# How to Release Capital Requirements During a Pandemic? Evidence from Euro Area Banks

C. Couaillier<sup>1</sup> A. Reghezza<sup>1</sup> C. Rodriguez d'Acri<sup>1</sup> A. Scopelliti<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> European Central Bank; <sup>2</sup> KU Leuven

The views presented are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the European Central Bank or the Eurosystem.

Workshop on Macroprudential Policy and the CCyB – 15 January, 2024 (Santiago de Chile)

### Motivation

- Expected functioning of the Basel III macroprudential framework.
  - Bank capital buffers built in economic upturns when vulnerabilities accumulate.
  - They can be employed to absorb losses and meet credit demand in **downturns**.
- But some concerns about potential limitations of this framework.
  - Are there constraints to the actual **usability of capital buffers**?
  - Is there adequate macroprudential space for **buffer releases**?
- The pandemic as an attractive setting to test the functioning of the macroprudential framework in severe economic downturns.
- Euro area provides ideal setting to study effects of capital relief.
  - Institutional setting of macro- and micro-prudential policy
  - Data for multiple countries: supervisory, credit register
  - Prudential policy measures: reduction of requirements; supervisory flexibility

### **Research Questions and Preview of Results**

- > **Setting.** Bank capital relief by prudential authorities at onset of pandemic
- Analysis. Loan-level study on the effects of capital relief on bank lending to firms, controlling for credit demand and concurrent policy measures
- 1. What is the impact of bank capital relief on credit supply?
  - Capital relief measures contribute to expand credit supply to firms
- 2. Does the **nature of the capital relief** matter for its effectiveness?
  - Releases of capital requirements raise bank lending to firms.
  - **Supervisory flexibility** on capital expectations has no significant impact.
- 3. Are the effects different across banks?
  - Requirement releases more effective for banks with smaller capital headroom
- 4. Does capital relief promote bank risk-taking towards weaker firms?
  - Requirement releases promote lending to firms with former loan impairments
  - But do not foster excessive risk-taking for weaker rel. to stronger banks

### Outline

- Related Literature and Contributions
- Capital Relief Measures
- Methodology & Data
- Empirical Results
- Conclusions

### **Related Literature and Contribution**

#### 1. The effect of changes in capital requirements on bank lending

- Capital surcharges and structural buffers [Gropp et al., RFS 2019; De Jonghe et al., JCF 2020; Behn and Schramm, 2020; Degryse et al., JCF 2023; Cappelletti et al., JBF 2022]
- Dynamic requirements [Aiyar et al., JFE 2014; Auer et al., JFI 2022; Imbierowicz et al., JMCB 2018; Basten, RoF 2019]
- Capital requirement releases during Global Financial Crisis [Jimenez et al., JPE 2017]
- > Analyse the effects of (different) capital releases during severe downturn.
- 2. <u>Rules vs. discretion in prudential policy</u>
  - Microprudential regulation and supervision [Walther and White, RFS 2020; Elliott et al., 2013]
  - Macroprudential policy [Agur and Sharma, 2013; Calem et al., JFI 2020].
  - > Predictability within known frameworks supports policy effectiveness.

#### 3. Basel III framework and bank lending during the pandemic

Capital buffers, internal models and bank lending [Abad and Garcia, 2022; Berrospide et al., IJCB 2023; Couaillier et al., 2022; Mathur et al., 2023; Matyunina and Ongena, EJLE 2022; Fiordelisi et al., 2022]

> Assess capital requirement releases under the Basel III framework.

#### Limited space from Countercyclical Capital Buffer (CCyB)



Source: ECB, Authors' Calculations

#### The Capital Stack for EU Banks



### Capital Relief: Reduction of Capital Requirements

- Starting on 12 March 2020, euro area prudential authorities adopted two types of measures, providing <u>capital relief</u> for overall EUR 140 bn:
  - 1. Reduced binding capital requirements (rule-based action)



#### Capital Relief: Supervisory Flexibility on Pillar 2 Guidance

- Starting on 12 March 2020, euro area prudential authorities adopted two types of measures, providing <u>capital relief</u> for overall EUR 140 bn :
  - 2. Granted flexibility on supervisory guidance (discretionary measure)



Combined Buffer Requirement

Pillar 2 Requirement

Pillar 1

#### Permission to operate below Pillar 2 Guidance (P2G)

- Decided by ECB Banking Supervision
- While supervisory expectation in place, temporary waiver on the potential consequences of a breach

# **Empirical Strategy**

#### Econometric strategy:

- Bank-firm loan-level data to study the effects of capital relief measures on banks' credit supply
- Control for demand through firm fixed effects (Khwaja and Mian, 2008) as well as across sectors
- **Supply** controlled for:
  - bank characteristics (time-variant balance sheet variables, bank FEs);
  - policy interventions
    - TLTRO III and dividend payment restriction at bank level
    - credit guarantees and moratoria at bank-firm level



#### Data

Combine different micro confidential datasets with euro area coverage for a quarterly sample from 2019 Q3 to 2020 Q4.

#### Loan-level data from AnaCredit

- All **bank-firm credit relations** with initially more than EUR 25,000
  - Credit contract data: Ioan volumes, lender, borrower, guarantees, moratoria
  - Firm level information: Industry (NACE), Location & Size information
- Bank-level supervisory data
  - Offer a vast variety of bank characteristics to control for
  - Information on capital relief measures and distance to the Pillar 2 Guidance
  - Focus on Significant Institutions due to Pillar 2 Guidance data availability
- Pandemic-related policy measures
  - Central bank liquidity measures: TLTRO-III allotment
  - Suspension of dividend distribution (decided by ECB Banking Supervision)

# **Empirical Specification**

#### Regression equation:

 $\Delta Y_{f,b,c,t} = \alpha \ CAPREL_{b,t} * PostCOVID_t + \beta \ P2G_{b,t} * PostCOVID_t + \Phi \ X_{b,t-1} + \Psi \ Z_{f,b,t-1} + \eta_{f,t} + \mu_{c,t} + \rho_b + \epsilon_{f,b,c,t}$ 

f is the firm, b is the lender bank, c is the country of the bank, t is the quarter

- **Dependent variable** for credit at the firm-bank level:
  - $\Delta \log of lending stocks$
- Key regressors expressed as continuous variables:
  - *CAPREL*<sub>b,t</sub> is the size of **capital requirement decreases**
  - $P2G_{b,t}$  is the pre-Covid level of the Pillar 2 Guidance
- **Fixed effects**: firm-quarter, country-quarter and bank (or firm-bank)
- Errors clustered at the firm-quarter and bank-quarter levels.
- Bank controls: bank size, NPL ratio, provisions/tot assets, net interest margin, cash/tot assets, loans/tot assets, average risk weight, lagged CET1 ratio, off-balance-sheet exposure/tot assets

### Table 1. Effects of Different Capital Relief Measures

- Reduction in capital requirements increases banks' credit supply to firms (for a release of 1 pp of risk-weighted assets, increase by 2.6%-3.6%).
- The flexibility on supervisory guidance has no significant impact on banks' lending behaviour.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)
CAPREL*PostCOVID	2.579**	2.845**	3.459*	3.641*
	(1.144)	(1.179)	(1.907)	(2.160)
P2G*PostCOVID	-1.949	-1.427	-0.8299	-0.7976
	(1.515)	(1.532)	(1.581)	(1.596)
TLTRO-III Allotment/Tot Assets	0.1925***	0.1460***	0.2177***	0.2059***
	(0.0410)	(0.0413)	(0.0544)	(0.0640)
Share Guaranteed Loans	0.3525***	0.3495***	0.8298***	0.8273***
	(0.0512)	(0.0508)	(0.0852)	(0.0849)
Obs.	4,939,787	4,939,787	4,939,787	4,939,787
Firm*Quarter FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Bank country*Quarter FE	NO	YES	NO	YES
Firm-bank FE	NO	NO	YES	YES

### Effectiveness of Different Relief Measures

# The design of the capital relief measure is key for its effectiveness. What are the main differences?

	Decrease in Requirements	Usability of Supervisory Guidance	
Benefits from change?	Reduce MDA trigger → MDA breach implies automatic restrictions (→ capital targets)	Supervisory expectation still in place → Temporary waiver on supervisory actions (already discretionary)	
Replenishment rules/timeline?	<ul> <li>Pillar 2 Requirement permanent</li> <li>Combined Buffer Requirement</li> <li>temporary but set within</li> <li>established framework</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Set on discretionary basis outside</li> <li>scope of the framework</li> <li>Timeline communicated only at the</li> <li>end of July 2020</li> </ul>	
	۱ <u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>	۲	
	<b>Predictability</b> for replenishment and sanctions enhances policy effectiveness	Uncertainty on replenishment or breach consequences may hamper relief effectiveness	

### Table 2. Effects of Capital Relief across Quarters

#### > Are expansionary effects of capital relief different across quarter?

Expansionary effects of requirement releases mainly in 2020 Q2 and 2020 Q3.

	(1) (2)		(3)	(4)
	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)
CAPREL*2020 Q2	2.120	4.106**	4.325**	6.079**
	(1.831)	(1.995)	(2.176)	(2.473)
CAPREL*2020 Q3	3.870**	3.918**	4.258**	3.678*
	(1.520)	(1.668)	(1.984)	(2.199)
CAPREL*2020 Q4	1.709	0.7327	1.246	0.1867
	(1.807)	(1.649)	(2.332)	(2.557)
P2G*2020 Q2	-9.830***	-9.501***	-7.286**	-7.443**
	(3.656)	(3.533)	(2.862)	(2.984)
P2G*2020 Q3	1.958	2.230	3.564*	3.632*
	(1.895)	(2.091)	(1.891)	(1.929)
P2G*2020 Q4	0.9678	1.873	2.086	2.281
	(1.493)	(1.451)	(2.094)	(2.135)
Obs.	4,939,787	4,939,787	4,939,787	4,939,787
Firm*Quarter FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Bank country*Quarter FE	NO	YES	NO	YES
Bank-firm FE	NO	NO	YES	YES

### Table 3. Bank Heterogeneity and Capital Headroom

Expansionary effects stronger for banks with ex-ante smaller capital headroom

- Dist. P2G PreCOVID= CET1 ratio P2G level (as of 2019 Q4).
- The reduction of capital requirements releases buffer usability constraints (Couaillier et al., 2022; Berrospide et al., 2023; Mathur et al., 2023)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	∆ Log (loans)	∆ Log (loans)	
CAPREL*PostCOVID	3.282**	3.097**	4.777***	4.591**	
	(1.325)	(1.353)	(2.110)	(2.302)	
CAPREL*PostCOVID* Dist. P2G PreCOVID	-0.4751**	-0.2971	-0.5599*	-0.5098*	
	(0.2137)	(0.1961)	(0.2921)	(0.2951)	
Dist. P2G PreCOVID	-0.2952	-0.2877	-0.2280	-0.3628	
	(0.2218)	(0.2336)	(0.3909)	(0.4197)	
P2G*PostCOVID	-3.656*	-2.488	-1.897	-2.125	
	(1.947)	(2.028)	(2.837)	(2.901)	
P2G x PostCOVID × Dist. P2G PreCOVID	0.3006***	0.2087**	0.2940*	0.2995*	
	(0.1066)	(0.1018)	(0.1695)	(0.1744)	
Obs.	4,939,787	4,939,787	4,939,787	4,939,787	
Firm*Quarter FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Bank country*Quarter FE	NO	YES	NO	YES	
Bank-firm FE	NO	NO	YES	YES	

### Table 4. Firm Heterogeneity and Riskiness

- Investigate interaction between capital relief and firms' ex-ante riskiness
  - In firm-bank relationships, L.IMPAIR is the (lagged) ratio of provisions over the amount of credit exposure (private info available to the lender; Jimenez et al. 2014)
  - In crisis times, capital requirement releases support higher lending growth for firms with previous loan impairments (evidence of some risk-taking)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)
CAPREL*PostCOVID	2.418**	2.768**	2.596	2.851
	(1.190)	(1.247)	(1.763)	(2.017)
CAPREL*PostCOVID* L.IMPAIR	0.0388**	0.0311	0.1150***	0.1100***
	(0.0190)	(0.0190)	(0.0291)	(0.0299)
L.IMPAIRMENT	0.0547***	0.0527***	0.4849***	0.4840***
	(0.0087)	(0.0089)	(0.0418)	(0.0418)
P2G*PostCOVID	-2.148	-1.677	-1.002	-0.9566
	(1.583)	(1.588)	(1.597)	(1.619)
P2G x PostCOVID × L.IMPAIR	0.0354***	0.0352***	0.0097	0.0114
	(0.0127)	(0.0127)	(0.0161)	(0.0163)
Obs.	4,576,380	4,576,380	4,576,380	4,576,380
Firm FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Bank country*Quarter FE	NO	YES	NO	YES
Bank-firm FE	NO	NO	YES	YES

### Table 5. Explore Both Firm and Bank Heterogeneity

- Requirement releases do not foster excessive risk-taking for weaker banks
  - The additional risk-taking enhanced by capital releases does not statistically differ across banks, in relation to their existing capital position

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)
CAPREL*PostCOVID	3.007**	2.903**	3.789*	3.726*
	(1.388)	(1.436)	(2.014)	(2.226)
CAPREL*PostCOVID*L.IMPAIR	0.0610**	0.0526**	0.1161***	0.1100***
	(0.0258)	(0.0257)	(0.0381)	(0.0389)
CAPREL*PostCOVID*L.IMPAIR*Dist. P2G	-0.0129	-0.0116	-0.0124	-0.0117
	(0.0084)	(0.0083)	(0.0125)	(0.0126)
CAPREL*PostCOVID*Dist. P2G	-0.4151*	-0.2390	-0.5124*	-0.4811
	(0.2233)	(0.2053)	(0.2964)	(0.3007)
P2G*PostCOVID	-3.846*	-2.769	-1.862	-2.041
	(2.094)	(2.152)	(2.947)	(3.036)
P2G*PostCOVID*L.IMPAIR	0.0311**	0.0299**	0.0290	0.0313
	(0.0142)	(0.0140)	(0.0199)	(0.0203)
P2G*PostCOVID*L.IMPAIR*Dist. P2G	-0.0017	0.0024	-0.0788***	-0.0798***
	(0.0141)	(0.0141)	(0.0187)	(0.0191)
P2G*PostCOVID*Dist. P2G	0.2816**	0.1911*	0.2799	0.2884
	(0.1098)	(0.1049)	(0.1700)	(0.1756)
Obs.	4,576,380	4,576,380	4,576,380	4,576,380
Firm FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Bank country*Quarter FE	NO	YES	NO	YES
Bank-firm FE	NO	NO	YES	YES

### Table 6. Interaction with Loan Guarantees

- Capital releases support bank lending, independently from guarantees
- Also, loan guarantees reduce credit risk and so risk weight for loans
  - The released capital space can be used to extend a larger amount of loans
  - Loan guarantees amplify expansionary effect of capital releases

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)
CAPREL*PostCOVID	2.608**	2.918**	5.839***	6.555***
	(1.161)	(1.183)	(1.795)	(2.050)
CAPREL*PostCOVID* D.GUAR SHARE	0.0216	0.0197	0.1109***	0.1134***
	(0.0377)	(0.0377)	(0.0371)	(0.0376)
P2G*PostCOVID	-1.769	-0.9164	-1.595	-1.674
	(1.472)	(1.508)	(1.309)	(1.306)
P2G*PostCOVID* D.GUAR SHARE	-0.0015	-0.0036	-0.0179	-0.0189
	(0.0383)	(0.0383)	(0.0454)	(0.0460)
Obs.	3,996,621	3,996,621	3,996,621	3,996,621
Firm*Quarter FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Bank country*Quarter FE	NO	YES	NO	YES
Bank-firm FE	NO	NO	YES	YES

#### **Further Analyses and Robustness**

#### Sectors less vulnerable to the pandemic

- Given the differences in credit demand across sectors, exclude loans to firms in sectors more vulnerable to the pandemic.
- ✓ The expansionary effect of requirement releases is confirmed (<u>table</u>)

#### > Definition of the dependent variable

- ✓ Investigate increase in loan volumes in lending relationships (<u>table</u>)
  - Estimate a linear probability model using binary variable for rise in credit

#### Potential endogeneity of the Pillar 2 Guidance

- ✓ P2G set by banking supervisors based on the risk of banks (<u>table</u>)
  - Two stage approach:
    - Estimate the P2G as function of expected capital depletion from 2018 Stress Tests
    - Use residuals from the P2G estimation as regressors in the main estimation

#### Disentangle the decrease of different capital requirements

Estimate separately the effects of the release of P2R and CBR (table)

## Conclusions

- COVID-19 pandemic provides ideal setting to study the functioning of capital buffer framework and the design of capital releases in crisis times
- Capital relief measures support banks' credit supply to firms, but not all measures are equally successful.
  - Banks adjust their credit supply only if the capital relief reduces binding capital requirements and is implemented within rule-based processes (shaping banks' capital planning and dividend policy)
  - **Discretionary relief measures** show limited success, possibly for the uncertainty in capital replenishment or as not affecting dividend policy.
- The effectiveness of countercyclical capital relief measures in crisis times depends not only on the relief size, but also on the design of measures.
  - Focus on rules setting clear policy reactions.
  - Tilting the balance from usable to releasable buffers

# Thank you!



# **Countercyclical Capital Buffer Rates**

#### **Countercyclical Capital Buffer rate applicable in euro area countries**

(2019-2024, as of January, percent of Risk Weighted Assets)

Country	Jan-19	Jan-20	Jan-21	Jan-22	Jan-23	Jan-24
Austria	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belgium	0	0	0	0	0	0
Croatia	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
Cyprus	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estonia	0	0	0	0	1	1.5
Finland	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	0	0.25	0	0	0	0.5
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	0.75
Greece	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ireland	0	1	0	0	0	1
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Latvia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lithuania	0.5	1	0	0	0	1
Luxembourg	0	0.25	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Malta	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	1
Portugal	0	0	0	0	0	0
Slovakia	1.25	1.5	1	1	1	1.5
Slovenia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0

At the beginning of 2020, among euro area countries:

- 5 had activated a positive CCyB rate;
- 2 (BE, DE) had announced a positive CCyB (under phase-in).

The activation or the increase of the CCyB rate requires a 12-month phasein implementation period

> Capital ratios before pandemic

Source: ESRB (2022)

### **Capital Relief Measures**

Capital relief measures by euro area prudential authorities for overall EUR 140 bn at the onset of the pandemic



# **Timeline of Capital Relief Measures**



# **Summary Statistics**

#### Panel A: Bank level

	Ν	Mean	SD	Mi	n Qi	l Median	Q3	Max	-
L.CET1	608	17.81	8.39	8.6	3 13.54	4 15.46	19.35	75.72	-
L.RWA/TA	608	40.20	15.44	3.2	3 30.01	1 38.84	48.56	78.72	
L.NIM	608	1.41	0.69	-0.0	4 0.96	5 1.34	1.78	3.13	
L.NPL	608	4.75	7.41	0.0	0 1.10	5 2.59	4.45	45.99	
L.CASH/TA	608	11.64	7.76	0.5	4 5.96	<b>9.75</b>	15.30	39.70	
TLTRO.III	608	2.62	7.64	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	43.73	
L.LOAN/TA	608	78.77	9.99	41.9	5  74.93	8 80.73	85.51	94.62	_
L.OFF BS	608	19.26	11.81	1.2	4 12.02	16.94	23.79	67.53	Dat
DIVIDEND.REST	608	0.09	0.27	-0.0	5 0.00	0.00	0.00	2.34	
L.PROVISION/TA	608	0.59	0.60	0.0	0 0.20	0.46	0.76	3.46	Table
CAP REL	608	0.34	0.54	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.57	3.03	
P2G	608	0.68	0.87	0.0	0.00	0.00	1.00	6.00	
Dist. P2G PreCOVID	608	2.46	5.86	-0.8	8 0.00	0.00	2.73	52.36	

#### Panel B: Loan level

	Ν	Mean	SD	Min	Q1	Median	Q3	Max
S.MORA	4939787	0.22	4.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
S.GUAR	4939787	8.66	23.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Credit dlog	4939787	1.82	35.48	-152.84	-5.11	-0.20	0.00	189.42

<u>a</u>

e 1

### Table A.1. Sectors less Vulnerable to the Pandemic

- Some differences in credit demand could be observed across sectors, due to the different exposures to the shock of the pandemic
- The expansionary effect of capital requirement releases is confirmed, also after excluding loans to firms in sectors more vulnerable to the effects of the pandemic

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)
CAPREL*PostCOVID	1.566*	1.551**	2.729**	2.905**
	(0.8106)	(0.7570)	(1.284)	(1.358)
P2G*PostCOVID	-0.3559	-0.2688	-0.0612	0.0213
	(0.6968)	(0.7026)	(0.5695)	(0.5754)
TLTRO-III Allotment/Tot Assets	0.1232***	0.0741**	0.1338***	0.1043**
	(0.0301)	(0.0294)	(0.0408)	(0.0453)
Share Guaranteed Loans	0.2798***	0.2771***	0.7504***	0.7464***
	(0.0433)	(0.0432)	(0.0849)	(0.0848)
Obs.	1,234,620	1,234,620	1,234,620	1,234,620
Firm*Quarter FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Bank country*Quarter FE	NO	YES	NO	YES
Bank-firm FE	NO	NO	YES	YES

**Bank controls**: log of bank total asset, non-performing loans ratio, provisions-to-total-assets, net interest margin, cash-to-total-assets, loansto-total-assets, average risk weight, lagged CET1 ratio, off-balance-sheet exposure to total assets. **Policy controls**: (at the bank-level) TLTRO-to-total assets, dividend restrictions; (at the bank-firm level) share of loans under moratoria, share of loans under guarantee schemes.

#### Robustness

### Table A.2. Definition of the Dependent Variable

- Define a dummy =1 when credit volume in lending relationships increases from t-1 to t and run a linear probability model progressively saturated with FEs
- The expansionary impact of requirement releases is confirmed also in supporting the increase of lending volumes in existing relationships

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	I(∆ credit >0)	I(∆ credit >0)	I(∆ credit >0)	I(∆ credit >0)
CAPREL*PostCOVID	0.0404***	0.0530***	0.0421***	0.0439***
	(0.0116)	(0.0123)	(0.0149)	(0.0169)
P2G*PostCOVID	-0.0284*	-0.0283*	-0.0048	-0.0033
	(0.0154)	(0.0155)	(0.0133)	(0.0133)
TLTRO-III Allotment/Tot Assets	0.0025***	0.0025***	0.0013**	0.0014*
	(0.0005)	(0.0006)	(0.0006)	(0.0008)
Share Guaranteed Loans	0.0019***	0.0018***	0.0057***	0.0057***
	(0.0004)	(0.0004)	(0.0006)	(0.0006)
Obs.	4,939,787	4,939,787	4,939,787	4,939,787
Firm*Quarter FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Bank country*Quarter FE	NO	YES	NO	YES
Bank-firm FE	NO	NO	YES	YES

**Bank controls**: log of bank total asset, non-performing loans ratio, provisions-to-total-assets, net interest margin, cash-to-total-assets, loansto-total-assets, average risk weight, lagged CET1 ratio, off-balance-sheet exposure to total asset ratio. **Policy controls**: (at the bank-level) TLTRO-to-total assets, dividend restrictions; (at the bank-firm level) share of loans under moratoria, share of loans under guarantee schemes.

#### Robustness

### Table A.3. Robustness Analysis for the P2G

- <u>Concern</u>: P2G may be endogenous, set by the supervisor based on bank's riskiness, which could potentially drive bank's behavior in crisis times
- Solution: use Expected Capital depletion from 2018 Stress Tests under adverse scenario to calibrate P2G and use residuals as regressors in the main estimation
- ► Two steps:  $P2G_b = \alpha + \beta$  Stress test capital depletion<sub>b</sub> +  $\epsilon_b \rightarrow$  Define  $\widetilde{P2G_b} \equiv P2G_b \widehat{P2G_b}$

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Deculto confirm
CAPREL*PostCOVID	4.331***	4.681***	4.658**	4.610*	Results confirm:
	(1.394)	(1.587)	(2.052)	(2.392)	- expansionary
P2G*PostCOVID	1.407	1.705	-0.1968	-0.3813	impact of
	(1.730)	(2.040)	(2.393)	(2.673)	requirement
Obs.	3,885,014	3,885,014	3,885,014	3,885,014	releases
Firm*Quarter FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	- no significant
Bank country*Quarter FE	NO	YES	NO	YES	effect of P2G
Bank-firm FE	NO	NO	YES	YES	usability

$\Delta Y_{f,b,t} = \alpha + \beta CAPREL_{b,t} * PostCOVID + \gamma P2\bar{G}_{b,t} PostCOVID + \sum \delta X_{b,t}$
---

### Table A.4. Disentangling Different Capital Requirements

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)	Δ Log (loans)
P2R REL*PostCOVID	3.411**	2.344	4.170*	3.887*
	(1.460)	(1.438)	(2.177)	(2.306)
CBR REL*PostCOVID	0.2756	4.815*	1.185	2.442
	(1.914)	(2.709)	(2.684)	(4.202)
P2G*PostCOVID	-1.968	-1.408	-0.8487	-0.8089
	(1.533)	(1.519)	(1.582)	(1.591)
Obs.	4,939,787	4,939,787	4,939,787	4,939,787
Firm*time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Bank country*Quarter FE	NO	YES	NO	YES
Bank-firm FE	NO	NO	YES	YES

Frontload Pillar 2 Req. composition change: 3.4 - 4.2% increase in credit volume

Decrease in Combined Buffer Requirement: effect positive but not always significant

**Bank controls**: log of bank total asset, non-performing loans ratio, provisions-to-total-assets, net interest margin, cash-to-total-assets, loansto-total-assets, average risk weight, lagged CET1 ratio, off-balance-sheet exposure to total asset ratio. **Policy controls**: (at the bank-level) TLTRO-to-total assets, dividend restrictions; (at the bank-firm level) share of loans under moratoria, share of loans under guarantee schemes.

Robustness