

### **DISCUSSION BY**

**Pedro Duarte Neves** 

Former Vice-Governor Banco de Portugal (2006-2017)

Prepared for the session

Disclosure of Stress Tests, Key Prudential Ratio's and TLAC/MREL amounts:

MARKET CONFIDENCE AND EXPECTATIONS

**EBI/Global Annual Conference on Banking Regulation** 20 February 2020

The opinions expressed in this presentation are those of the author and do not necessarily coincide with those of Banco de Portugal or the Eurosystem. Any errors and omissions are the sole responsibility of the author.

# **EU stress tests: possible improvements...**

- 1. Use top-down approach for the supervisory leg...
  - ... to avoid gaming/beauty contest...
  - ... include contagion/2<sup>nd</sup> rounds/interactions with non-banking sector
- 2. Use unrestricted baselines (FCPs) as the basis for the bank leg...
  - ... to address structural issues (profitability, Basel III, climate change, low-for long)...
  - ... to challenge business models...
- 3. Use stress tests fully owned by the banks and/or sensitivity analysis (will it work?) ... promote consistency with ICAAP... (will it work?)
- 4. The Stress Test as a component of a Comprehensive Assessment...
  - ... where the starting point, the baseline and the stress test play specific roles...
- 5. Use holistic approach to capital measurement...
  - ... leveraged ratios, risk based solvency measures, loss-absorbing measures...
- 6. Use a 5-years time horizon for the FCPs to fully anticipate Basel III compliance...

## P2G disclosure

## CONS

- P2G is not a binding requirement in the recently agreed CRD5/CRR2 package;
- P2G does not determine automatic restrictions in the distribution of dividends;
- P2G has been introduced exactly to ensure that capital add-ons stemming from the stress tests are not included in the P2R as binding;
- There is the risk that the market perceives the P2G as binding, turning the P2G to a requirement;
- No disclosure of P2G retains some flexibility in times of crisis;
- P2G does not depend only on ST outcomes.

### **PROS**

- Current disclosure practices (SW) have not had negative consequences;
- Differences approaches in different jurisdictions and/or different disclosure practices by different institutions at national level may occur;
- Increased transparency to market participants.

## **MREL** disclosure

### **PROS**

- Constitutes material market information;
- Promotes market transparency and certainty;
- Provides flexibility in the transition period, as disclosure takes place only after complying with MREL requirements (2024).

#### **BUT**

- MREL calibration rules are very complex and resolution strategy specific;
- Ignores bail-inable liabilities not eligible for MREL, but that are eligible for loss absorption in resolution.

#### **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

- TLAC vs MREL; Restoy's "middle class"; capacity of the market to absorb large values of debt issuance; holders of MREL instruments.

#### PILAR 1

- Reduction in the variability of risk-weighted measures of capital;
- Holistic approach to solvency measures (risk-weighted capital ratios and leverage ratio);
- Multi metrics approach.

### PILAR 3

- BCBS guiding principles: clarity, comprehensiveness, usefulness/meaningfulness, consistency over time, comparability;
- Recognize the merit of the EBA transparency exercise;
- Concern 1: LCR disclosure could imply confidential information;
- Concern 2: Possible risk of disclosing strategic information on the institution.



### **DISCUSSION BY**

**Pedro Duarte Neves** 

Former Vice-Governor Banco de Portugal (2006-2017)

Prepared for the session

Disclosure of Stress Tests, Key Prudential Ratio's and TLAC/MREL amounts:

MARKET CONFIDENCE AND EXPECTATIONS

**EBI/Global Annual Conference on Banking Regulation** 20 February 2020

The opinions expressed in this presentation are those of the author and do not necessarily coincide with those of Banco de Portugal or the Eurosystem. Any errors and omissions are the sole responsibility of the author.