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One of the most important and counter-intuitive ideas in financial regulation is that more regulation is not always better. While some degree of regulation can help improve financial stability, complex and overlapping regulations can actually cause banks to increase their risk-taking activities.

U.S. bank regulators have recently proposed two reforms related to the issue of complexity. First, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (the Fed) has introduced a proposal that would simplify bank capital regulations. Second, the Fed and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) have proposed reducing the capital requirement for large banks known as the Enhanced Supplementary Leverage Ratio (eSLR), which would push the financial regulatory system toward greater complexity.

This issue brief summarizes the debate over regulatory complexity, outlines the current proposals from the Fed and the OCC, and recommends reforms to help improve financial stability.

REGULATORY COMPLEXITY

Banks in the United States are subject to a wide variety of regulations, the scope and scale of which have drastically increased since the 2008 financial crisis. While some regulations may be effective at reducing bank risk, complex regulations can actually increase risk in several ways. For instance, overlapping rules can push banks to take risks that were not expected by the regulators. Complexity also creates loopholes that allow banks to take even greater risks. Finally, if regulators do not properly understand the riskiness of different assets, they can unintentionally encourage risky investments.

The dozens of capital and liquidity standards required of U.S. banks are often overlapping, or even contradictory. For example, suppose a bank holds mostly moderately risky assets such as real estate loans, but it can earn the same rate of return by holding some combination of very safe (e.g., U.S. Treasury bonds) and very risky assets, like mortgage-backed securities (MBSs). U.S. capital regulations encourage banks to hold fewer risky assets—like MBSs—and more moderate-risk real estate loans. Liquidity ratios, on the other hand, require banks to hold safe, liquid assets like Treasury bonds, which means that banks must also hold risky MBSs in order to earn the same overall rate of return. It is unclear whether these conflicting regulations will cause banks to increase or decrease their holdings of risky assets.

Complex regulations are also easier to manipulate for bankers looking to avoid such restrictions. As an analogy, consider the complexity of the tax code. Most people agree a simple tax code would be better for everyone. We might allow small deductions to benefit certain groups, such as charities or new home owners, but too many deductions could allow people with high incomes to avoid large portions of their tax burdens. Similarly, a complex regulatory system allows banks to avoid the rules that might restrict their risk-taking activities.
Reducing regulatory complexity can help eliminate loopholes and stabilize the financial system.

One example of regulatory complexity is the system of risk-based capital (RBC) regulations used by U.S. banking regulators. In the RBC system, regulators assign a rating to each class of bank assets based on its perceived level of risk. For example, cash and U.S. Treasury bonds are considered completely safe, while high-yield junk bonds are considered very risky, with residential real estate loans falling in the middle range. The RBC formula determines the bank’s required level of equity capital based on the riskiness of its asset holdings, with more capital required for high-risk assets and less capital for safer assets.

The RBC ratio is described by regulators as an improvement over the simple leverage capital ratio, calculated as the bank’s equity divided by its total assets. Regulators argue that the RBC ratio is more effective because it accounts for the riskiness of different bank assets. This can be problematic, however, when regulators misjudge the risk of particular assets. In the 1990s and early 2000s, for example, MBSs were thought to be very low-risk assets and were therefore assigned the lowest risk ratings in the RBC formula. This encouraged banks to buy MBSs and promoted the massive buildup of MBS holdings in the banking system, which played a major contributing role in the financial crisis.

Flaws in the RBC formula encourage banks to invest in assets that are rated incorrectly by the regulators, which can simultaneously decrease their required levels of capital while increasing their levels of risk.

Some financial regulators have come to understand the dangers of regulatory complexity. Thomas Hoenig, former vice chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), has long been a critic of regulatory complexity, and of RBC regulation in particular. More recently, two former chairs of the FDIC have also spoken out on the advantages of simple capital ratios. As Sheila Bair described, “Because their judgments about risk had been so wrong, regulators after the financial crisis have made greater use of capital...
standards that don’t rely on government risk assumptions.”16 Martin Gruenberg concurred that “Strengthening leverage capital requirements … was among the most important post-crisis reforms.”17

Recent legislative proposals have also favored simple capital ratios over complex RBC regulations. Bills that passed the House18 and Senate19—sponsored by Representative Jeb Hensarling (R–TX) and Senator Mike Crapo (R–ID) respectively—would allow banks with less than $10 billion in total assets to be exempted from many restrictions and reporting requirements, so long as they maintain sufficiently high levels of capital. The intent of these bills is to provide regulatory relief for well-capitalized community banks, but the emphasis on leverage ratios rather than RBC ratios has the added benefit of avoiding the negative incentives created by regulatory complexity, which—as detailed above—can encourage banks to increase their risk-taking activities.

PROPOSED RULE CHANGES

The Fed and the OCC have recently proposed two changes to the capital rules that apply to large banking institutions. Although the reforms affect only small portions of the vast framework of banking regulations, both address banks’ capital requirements, which are the most fundamental form of banking regulation. In addition, they provide perspective regarding regulators’ understanding of regulations and potential future plans.

First, the Fed has proposed to simplify capital regulations by combining two existing standards. Banks currently are assigned a minimum level of capital that must be maintained on a year-round basis, but once per year they also face a stress test known as the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review (CCAR), which estimates their required levels of capital during an economic downturn. The new proposal would combine these capital requirements into a single year-round standard based on each bank’s performance in the annual stress test. The new “stress buffer” would replace a portion of the current requirements known as the “capital conservation buffer.” The stress buffer would modestly increase required levels of capital since it would be set at greater than or equal to the capital conservation buffer, which is 2.5 percent of risk-weighted assets. This change would decrease regulatory complexity by reducing the

While a few early studies favored RBC ratios, more recent studies find that complex RBC regulations are not effective predictors of risk.
would become main determinant of bank behavior. For example, Randal Quarles, vice chairman for supervision at the Fed, recently testified before the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs that simple leverage requirements can encourage banks to take excessive risks. As a banker constrained by a leverage ratio, he argued, “You will bear the same capital cost if you take on a very risky asset versus if you take on a less risky asset.” While Quarles is correct that simple leverage ratios assign equal weights to assets of different risk levels, he overlooks the fact that an incorrectly specified RBC rule can actually put less weight on risky assets, as was the case with MBSs prior to the financial crisis.

Academic research does not support Quarles’ argument for RBC ratios over simple capital ratios. The Fed’s proposal cites a study by researchers at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York arguing for the complementarity of RBC and simple capital ratios. That study, however, finds that “the risk-weighted ratio does not consistently outperform the simpler ratios, particularly with short horizons of less than two years” and that “in a short time horizon, risk weighting can overstate differences in asset return variances and hence reduce the accuracy of the risk-weighted ratio as a measure of capital adequacy.” This evidence is consistent with other recent studies finding that simple capital ratios are better than RBC ratios as predictors of bank risk.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the evidence on the negative consequences of regulatory complexity, the following actions by the Fed and the OCC could help improve U.S. financial regulations and reduce the probability of another financial crisis:

1. The Fed should adopt its proposal to simplify bank capital regulations by integrating its stress-testing program with its regulatory capital rules. It should consider further ways to reduce regulatory complexity in order to minimize risk in the banking system.
2. The Fed and the OCC should abandon their proposed modifications to the eSLR and instead make greater use of simple leverage ratios as binding constraints on bank capital.

3. Future proposals should consider raising—not lowering—bank capital requirements, since higher levels of capital are likely to improve financial stability with only minor effects on bank lending.
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