Basel iii guidelines on liquidity

Banking Regulation and Standards Bank International Settlements Basel Agreements (Basel I, Basel II, Basel III, Basel IV) Financial Stability Council Reference Banking (Regulation) Monetary Policy Central Bank Risk Management Regulatory Capital Tier 1 Tier 2 Pillar 1: Regulatory Risk Of Capital Lending Standardized IRB Approach F-IRB A-IRB LGD L.A.L.G.P. : Disclosure of market disclosure Business and Economics Portalvte Basel III (or Third Basel Agreement or Basel Standards) is a global, voluntary regulatory framework on bank capital adequacy, stress testing, and risk of market liquidity. The third installment of the Basel Accords (see Basel I, Basel II) was developed in response to the shortcomings in financial regulation identified by the 2007-2008 financial crisis. It is designed to strengthen capital requirements for banks by increasing the liquidity of banks and reducing the leverage of banks. Basel III was agreed by members of the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision in November 2010 and was to be introduced from 2013 to 2015; however, the sale was repeatedly extended until March 31, 2019, and then again until January 1, 2022. The Basel III review aims to strengthen Basel II's standard requirements to the bank's minimum capital ratios. In addition, it introduces requirements for liquid assets and financing stability, thereby seeking to reduce the risk of running into the bank. The key principles of the Capital Requirement Of basel III's 2010 primary rule required banks to finance 4.5% of total capital (compared to 2% in Basel II) of risk-weighted assets (RWAs). From 2015, the minimum total capital ratio of 1 (CET1) of 4.5% should be maintained by the bank at any time. This ratio is calculated as follows: CET1 RWAs ≥ 4.5% display frac mboxcET1mbox RWAs 4.5% Minimum capital level 1 increases from 4% in Basel II to 6%, which is applicable in 2015, compared to RWAs. These 6% consist of 4.5% CET1, plus an additional 1.5% additional Level 1 (AT1). In addition, Basel III introduced two additional capital buffers: a mandatory capital buffer equivalent to 2.5 per cent of risk-weighted assets. Taking into account the required capital ratio of 4.5% CET1, banks should have a total of 7% CET1 capital from 2019. A discretionary anti-cyclical buffer that allows national regulators to claim up to 2.5 per cent of capital during periods of high credit growth. The level of this buffer ranges from 0% to 2.5% RWA and should be satisfied with the capital of CET1. Basel III's leverage ratio introduced a minimum leverage ratio. This is a non-risk leverage ratio and is calculated by dividing Level 1 on the average total consolidated capital of the bank (the sum of exposure to all assets and unbalanced positions). Banks Banks the leverage ratio is expected to remain above 3 per cent under Basel III. Level 1 Capital Total Exposure Level ≥ 3% display frac mbox Tier 1 Capital mbox mbox Geck 3 % In July 2013, the U.S. Federal Reserve announced that the minimum Basel III credit ratio would be 6% for 8 systemically important financial institutions (SIFI) banks and 5% for their insured banking holding companies. Basel III introduced two necessary liquidity ratios. The Liquidity Coverage Ratio was supposed to require the bank to require enough high-quality liquid assets to cover total net cash outflows within 30 days. This is as follows: L C R - High quality liquidity assets Total net liquidity outflow within 30 days ≥ 100% LCR display mbox high quality liquid assets mbox Total net liquidity outflow within 30 days (100%) The ratio of net stable financing should require that available stable funding exceed the required level of stable funding within one year of long-term stress. On October 24, 2013, the U.S. Federal Reserve Board of Governors approved an interagency proposal for the U.S. version of the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) on liquidity coverage ratio (LCR). This ratio will apply to some U.S. banking organizations and other systemically important financial institutions. The comment period for the proposal was closed on January 31, 2014. The United States LCR proposal was much tougher than the BCBS version, especially for large bank holdings. The proposal requires financial institutions and FSOC to appoint a non-bank financial company to have a sufficient stock of high-quality liquid assets (HLA) that can be quickly liquidated to meet liquidity needs within a short period of time. LCR consists of two parts: the numerator is H'A, and the denominator consists of total net cash outflows for a certain period of stress (total expected cash outflow minus the total expected cash flow). The liquidity coverage ratio applies to U.S. banking transactions with assets of more than $10 billion. to hold off enough H'A to cover 30 days of net cash outflow. This amount will be determined on the basis of the peak aggregate over a 30-day period. Regional firms (with assets of between $50 billion and $250 billion) will only be subject to change by LCR at the BHC level. The modified LCR requires that Firms hold enough HLA to cover 21 days of net cash outflows. Net cash outflow options of 70% of those that apply to larger institutions and do not include the requirement to calculate peak peak smaller BHCs, those under $50 billion, would remain subject to prevailing to prevailing quality oversight systems. The U.S. proposal divides qualifying headquarters into three specific categories (Level 1, Level 2A, and Level 2B). By category, the combination of 2A and 2B assets may not exceed 40% H'A with 2B assets limited to a maximum of 15% of H'A. Level 1 represents assets that are highly liquid (usually risk-weighted at 0% in accordance with Basel III's standardized approach to capital) and do not receive haircuts. Remarkably, the Fed has decided not to include GSE-issued securities in Level 1, despite industry lobbying, on the grounds that they are not guaranteed full faith and credit by the U.S. government. Level 2A assets typically include assets that will be subject to a 20% risk weighting under Basel III and include assets such as GSE-issued and guaranteed securities. These assets will be subject to a 15% haircut, which is similar to the handling of such securities according to the BCBS version. Level 2B assets include corporate debt and securities and are subject to a 50% haircut. BCBS and the U.S. version considers stocks in a similar way, but the corporate debt according to BCBS is divided between 2A and 2B based on government credit ratings, as opposed to the U.S. offer. This attitude toward corporate debt securities is a direct consequence of Section 939 of the Dodd-Frank Act, which removed references to credit ratings and once again demonstrates the conservative bias of U.S. regulators' approach to LCR. The proposal requires LCR to be at least equal to or more than 1.0 and includes a multi-year transition period that will require: 80% compliance from January 1, 2015, 90% compliance from January 1, 2016 and 100% compliance from January 1, 2017. Finally, the proposal requires both sets of firms (large banking holding companies and regional firms) to submit recovery plans to U.S. regulators in accordance with LCR requirements to decide what action will be taken if the LCR falls below 100% for three or more consecutive days. A summary of the implementation of the originally proposed changes (2010) in the Basel language committee First, the quality, consistency and transparency of the capital base will be raised. Level 1 Capital: The prevailing form of Tier 1 capital must be ordinary shares and non-fixed capital gains: additional capital, however, the instruments will be agreed tier 3 capital will be liquidated. Secondly, the coverage of capital risks will be strengthened. Promoting more comprehensive management of market and counterparty credit risk Add adjustment to credit risk assessment due to deterioration of the credit rating of the counterparty Strengthening the capital requirements of the counterparty credit risks arising from banks derivatives, repo Securities Finance Operations Raising Capital Buffers Support These Risks Reducing Procyclism and Provide Additional Incentives for Moving Move derivative contracts to qualifying central counterparties (probably clearing centres). Currently, BCBS said derivatives cleared with RCMP will risk weighted at 2% (rule not yet finalized in the U.S.) provide incentives to strengthen risk management of credit risk counterparties Raising counterparty credit risk management standards by incorporating incorrect risk Third, leverage ratio will be introduced as an additional measure in Basel II based on risks. Designed to achieve the following goals: Put the floor under leverage build-up in the banking sector to introduce additional safeguards against model risk and measurement errors by supplementing risk-based measures with a simpler measure that is based on gross exposure. Fourth, a number of measures are being introduced to help build up capital buffers in good times, which can be used in times of stress (reducing procyclicity and encouraging countercyclic buffers). Measures to combat procyclism: easing the excessive cycle of the minimum capital requirement; Encourage more forward-looking provisions; Saving capital to create buffers in individual banks and the banking sector that can be used in stressful cases; and achieve a broader macroprudential goal of protecting the banking sector from periods of over-growth lending. Requirement to use long-term data horizons to assess the probability of default, assess the losses recommended in Basel II, to become a mandatory Improved calibration of risk functions that convert loss estimates into regulatory capital requirements. Banks should conduct stress tests that include extending credit spreads in recessionary scenarios. Encouraging stronger training practices (forecasting): Advocating for changes in accounting standards towards the expected approach to losses (EL) (usually EL: Fifth, a global minimum liquidity standard for international active banks is introduced, which includes a 30-day liquidity coverage requirement, backed by a long-term structural liquidity ratio called Stable Stable Funding Ratio. (In January 2012, the supervisory group of the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision issued a statement saying that regulators would allow banks to fall below the required level of liquidity, liquidity coverage, during periods of stress. , the proposed Basel III regulations requested ratios: 7-9.5% (4.5% and 2.5% (buffer preservation) 0-2.5% (seasonal buffer)) for total capital and 8.5-11% for level 1 capital and 10.5-13% for total capital. On 15 April 2014, the Basel Committee on Banking (BCBS) has released the final version of its Surveillance Framework for Measuring and Controlling Large Impacts impacts that is based on a long-standing BCBS guide to the concentration of credit exposure. On September 3, 2014, U.S. banking agencies (the Federal Reserve, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) issued their final rule by implementing the Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR). LCR is a short-term liquidity measure designed to ensure that banking organizations retain a sufficient pool of liquid assets to cover net cash outflows during the 30-day stress period. On 11 March 2016, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision unveiled the second of three proposals for the public disclosure of regulatory indicators and quality data by banking institutions. The proposal requires market risk disclosure to be more detailed, both for the standardized approach and for the approval of domestic regulatory models. In December 2011, the U.S. Federal Reserve announced that it would comply with virtually all Basel III regulations. , stress tests and capital adequacy, including an overall risk-based capital ratio of more than 5 per cent, both at expected and stressful conditions, - see Risk-Based Capital Allowance Market Liquidity, first based on its own Interagency LiquidIty Risk Management Guide in the United States, issued in March 2010, which requires stress tests and internal quantitative limits. See below. The Federal Reserve Board itself will conduct tests annually using three scenarios of the economic and financial markets. Agencies will be asked to use at least five scenarios that reflect incredible events, especially those that management considers impossible, but no standards are yet applied to extreme scenarios. Only a summary of the three official Fed scenarios including specific company information will be made public, but one or more internal companies run stress tests should be run each year with resumes published. Single credit limits to reduce the credit impact of the financial firm covered on one counterparty as a percentage of the firm's regulatory capital. Credit exposure between the largest financial companies will be limited by tighter limits. Requirements for early recovery to ensure that financial deficiencies are addressed at an early stage. In 2012, the Council will propose one or more recovery triggers such as the level of stress test results and risk management deficiencies are in some cases calibrated for predictive development. The necessary measures will vary depending on the seriousness of the situation, but may include restrictions on growth, capital allocation and remuneration of managers, as well as capital raising or asset sale. How To In January 2014, the United States was on track to implement many of Basel III's rules, despite differences in the ratio of requirements and calculations. The main article of the European Implementation: Capital Requirements Regulation and the Basel III Directive in the European Union was a new legislative package comprising Directive 2013/36/EU (CRD IV) and Regulation (EU) No. 575/2013 on Prudential Requirements for Credit Institutions and Investment Firms (CRR). The new package, approved in 2013, replaced the Capital Requirements Directives (2006/48 and 2006/49). Key Milestone Capital Requirements Date: Capital Requirements 2014 Minimum Capital Requirements: Beginning of gradual phase-in in higher minimum capital requirements. Minimum capital requirements for 2015: Higher minimum capital requirements are fully met. 2016 Buffer Preservation: Start gradual phase in buffer conservation. 2019 Buffer Preservation: Keeping the buffer fully implemented. Date Milestone Leverage Ratio: Leverage Ratio 2011 Monitoring: Develop templates to track leverage and underlying component ratios. 2013 Parallel Launch I: Leverage Ratio and its components will be tracked by managers, but not disclosed and are not mandatory. 2015 Parallel Launch II: Leverage Ratio and its components will be tracked and disclosed, but not necessarily. 2017 Final adjustments: Based on the results of the parallel launch period, any final adjustments to the leverage ratio. 2018 Mandatory Requirement: Leverage Ratio will become a mandatory part of Basel III requirements. Milestone Liquidity Requirements Date: Liquidity Requirements 2011 Monitoring Period: Pattern Development and Liquidity Ratio Control. 2015 Introduction of LCR: Initial introduction of liquidity coverage ratio (LCR), with a requirement of 60%. This will increase by ten percentage points each year until 2019. In the EU, 100% will be achieved in 2018. Introduction of NSFR in 2018: Introduction of the Net Stable Funding Ratio (NSFR). 2019 LCR comes into full force: 100% LCR is expected. An analysis of the impact of Basel III in the United States of higher capital requirements has led to a reduction in trade operations and the number of employees employed on trading floors. The macroeconomic impact of the OECD Study, published on 17 February 2011, showed that the medium-term impact of Basel III on GDP would range from 0.05% to 0.15% per year. Economic production will be mainly affected by the increase in bank lending spreads, as banks move to their customers with the rising cost of bank financing due to higher capital requirements. To meet capital requirements, originally due to effect in 2015 it is estimated to increase their credit spreads by an average of about 15 basis points. Capital requirements due from 2019 (7% for total capital ratio, 8.5% 8.5% Level 1 capital ratio) can increase bank lending spreads by about 50 basis points. The perceived impact on GDP growth does not imply an active monetary policy response. To the extent that monetary policy will no longer be constrained by a zero lower boundary, Basel III's impact on economic production can be offset by a reduction (or delay) in monetary policy rates by about 30-80 basis points. Basel III has also been criticized as having a negative impact on the stability of the financial system, increasing banks' incentives to play into the regulatory framework. Critical think tanks, such as the World Pension Council, argue that Basel III simply builds and expands the existing regulatory framework of Basel II without questioning its basic principles, in particular its ever-increasing reliance on standardized credit risk assessments, in the market of two private sector agencies, Moody's and S'P, thereby using public policy to strengthen anti-competitive duopolisan practices. The conflicting and unreliable credit ratings of these agencies are generally seen as a major contributor to the U.S. housing bubble. Academics have criticized Basel III for continuing to allow big banks to calculate credit risk through domestic models and to set overall minimum capital requirements too low. The opaque handling of all derivative contracts has also been criticized. While institutions have many legitimate (hedging, insurance) reasons for reducing the risk for derivatives transactions, Basel III agreements: treat insurance buyers and sellers equally, even if sellers take on more concentrated risks (literally their purchases), which they then have to compensate correctly without regulation does not require organizations to investigate the correlation of all internal risks they possess are not taxed or charged by institutions for systematic or aggressive externalization or conflict marketing. unravelling derivatives into crisis and stricter accounting Because derivatives pose a major unknown in a crisis, they are seen as the main flaws of some critics, forcing some to argue that the status of too big to fail remains in relation to large derivatives dealers who aggressively took the risk of an event they did not believe would happen, but it did. Since Basel III absolutely does not require extreme scenarios, which management categorically rejects for inclusion in stress testing, this remains a vulnerability. However, standardized external audit and modelling is an issue that is proposed to be resolved in Basel 4. Some critics argue that capitalization regulation is inherently fruitless because of these and similar problems, and despite ideological view of regulation, agree that too big to fail persists. Basel III has come under similar criticism for its paper burden and ban on risk by banks organized by the Institute of International Finance, an international association of global banks based Washington, D.C who argue that it will hurt both their business and overall economic growth. Basel III has also been criticized as having a negative impact on the stability of the financial system, increasing banks' incentives to play into the regulatory framework. The American Bankers Association, public bankers organized by the Independent Bankers' Community of America, and some of the most liberal Democrats in the U.S. Congress, including the entire Maryland congressional delegation with Democratic Senators Ben Cardin and Barbara Mikulski and representatives Chris Van Hollen and Elijah Cummings, expressed their disagreement with Basel III in their comments to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Will hurt small banks by increasing their capital stocks dramatically on mortgages and small business loans. Professor Robert Reich argued that Basel III did not go far enough to regulate banks because it believed that inadequate regulation was the cause of the financial crisis. On January 6, 2013, the global banking sector won a significant easing of the Basel III Rules, when the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision extended not only the implementation schedule until 2019, but also expanded the definition of liquid assets. Prior to the adoption of Basel III in 2011, the Institute of International Finance (IIF), based in Washington, D.C., was based in Washington. The 450-member banking trade association opposed the implementation of the agreements, arguing that it would hurt banks and economic growth. The Association of American Bankers, public banks organized by the Independent Community of Bankers of America, and some of the most liberal Democrats in the U.S. Congress, including the entire Maryland congressional delegation with Democratic senators Cardin and Mikulski and Republican Van Hollen and Cummings, disagreed with Basel III in their comments submitted by the FDIC, saying that Basel III proposals, if implemented, would hurt the banks. Former U.S. Secretary of Labor Robert Reich argued that Basel III did not go far enough to regulate banks because, in his view, inadequate regulation was the cause of the financial crisis. However, this assertion has not been proven in any academic literature, and, in fact, much of the regulation called for by the Reich is focused on areas that were not a problem in the global financial crisis (i.e. all service investment banks were not affected or harmed the financial system, and autonomous ones such as Lehman Brothers failed). Original research? On January 6, 2013, the global banking sector won a significant easing of the Basel III Rules, when the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision extended not only the implementation schedule until 2019, but also expanded the definition of liquid assets. In the US investor Michael Berry criticises Basel III for what he describes as 'more or less remote' opening with credit markets, meaning the risk does not have an accurate pricing mechanism in interest rates anymore. (quote is necessary) In further research in addition to the articles used for links (see References), this section lists links to publicly available high-quality research on Basel III. Date Source Article Title /Link Comments February 2012 BNP Paribas Fortis Basel III for dummiesVideo Everything you need to know about Basel III in 10 minutes. Updated on January 6, 2013. December 2011 OECD: The Economic Department of the OECD Systemically Important Banks analyses the inability of banking regulation and markets to discipline systemically important banks. June 2011 BNP Paribas: Department of Economic Research Basel III: No Achilles Spear BNP Paribas' Economic Research Department Basel III. February 2011 George, co-Pierre Basel III and systemic risk management: What is the way forward? Basel III review article with a focus on how to manage systemic risk. February 2011 OECD: The macroeconomic impact of Basel III OECD on the macroeconomic impact of Basel III. May 2010 OECD Journal: Trends in Financial Market Thinking for Basel III OECD study on Basel I, Basel II and III. May 2010 BloombergBusinessweek FDIC in Bair says that Europe should make banks keep more capital Bair said that regulators around the world should work together on the next round of capital standards for banks ... the next round of international standards, known as Basel III, which Bair said should meet very aggressive goals. In May 2010, a meeting of the Finance Ministers of the G20 countries on financial regulation will be held in Busan, Korea, during which the finance ministers of the G20 countries meet in Busan, Korea, to review commitments made in 2009 to strengthen regulation and learn from the financial crisis. May 2010 Economist Banks are battling a back-up fight over new capital and liquidity rules The most important bit of reform is an international set of rules known as Basel 3 that will regulate the capital and liquidity buffers banks carry. This is where the most violent and least public skirmish between banks and their regulators takes place. See also the Banks portal Basel I Basel II Basel IV Operating Risk Management SystemIcally Important Financial Links Institutions : The Group of Managers and Supervisors Announces Higher Global Minimum Capital Standards (PDF). Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. September 12, 2010. - Financial Times report for October 2012 - Basel III - Implementation - Financial Stability Board. www.fsb.org. received on March 21, 2019. b Phase 3 arrangements (PDF). www.bis.org. - Archive copy (PDF). from the original (PDF) of December 11, 2013. Received April 30, 2015.CS1 maint: archived copy as headline (link) - Report (PDF). www.bis.org. AllBankingSolutions.com -. AllBankingSolutions.com. - Publication of the FDIC (PDF). ^ ^ Banking Supervision Committee (PDF). www.bis.org 2010. Hal S. Scott (June 16, 2011). Hal S. Scott's testimony before the Financial Services Committee (PDF). Financial Services Committee, United States House of Representatives. 12-13. Received on November 17, 2012. b Archive copy (PDF). Archive from the original (PDF) dated November 2, 2013. Received 2 November 2013.CS1 maint: archived copy as headline (link) - Federal liquidity offer saw trading security for a more expensive loan. Bloomberg. b Non-bank SIFIs: FSOC offers initial designations of more names to follow. www.pwc.com. - b c liquidity coverage ratio: another brick in the wall. www.pwc.com. The Federal Reserve Board proposes a rule to strengthen the liquidity of the positions of large financial institutions. Sign up for reading. Financial Times. Strengthening the sustainability of the banking sector (PDF). BCBS. December 2009. page 15. Level 3 will be abolished to ensure that market risks are met with the same quality of capital as credit and operational risks. Basel II Comprehensive Version Part 2: First Pillar - Minimum Capital Requirements (PDF). November 2005. 86. Suzanne Craig (January 8, 2012). Banking regulators to give leeway on the liquidity rule. The New York Times. Received on January 10, 2012. Proposed Basel III Guidelines: Credit Positive for Indian Banks - Stress Testing: First Take: Basel's Large Exposure Framework. www.pwc.com PwC Financial Services Regulatory, April 2014. First look: Liquidity coverage ratio. www.pwc.com PwC Financial Services Regulatory, September 2014 Five key points from Basel's expanded disclosure proposal. PwC's risk and financial services regulatory practice. March 2016. Edward Wyatt (December 20, 2011). The Fed proposes new capital rules for banks. The New York Times. Received on July 6, 2012. Press release. Federal Reserve Bank. December 20, 2011. Received on July 6, 2012. Basel leverage ratio: Lack of coverage for U.S. banks (PDF). www.pwc.com PwC Financial Services Regulatory, January 2014. Risk management for banks and financial institutions. The European Commission is the European Commission. Basel III in Europe - European Banking Authority. www.eba.europa.eu. - The Liquidity Requirement Delegation Act: frequently asked questions. Brussels: European Commission. MEMO/14/579. October 10, 2014. Received on November 1, 2016. Nathaniel Popper (July 23, 2015). In Connecticut, Twilight Shopping Center. The New York Times. Received on July 26, 2015. ... a set of international banking rules that had the greatest impact requires banks to hold capital as a buffer against trade losses, rules commonly referred to as Basel III. a b Patrick Slowick; Boris Kurnede (2011). Impact of Basel III. Working documents of the OECD Department of Economy. OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/5kghwnhkkjs8-en. John B. Taylor (September 22, 2012) Expanding regulation of regulation Economic expansion in two recovery (blog). Hugh Jones (February 15, 2011). Basel's rules have little impact on the economy. Reuters. Slowick, Patrick (2012). Systemically important banks and problems related to capital regulation. Working documents from the OECD Department of Economy. OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/5kg0ps8cq8q6-en. To quote the magazine requires magazine (assistance) M. Nicolas J. Firzli, Criticism of the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision Revue Analysis Financi're, 10 November 2011 - No 2 2012 - Barr, David G. (November 23, 2013). What we thought we knew: the financial system and its vulnerabilities (PDF). Bank of England. Archive from the original (PDF) dated February 1, 2014. Ranjit Lall (2012). From failure to failure: the policy of international banking regulation. An overview of the international political economy. 19 (4): 609–638. doi:10.1080/09692290.2011.603669. S2CID 154898296. Basel III and existing banking regulations are not sufficient to regulate derivatives, says the economist (PDF). cholar.harvard.edu on October 28, 2013. Basel III Capital Standards do not reduce too much to fail the problem. www.heritage.org April 23, 2014. Patrick Slowick (2012). Systemically important banks and problems related to capital regulation. Working documents from the OECD Department of Economy. OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/5kg0ps8cq8q6-en. Referring to the magazine requires journal (assistance) Comment Letter on proposals for a comprehensive revision of the regulatory framework of capital for U.S. banking organizations (October 22, 2012, The 95 organizations listed on the received march 13, 2013 www.icba.org - Not Found (PDF). Wall Street is still out of control, and why Obama should call for Glass-Steagall and the break-up of the big banks Reich.org. NY Times July 1, 2013 - Comment Letter on proposals for a comprehensive overhaul of the capital regulatory framework for U.S. banking organizations. Association of Securities and Financial Markets. October 22, 2012. Archive from the original on September 24, 2015. Received on September 12, 2013. The American Bankers Association, the Securities and Financial Markets Industry Association and the Financial Services Roundtable meet Basel III and other regulations: 95 organizations listed under access 3-13-13. Testimony of William A. Love (PDF). Received on September 12, 2013. Robert Reich (October 25, 2011). Wall Street is still out of control, and why Obama should call for Glass-Steagall and the breakup of the big banks. Robert Reich.org. NY Times 1/7/13 External References Basel III Capital Rules Basel III Rules of Governance and Liquidity Bank, Springer Nature - Office for Professionals, 2020 U.S. U.S. Basel Capital Regulatory Framework of the Congress Research Service Securitized Products Risk Fees: Moving Beyond SSFA Basel III in India How Basel III Affects SMEs Borrowed From