

Discussion of:
**The Effects of Supervision on Bank Performance:
Evidence from Discontinuous Examination Frequencies**
by
Marcelo Rezende and Jason J. Wu

Bo Sun

Guanghua School of Management

Tsinghua PBCSF Global Finance Forum
May 12, 2014

Paper Overview

Great paper: important question & nice identification strategy

- ▶ Are supervisory policies useful?
- ▶ Nice identification in the context of banking supervision: fuzzy regression discontinuity
 - ▶ examination frequencies jump at an asset threshold
 - ▶ threshold triggering high frequency varies over time
- ▶ Supervision improves banks' ROE by reducing loan loss

Interpreting the results

frequent examinations \rightarrow reduce risk and increase ROE

- ▶ Implication: banks are *not* operating on a risk-return efficient frontier
- ▶ Question: Do regulators, at large, know how to run a private business better than private entities?
- ▶ Possible test: whether the result is more prominent for banks banks with poor governance and management incentives

How to bank examinations affect bank performance?

- ▶ This paper's story:
Regulators provide information and guidance during examinations
- ▶ Alternative story:
Enhanced incentives to perform in anticipation of examination
 - ▶ an incentive disciplining device
 - ▶ reduce agency cost

⇒ correct actions ex-post v.s. align incentives ex-ante

How to bank examinations affect bank performance?

- ▶ This paper's story:
Regulators provide information and guidance during examinations
- ▶ Alternative story:
Enhanced incentives to perform in anticipation of examination
 - ▶ an incentive disciplining device
 - ▶ reduce agency cost

⇒ correct actions ex-post v.s. align incentives ex-ante

How to bank examinations affect bank performance?

- ▶ This paper's story:
Regulators provide information and guidance during examinations
- ▶ Alternative story:
Enhanced incentives to perform in anticipation of examination
 - ▶ an incentive disciplining device
 - ▶ reduce agency cost

⇒ correct actions ex-post v.s. align incentives ex-ante

Empirical design: measure examination intensity

- ▶ D_{t-1} : number of days between the two most recent examinations as of Dec 31 at year t-1
- ▶ Different effects of # days between two recent exams v.s. # days after the most recent exam
- ▶ Control the number of days after the most recent examination (as of Dec 31 at year t-1)

Empirical design

- ▶ Choice of sample: safe and sound banks (that satisfy all criteria)
 - ▶ Main target of bank supervision
 - ▶ A valid (weaker) instrument for all banks
- ▶ bank-specific control variables:
leverage, M/B ratio, PE ratio, Dividend-price, etc.
- ▶ macroeconomic control variables:
interest rate, PPI, CPI, unemployment, etc.

Empirical design

- ▶ Loan loss measures involve reporting incentives
- ▶ Banks may deliberately choose asset levels
- ▶ Possible cyclicalities in the effects of supervision

Conclusion

- ▶ Tackle an important question in a nice setting with a neat identification
- ▶ Applying the methodology to a broader set of banks can be important
- ▶ Pinpointing the channel is likely a future task