, MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY RETAIL INVESTORS AND IT WOULD BE RECKLESS AND INAPPROPRIATE FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO USE MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS OR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WHEN MAKING AN INVESTMENT DECISION. IF IN DOUBT YOU SHOULD CONTACT YOUR FINANCIAL OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL ADVISER.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY ANY PERSON AS A BENCHMARK AS THAT TERM IS DEFINED FOR REGULATORY PURPOSES AND MUST NOT BE USED IN ANY WAY THAT COULD RESULT IN THEM BEING CONSIDERED A BENCHMARK.

All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MOODY'S considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process or in preparing the Moody's publications.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability to any person or entity for any indirect, special, consequential, or incidental losses or damages whatsoever arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information, even if MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers is advised in advance of the possibility of such losses or damages, including but not limited to: (a) any loss of present or prospective profits or (b) any loss or damage arising where the relevant financial instrument is not the subject of a particular credit rating assigned by MOODY'S.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability for any direct or compensatory losses or damages caused to any person or entity, including but not limited to by any negligence (but excluding fraud, willful misconduct or any other type of liability that, for the avoidance of doubt, by law cannot be excluded) on the part of, or any contingency within or beyond the control of, MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers, arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information.

NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

Moody's Investors Service, Inc., a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by Moody's Investors Service, Inc. have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to Moody's Investors Service, Inc. for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at www.moody.com under the heading "Investor Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Additional terms for Australia only: Any publication into Australia of this document is pursuant to the Australian Financial Services License of MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657 AFSL 336969 and/or Moody's Analytics Australia Pty Ltd ABN 94 105 136 972 AFSL 383569 (as applicable). This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. MOODY'S credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail investors. It would be reckless and inappropriate for retail investors to use MOODY'S credit ratings or publications when making an investment decision. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.

Additional terms for Japan only: Moody's Japan K.K. ("MJKK") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Group Japan G.K., which is wholly-owned by Moody's Overseas Holdings Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of MCO. Moody's SF Japan K.K. ("MSFJ") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of MJKK. MSFJ is not a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization ("NRSRO"). Therefore, credit ratings assigned by MSFJ are Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings. Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings are assigned by an entity that is not a NRSRO and, consequently, the rated obligation will not qualify for certain types of treatment under U.S. laws. MJKK and MSFJ are credit rating agencies registered with the Japan Financial Services Agency and their registration numbers are FSA Commissioner (Ratings) No. 2 and 3 respectively.

MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) hereby disclose that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from JPY200,000 to approximately JPY350,000,000.

MJKK and MSFJ also maintain policies and procedures to address Japanese regulatory requirements.