

Banks and the pandemic: four critical steps to take even without regulatory prodding



A key justification for rescuing large banks before they fail – widely invoked during the last financial crisis – has been their irreplaceable role in supporting economies and preserving financial stability. If that is the case (which it is in Europe's notably bank-intermediated markets), banks should step up to the plate during the pandemic and fulfil their role in full gear and without any hesitation. And not only because regulators and politicians urge them to.

In the midst of the pandemic crisis and unlike the last time around, banks need to show the public at large that they should be viewed as part of the solution, not the problem.

It is unrealistic and arguably wrong to compare the current crisis with the global financial crisis of 2008-09. Covid-19 is first and foremost a distressing human-life crisis, rather than just a financial crisis. And this time, the banks are not among the parties triggering it. Equally wrong is to draw too many lessons from the post-9/11 crisis – which also stemmed from a non-financial source but whose economic impact was quickly defeated by the power of the Fed and other central banks. Central bank powers are far less mighty now, since so many tools in the kit have already been used and rates stuck at rock-bottom levels allow much more limited monetary-policy flexibility.

It is not surprising that the alphabet of doom is again being dusted off, from the optimistic V, going through W and U and all the way to the feared L. Several large European banks, possibly just entering the second stage of the Kübler-Ross curve's five stages of grief, seem to be relying on the V-shaped scenario. The assumption behind it is that the growth of the pandemic in Europe is likely to subside in a few weeks, following the encouraging pattern in China (at least as reported by the Chinese authorities). And, supposedly, after that the economy will gallop back up with a vengeance.

With the understandable 'too early to know' proviso, banks anticipated a hit to earnings of roughly 5%-10% for the year at a large banking conference last week¹. After taking into account the positive impact of government guarantees and subsidies to help virus-impacted business borrowers, expected supervisory capital forbearance, and a postponement of tougher loan-loss provisioning rules (IFRS 9).

Despite these steps to help, the reality will probably end up being uglier than just a dip in income. The full impact of NPL recognition and provision taking may be softened up for a while, but the top revenue line will likely show a dramatic shrinkage for the next quarters – investment and wholesale banking, asset management and bancassurance, business lending, etc.

Faced with this reality, the banking industry should be aiming at far more than just meeting market expectations during these extraordinary times. Specifically, banks should publicly announce and start implementing their own set of highly visible actions. And they should do that without regulatory prodding. Some in the market may be disapproving, even angry. But many other market participants, and especially people beyond the market, could look at these steps positively.

Author

Sam Theodore
+44 (0)776 932 1043
s.theodore@scopeinsights.com

Editing and Media

Keith Mullin
k.mullin@scopegroup.com

Scope Insights

Suite 204
2 Angel Square
London EC1V 1NY

Phone +44 20 3457 0444

Scope Group

Lennéstraße 5
10785 Berlin
Phone +49 30 27891 0
Fax +49 30 27891 100
www.scopegroup.com

  Bloomberg: SCOP

This report is published by Scope Insights, a Scope Group subsidiary which is separate from Scope Ratings. The content is an independent view not related to Scope's credit ratings.

¹ Morgan Stanley's European Financials Conference, 18-19 March 2020.

Four actions banks should announce and implement

1. Banks across Europe should announce that no variable management remuneration (bonuses) will be paid in 2020 (or beyond if the pandemic extends into 2021). On their own, senior bankers could at the same time publicly state that they will not accept any bonuses, should these be offered to them. While many bankers will be working hard during this difficult period, so will health workers and employees in other services critical for society who do not get and do not expect banker-level bonuses.

The most rewarding outcome for a bank in the age of the pandemic should not be closing a juicy commission-rich deal but saving a business from virus-triggered bankruptcy and its employees from being laid off. In any event the absence of a bonus could disincentivise bankers from contemplating high-risk high-return transactions, which is just as well.

2. The same should go for dividends. It is true that the expectation of a steady dividend is one element motivating investment in bank equities. But this flow was already interrupted during the crisis and in the post-crisis years and shareholders did not desert the sector. For banks, paying dividends to their shareholders is a choice, not a legal or moral requirement. And under the present dire circumstances, most shareholders are likely to understand this necessity. Specifically, dividends should not be paid because of the need of the bank to support the pandemic crisis all-hands-on-deck, not because the bank ran out of money due to mismanagement or foolish risk taking. Which would pretty much preclude dividend payments by all banks, bar none.

Again, banks would do well to announce skipping dividend payments without being guided to do so by their supervisors. Any institutional shareholders disagreeing with this could express publicly their discontent. Which is unlikely to happen in these times of extreme public stress.

It goes without saying, stock buybacks should be totally off the map also in banks' financial planning – again, without the regulators having to prohibit banks from doing it.

3. A key challenge for European banks in the digital age is reducing excess capacity – especially in physical branches and back offices. On balance, most large banks remain seriously over-staffed. To be able to compete effectively, they need to become more efficient and shed legacy costs. But, in the spirit of St. Augustine's "give me chastity, but not yet" prayer and with the pandemic around them, banks should postpone cost-cutting when it entails staff reductions. This would not perhaps be in line with cold bottom line-driven calculations, but it would help banks' public image, not to mention employee morale and financial welfare.

As government and central bank loans, subsidies and guarantees are intended to help pandemic-threatened businesses, some public statements (e.g. by the Bank of England's new governor) condition them to the preservation of jobs and salaries under threat. It is only logical that, in turn, the banks themselves should commit to the preservation of jobs and salaries under threat for their own staff. This would not be a goodwill act but the right thing to do under the current circumstances. There will be time to look again at optimising efficiency and boosting cost-income ratios later on, after the pandemic is gone.

4. Banks should also adjust their approach to risk-taking during the pandemic. Specifically, any activities liable to push a bank into new areas of risk – such as M&A and similar transactions which may make sense during more normal times – should be best avoided for a while. Management time and effort, stretched to the extreme in these difficult times, are better spent steering the bank's activities to support and guide businesses and individuals impacted by the coronavirus.

Such an approach would be in line with the newly expressed regulatory forbearance on capital levels. It would be very clumsy for a bank to take advantage of any supervisory leniency in the current period to push for unnecessary risk-taking.



Banks and the pandemic: four critical steps to take even without regulatory prodding

Scope Insights GmbH

Lennéstraße 5
D-10785 Berlin

Phone +49 30 27891 0
Fax +49 30 27891 100

Disclaimer

© Scope Insights GmbH ("Scope Insights") produces independent and objective non-credit-rating-related research and opinions ("research and opinions"). Forward-looking statements are based on estimates, so the research and opinions do not constitute a factual claim; they merely express an opinion, which may subsequently change and may then be reflected in an altered research or opinion. Consequently, Scope Insights does not assume any liability for damage resulting from decisions taken based on any research and opinion it produces. The information contained in the research and opinions is derived from sources that Scope Insights deems to be reliable; it has been compiled in good faith. Nevertheless, Scope Insights cannot give any guarantee that the information used is correct, nor can assume any liability for the correctness, completeness, timeliness or accuracy of the research and opinions.

The parties involved should only, if at all, regard such research and opinions as one out of many other factors in a possible investment decision; the research and opinions cannot replace the parties' own analyses and assessments. The research and opinions therefore only comprise the expression of an opinion with respect to quality and do not constitute any statement as to whether the parties to an investment could generate any income, recover any capital invested, or assume any specific liability risks. Scope Insights does not provide any financial, legal, tax, advisory or consultancy services and does not give advice on structuring transactions, drafting or negotiating transaction documentation. Scope Insights does not consent to being named an "expert" or any similar designation under any applicable securities laws or other regulatory guidance, rules or recommendations. Scope Insight's research and opinions are not a part of the credit analysis of Scope Ratings GmbH and do not represent the rating methodology of Scope Ratings GmbH. The research and opinions do not represent or constitute a credit rating, rating driver, or rating action and do not affect any of Scope's credit ratings.

Managing Director: Florian Schoeller
Commercial Register: District Court Berlin-Charlottenburg HRB 202433 B