





- Basel I and Basel II
- Towards Basel III
- Stability vs. Access?



Basel I

The main objectives were to unify the playing field by introducing capital standards:

- Linking banks' capital requirements to the riskiness of its activities plus
 Off Balance Sheets risk exposures (risk weights).
- Coordinating the definition of capital, risk assessment and capital adequacy standards across nations.
- Increase integration of financial markets.

But, Basel I did not take account of:

- Risk diversification through portfolio formation.
- Assets maturity profile.
- Risk-mitigating techniques such as collateral.
- Degree of risk standings of individual borrowers.
- Operational and market risks.
- Strength of risk management functions of different banks.



Basel II

Basel II encompasses qualitative and quantitative aspects of bank risk.

- Expected to address Basel I shortcomings
- A more comprehensive approach, placing more emphasis on banks' internal risk methodologies, supervisory review and market discipline
- Focuses more on sensitive measures of risk levels involved in a bank's positions & activities.
- More active role of bank supervision
- Harmonization of regulatory and economic approach
- Also took account of additional risk types (e.g. operational risks)

In Zimbabwe the Central Bank issued a guideline requiring banks to implement Pillar 1 by subscribing minimum options for Credit Risk as Modified Standardized Approach, Standardized Approach for Market Risk, and the Alternative Standardized approach for Operational Risk.

Benefits:

- Comprehensive vision of risks
- Higher specialization of functions
- Better allocation of capital and performance measurement
- Intensity of interrelations between units

Challenges:

- Complexity of organizational structure
- Formality of duties and responsibilities
- Lack of external credit ratings
- Needs of appropriate reporting
- Efforts on implementation

Almost 100% of financial institutions in Zimbabwe have now implemented Basel II (deadline was January 2013).



Basel III

Basel 11 Ratio	Requirements	Basel 111
8%	Minimum Ratio of Total Capital/ RWAs	10.5%
2%	Minimum Ratio of Common Equity/RWAs	4.5%-7%
4%	Tier 1/ RWAs	6%
none	Capital Conservation buffer/ RWAs	2.5%
none	Leverage Ratio	3%
none	Cyclical buffer Ratio	2.5%

- Strengthens risk management
- Increased capital requirements put pressure on profitability and ROE
- Weaker banks will be crowded out;
 expect mergers & acquisitions

 Pricing strategies likely to be biased towards long-term arrangements

In Zimbabwe the Central Bank has taken a position to set the minimum capital adequacy ratio at 12%.



Basel III: Stability vs. access?

 Increased costs to consumers: cost pressures from meeting liquidity requirements will be passed on

+

 Inherent favoritism of higher value mortgages: pressure on profitability will reduce attractiveness of smaller, entry-level loans

+

 Decreased market diversity as lenders are forced to consolidate under the pressure of regulation

Pressure on financial inclusion & rising housing backlogs

In South Africa, one author has suggested that the Basel III could have the impact of doubling the backlogs in the entry-level housing market



Basel III: Stability vs. Access?

- Regulatory reform critical to safety and soundness of the banking system
- But this puts pressure on financial inclusion goals
- Lending to low income earners is not by definition sub-prime!
 No African country has ever had a NINJA loan.
- Sub-market specific data critical to understanding risk

- Mortgage markets in many African countries are in their infancy
- The bulk of the demand is in the entry-level, lower value market
- Lending is critical to the growth of sustainable human settlements
- Appropriate and supportive international frameworks are necessary to enable growth in our markets.



Thank you!

Colin Chimutsa
Chairman, AUHF
Executive Director, CBZ Bank, Zimbabwe

For more information, contact

Email: info@housingfinanceafrica.org

web: www.auhf.co.za

Telephone: +2711-447-9581