

COMMENT
OPINION

FT Home > Comment > Opinion

Basel needs a firm hand and fewer delays

By David Scharfstein and Jeremy Stein

Published: September 13 2010 22:48 | Last updated: September 13 2010 22:48

This weekend top central bankers announced agreement on **Basel III**, the new rules to enhance global capital standards for banks. The agreement, which will now be presented to the Group of 20 leading nations summit in Seoul this November, represents a significant and welcome increase in the capital that banks will be required to hold. However, worries that a rapid transition will cut lending and deepen the global recession mean the full increase will be delayed until 2019.

These transitional concerns are understandable, but a long phase-in period is unnecessary and potentially harmful. Instead, a much shorter period should be implemented, with regulators forcing banks to meet the new requirements by going to the market to raise **fresh capital**. If carefully managed, this approach could avoid any adverse effect on lending and the economy.

EDITOR'S CHOICE

Editorial: The long road to stability - Sep-13
Lex: New bank capital rules - Sep-13
John Gapper: A new ratio for banks to arbitrage - Sep-12
Video: Do reforms go far enough? - Sep-13
Chris Giles: Is Basel like monetary tightening? - Sep-13
FT Alphaville: Basel III – the analysts react - Sep-12

Banks have argued that higher capital requirements raise their financing costs and thus reduce their willingness to lend. But there is now widespread understanding in the regulatory and academic community that this argument is overstated. Research, including our own, shows that the long-term impact of higher capital on loans is too small to have a big impact on growth. More capital makes banks safer, lowering the returns demanded by shareholders and creditors. Overall their costs increase only slightly, hence the reason why regulators feel comfortable raising standards after a period of adjustment.

The planned long phase-in suggests that this adjustment period is the regulator's main worry. Left to their own devices, banks are reluctant to increase capital by issuing new shares, which could lower their stock price. While **Deutsche Bank** recently announced plans for a substantial **equity raising**, history suggests such issues are a banker's last resort.

Indeed, even after the subprime crisis first hit, banks issued relatively little new equity to beef up their capital – even though it became obvious that both their losses and the risks in the financial system had risen dramatically. The US government's controversial rescue programme after the failure of Lehman was needed in part because banks did not raise enough capital on their own.

Under the current plan, this reluctance to raise capital will create problems, especially if regulators do not place restrictions on how banks meet the rules. The Basel agreement asks banks to hit a specified ratio of capital to risk-weighted assets, not an amount of capital alone. A bank could adjust to the more stringent target either by raising new dollars of capital or by shrinking its assets, which means a cutback in lending.

Given the unwillingness to issue new shares, the brunt of any adjustment would likely take the form of lending cuts. Thus, unless the transition is managed carefully, the banks have a valid point when they say the new rules could lead to a period of tighter credit. This is what happened during the first round of Basel, announced in 1988 and implemented by the end of 1992. Research suggests that this phase-in was partially responsible for a significant credit crunch during this period.

What can be done to avoid repeating this mistake? Lengthening the phase-in, as under the current agreement, is one approach. This allows banks to build up their capital over time by retaining earnings, without having to seek new external funding. But this approach is risky, especially if banks feel pressure to demonstrate to the market they can get their figures in order well before the official deadline. If so, extending the deadline will do little to reduce the incentive to cut lending. Even on a best-case scenario banks will be less stable during the phase-in period too.

A better approach would see regulators push those banks who are falling well short of the overall target to make the adjustment more quickly. Rather than simply granting a long phase-in period, the regulator would encourage these banks to raise fresh capital – perhaps by forbidding dividend payments or limiting executive compensation until they did so.

While this approach is not the norm in capital regulation, and while it will likely be unpopular with the banks themselves, it was a central feature of the supervisory capital assessment

LATEST HEADLINES FROM CNN

Iran: Female hiker freed from prison
 In Middle East talks, core issues now on the table
 French senate to vote on burqa ban
 Adventurer to sail solo around world -- backwards
 European Commission blasts France's deportation of Roma

[More](#)

Jobs Business for sale Contracts & tenders

SEARCH Enter keywords

Director - General of the Joint Research Centre
 European Commission

Divisional Director, Corporate Partnerships
 Medical Research Council Technology

Solvency II Implementation
 FSA

Head of Cards
 UK Retail Bank

RECRUITERS

FT.com can deliver talented individuals across all industries around the world
[Post a job now](#)

RELATED SERVICES

FT Lexicon
 FT Bespoke Forums
 Market research
 Growth companies
 Corporate subscriptions
 Luxury Travel brochures
 Analyst Research
 MBA-Direct.com
 FT Newspaper subscriptions
 FT Diaries
 FT Conferences
 FT Syndication services
 The Non-Executive Director

programme – the “stress tests” run by US regulators in 2009. Each bank subject to the tests was set a target for a total of new dollars of capital they had to raise, not for how their capital ratio needed to be adjusted. Combined with the strong incentives that banks had to satisfy these targets, the programme was highly successful in generating new equity for the banking system, with more than \$125bn raised by the end of 2009.

The stress tests taught us an important lesson about the benefits of a firm regulatory hand, one that is directly relevant for managing the phase-in of Basel III. In short, a clear and forceful emphasis on getting additional dollars of capital into the banking system is needed, and can do much to alleviate the risk of a new credit crunch during this critical period for the world economy.

David Scharfstein is a professor of finance at Harvard Business School. Jeremy Stein is a professor of economics at Harvard University

Copyright The Financial Times Limited 2010. You may share using our article tools. Please don't cut articles from FT.com and redistribute by email or post to the web.

[Print article](#) [Email article](#) [Clip this article](#) [Order reprints](#)

[Twitter](#) [Digg](#) [LinkedIn](#) [Yahoo! Buzz](#) [Delicious](#)
[reddit](#) [BX](#) [Facebook](#) [stumbleupon](#) [Viadeo](#)

Post your own comment

jeremy_stein Use different pseudonym this time or [update your profile](#)

Enter your comment here

[Submit Comment](#) By submitting this comment I confirm that I have read and agreed to the [FT terms and conditions](#).
 Please also see our [commenting guidelines](#).



Comments

Sorted by newest first | [Sort by oldest first](#)

The Slog | September 14 8:55am | [Permalink](#)

[Report](#)

Take a look at the Deutsche Bank and Postbank accounts. This tells you all you need to know about how much more we still need to do...

<http://nbyslog.blo...nk-real-story.html>

MORE IN THIS SECTION

[It is time to dance to a new long-term tune](#)
[Europe must react to Turkey's vote](#)
[New inequality stunts global recovery](#)
[Pope Benedict courts irrelevance](#)
[The shadow shogun is the man for Japan](#)
[Basel III faces repeat of old problems](#)
[Models tell us more than hindsight](#)
[Outside Edge: Reach for the stars in age of austerity](#)
[Turkey faces the democracy test](#)
[The new disintegration of finance](#)

[FT Home](#)

[Site map](#) [Contact us](#) [Help](#)

[Advertise with the FT](#) [Media centre](#) [FT Newspaper subscriptions](#) [FT Conferences](#) [FT Syndication](#) [Corporate subscriptions](#) [FT Group](#) [Careers at the FT](#)

Partner sites: [Chinese FT.com](#) [The Mergermarket Group](#) [Investors Chronicle](#) [Exec-Appointments.com](#) [Money Media](#) [The Banker](#) [fDi Intelligence](#) [MBA-Direct.com](#) [The Non-Executive Director](#)

© Copyright The Financial Times Ltd 2010. "FT" and "Financial Times" are trademarks of The Financial Times Ltd. [Privacy policy](#) [Terms](#)