

REUNIÃO DE CONJUNTURA

18/12/2017

Artigos de Bancos Centrais e BIS

Jens Weidmann: Monetary union – ever a work in progress? The euro area torn between the Maastricht framework and fiscal union..... 1

Andreas Dombret: Shared challenges, different perspectives, shared solutions? 13



Jens Weidmann: Monetary union – ever a work in progress? The euro area torn between the Maastricht framework and fiscal union

Speech by Dr Jens Weidmann, President of the Deutsche Bundesbank and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Bank for International Settlements, at the 21st RWI (Leibniz-Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung) Economic Discussion, Essen, 29 November 2017

* * *

1. Introduction

Ladies and gentlemen

Many a joker in his time has answered the question “How do I get to the philharmonic hall?” with the punch line “Practice, practice, practice.”

As my musical talent would certainly never have got me onto this stage, I am all the more grateful to you, Mr Schmidt, for the opportunity to talk here today about current monetary policy and the architecture of monetary union.

I will be discussing what needs to be done to make monetary union stable, and what role monetary policy plays in this endeavour.

2. Congratulations to Wim Kösters

But first of all, I would like to say a few words about Professor Wim Kösters, who is retiring today. It is a special honour to pay tribute to his long and successful career as an academic, an academic manager and a supporter of young talent.

Mr Kösters, you have been a member of the RWI’s Board of Directors since 2003 in your function as an academic manager. It is partly down to you, then, that the RWI ranks among Germany’s foremost economic research and policy consulting institutions. The Leibniz Association shared this view in its 2012 evaluation, hailing the work of five out of the RWI’s six research areas ratings as “good” to “excellent”.

First-rate research and problem-driven policy consulting calls for well-trained and motivated employees who are the brains and soul of any institution. But as we all know, that kind of talent doesn’t just spring up like mushrooms. Hence the particular importance of nurturing up-and-coming talent – at the RWI, at the Bundesbank and at the many other enterprises and institutions across Germany.

Bearing that in mind, Mr Kösters, it is greatly to your credit that you have done so much for so many years to foster gifted students and doctorate candidates. You have been a member of the board of the Cusanuswerk scholarship body’s gifted education foundation since 2008, as well as its chairman since 2011. Incidentally, there used to be long-standing ties between the Cusanuswerk and the Bundesbank – you took over as chairman back then from Hans Tietmeyer, the former president of the Deutsche Bundesbank. I’ve had the numbers checked: since you became a member of the foundation’s board, more than 3,000 students

have been sponsored. And at the RWI, too, you helped to create an environment in which the next generation of academics can reach their full potential. The great many RWI employees who submit their PhD thesis each year attest to your achievements.

And let's not forget the many academics trained personally by you, Mr Kösters, in your chair, among them Professor Ansgar Belke, who will be taking part in the subsequent panel discussion.

That panel discussion will be discussing a topic to which you have devoted yourself as an academic since the 1990s, and one which is close to my own heart: the prerequisites for making monetary union a union of stability.

3. European integration

Ladies and gentlemen, even though today's event is essentially a gathering of economists, there is one point which must not be forgotten when discussing monetary union: namely that the euro was also a political project from the outset. As early as 1949, the French economist Jacques Rueff declared that money would pave the way to European integration. In his own words: "Europe will either be built on money or it won't be built at all."

The unification of Europe after the Second World War was a political vision intended to bring lasting peace and stability to the continent. To put it in the words of Jean Monnet, the great European and winner of the Charlemagne Prize, and whose name your chair, Mr Köster, also bears: "By creating Europe, the Europeans are building a true foundation for peace."

Yet it was the integration of Europe's economies that was a major catalyst for European unification. And this in itself has produced remarkable results. Economic integration – in other words, the elimination of trade barriers and the harmonisation of regulations – boosts prosperity. Free trade enables each of us to specialise in what we're best at. Economies of scale can be harnessed more readily. Plus a bigger market results in greater competition. And this in turn fosters innovative power and productivity.

It is, of course, impossible to say exactly how the economy would have fared in the absence of European unification. The impact of the single market on the prosperity of European states, however, has been considerable. It is estimated that European economic integration has boosted annual economic output by between 5 and 25 per cent. [1] [2] [3] That's a handsome 1,450 to 7,250 euro per capita.

There is no question that economic and monetary union was the boldest step towards deeper economic integration. And at the same time, it was a twin promise: of price stability, and of stronger long-term economic growth.

There is a broad consensus that EMU has so far succeeded in delivering on the first of those promises. I dare say that significantly fewer people would claim that it has done likewise on the second.

For one thing, mounting economic competition across borders has been driving change, just like technological progress has, and many people are afraid of this. If the benefits not just of economic integration but of innovation as well are to be felt by the greatest number of people, the framework conditions also need to be right. Flexible economic structures and a good education system, say, are prerequisites for sustainable growth and for ensuring that many people can share in the opportunities offered by technological progress and international trade, for example.

For another thing, though, the financial and sovereign debt crisis shook the euro area to its core. Taxpayers were forced to step in for billions upon billions of euro in bank losses. Joblessness in some member states rocketed to levels hitherto unseen in the post-war era. To all intents and purposes, European and global institutions became the ancillary government in individual countries. And many saw the rescue packages as the first step on the road towards a transfer union – something which had been categorically ruled out prior to the launch of monetary union.

Many perceived the problems instigated by the crisis to be huge. Some even thought them irresolvable. Indeed, a number of commentators, particularly on the other side of the Atlantic, but elsewhere, too, predicted that the euro would come crashing down.

That didn't happen – and it would have been a disaster if it had. At the same time, let's be honest – the future might also hold regional or sectoral crises in store which put the euro area to the test. The upbeat economic situation right now shouldn't blind us to the fact that it is one outcome of a very accommodative monetary policy.

The low-interest-rate environment, then, is contributing to an air of deceptive calm which might tempt economic and fiscal policy decision-makers to sit back and do nothing. But if a crisis does materialise, the European house we live in today will need to be sufficiently strong to withstand these headwinds. There is still much to do, if we are to make that a reality.

4. Ensuring the long-term stability of monetary union

One defining characteristic of European monetary union is that, while it has a common monetary policy, it also encompasses 19 largely independent national fiscal and economic policies. This, incidentally, is what makes European monetary union unlike other federal currency areas, such as the United States or Switzerland.

This particular composition does not only make European monetary union unique, it also potentially makes it vulnerable. As the crisis made clear, the euro area as a whole ultimately had no option but to cushion unsound developments in individual member states in order to prevent the stability of the entire monetary union from being jeopardised.

The underlying context is that, if you are not careful, membership in a monetary union undermines the incentive to exercise fiscal prudence. This is because the consequences of excessive debt in one member state can, to an extent, be passed on to the rest of the group.

Mr Kösters, you were not alone in flagging this incentive to run up debt inherent to monetary union early on. [4] When a country in a monetary union takes on debt, the interest rate does not rise quite as sharply as it would have if that country had its own currency. Instead, however, the interest rates in all of the other member states rise slightly.

Economic theory calls this phenomenon the “common pool problem”, and overfishing is often used as an example to explain it. A single fisherman who catches too many fish leaves fewer behind for others and ultimately jeopardises the long-term sustainability of fish stocks. Overfishing, then, is detrimental to the fishing community. But, for an individual fisherman, it is highly desirable to net as many fish as possible and not consider the interests of other or future generations of fishermen.

This is arguably one reason why historian and winner of the 2017 Charlemagne Prize Timothy Garton Ash described the story of monetary union so far as a “crisis foretold”.

Yet that remark is not really entirely fair to the founding fathers of monetary union, who most certainly did have their eye on the particular incentive to run up debt. Their idea was that a combination of market discipline and fiscal rules would keep budgetary policymaking on a sound basis.

As you know, the Maastricht Treaty contains a no-bailout clause prohibiting member states from assuming each other’s debts. The treaty also bans monetary financing of government debt by the Eurosystem. Together, these safeguards aim to ensure that investors themselves – and not other parties such as the taxpayer – bear the risks of investing in government bonds.

In addition, the Stability and Growth Pact includes rules to restrict government debt and budget deficits. These aimed not only to ensure that public finances remain on a sustainable path, but also to create the buffers needed to allow budgets to fluctuate over the economic cycle and to enable member states to take countermeasures during economic crises without being forced to call for external aid to fend off looming overindebtedness.

These rules form the principle of national fiscal responsibility. This is the foundation of the Maastricht framework.

Walter Eucken, a founder of the Freiburg school and pioneer of the social market economy, summed up this liability principle as follows: “Whoever reaps the benefits must also bear the liability.”

And what goes for the economy goes for countries as well: decisions will only ever be taken responsibly if those who decide also bear responsibility for the consequences of their actions.

Thus, the Maastricht Treaty largely assigned the power to act and liability in matters of economic and fiscal policy to the member states.

And yet, government debt in some euro area countries has risen significantly. One reason for this is the repeated breaches of the budgetary rules – even by Germany, incidentally, at the very beginning of monetary union. Capital markets, contrary to initial expectations, also did not punish these infractions by imposing higher risk premiums. The no-bailout clause, it seemed, lacked credibility.

But another reason for the ballooning debt levels was undoubtedly the financial crisis, which forced euro area countries to shore up their banking systems. This was another reason why doubts emerged over the sustainability of some member states' debt in the subsequent sovereign debt crisis. Rescue measures were swiftly rolled out to prevent the crisis from escalating.

This episode showed that it might be wise for the euro area, too, to have a lender of last resort to support countries facing exceptional circumstances in order to limit the negative fallout for the currency area as a whole.

Hence the establishment of a permanent safety net in the form of the European Stability Mechanism (ESM). Its financial assistance allows distressed sovereigns to bridge temporary liquidity bottlenecks and put government finances back on a sustainable footing. This is why countries are required to commit to reforms so that they can put their finances back in order as soon as possible.

However, not even the financial assistance programmes have made monetary union crisis-resistant for good. For all their benefits, they added further elements of mutual liability and softened the principle of independent accountability. At the same time, economic and fiscal policy remained a national matter. The balance between actions and liability for their consequences, then, had got out of kilter.

The euro area will only ever be made crisis-proof once and for all if the balance between action and liability is restored. There are two ways in which this can be achieved. Either through deeper integration, ie a situation in which every member state surrenders decision-making powers in fiscal and economic policy matters to the European level, or by returning to an overhauled Maastricht framework. In the latter case, euro area countries would once again bear greater liability for their own decisions.

The first solution is the road to fiscal union with centralised decision-making powers. Admittedly, fiscal union would not guarantee fiscal prudence, and permanent guide rails would need to be added as a matter of stability policy, though it could curb the aforementioned propensity to run deficits.

This is why it was obvious to many economists, even before monetary union was launched, that, in the long term, monetary union must go hand in hand with political union. One of those economists was you, Mr Kösters. In 1994, you wrote: "It should first of all be clear that in the long run the EMU can only exist if accompanied by a European Political Union." [5] German Chancellor Helmut Kohl held a similar view. Addressing the Bundestag in November

1991, he remarked that “the idea of sustaining economic and monetary union over time without political union is a fallacy”.

True political union proved unfeasible back then, however. It seems to me that not much has changed in this regard, not least because the necessary transfer of sovereign rights would require comprehensive changes to the EU Treaty and national constitutions.

That would suggest that option number two currently stands a more realistic chance of restoring the balance between actions and liability. It essentially means bolstering the principle of independent national responsibility. Only when public finances are put on a sound footing and countries stop drifting apart economically will the Eurosystem ultimately be relieved of the pressure to constantly intervene as a firefighter. And only then will the financial markets do their job of taking adequate account of risks in their lending activities.

But what would have to change for monetary union’s regulatory framework to function better than it has done in the past?

To paraphrase Johann Wolfgang von Goethe: “Easier said than done.” Goethe was not just a poet, but also finance minister for the Duchy of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach. Whether or not this bon mot summed up his experiences in fiscal policy is unclear, however.

In any case, his remark holds true for the fiscal rules in the euro area: established with the best intentions, but rarely adhered to consistently. The European Union’s budgetary and debt rules have been reformed over and over again. But that did not make them any stricter, to put it mildly. I have already mentioned that not even Germany set a shining example in the early days.

The latest reform of the Stability and Growth Pact originally set out to strengthen the binding force of the rules on debt. As it turned out, that reform created considerable discretionary scope, mainly for the European Commission. We also drew attention to this in our June Monthly Report. [6] The Commission has already exploited this leeway on several occasions and invariably interpreted the rules very liberally in doing so.

The Commission’s dual role as the guardian of the EU Treaty on the one hand and as a political institution on the other is undoubtedly a factor in the repeated compromises made at the expense of budgetary discipline. After all, as a political institution, the Commission must always strive to strike a balance between the various political interests of the member states. The outcome is that individual euro area countries have breached the budgetary rules ever since the financial crisis erupted.

Austrian comic Werner Schneyder once accurately characterised the situation as follows: Europe, he quipped, is made up of countries that do not want to be told to do what they have decided to do themselves.

4.1 Reinforce the binding effect of fiscal rules

What is needed to reinforce the binding effect of the fiscal rules is a straightforward and transparent design and implementation of the rules. An independent institution taking over responsibility for fiscal surveillance from the Commission would be a key step towards a less political approach. That would be a clear marker where unbiased analysis ends and political concessions begin. That is why one of the Bundesbank's suggestions is to strengthen the role of the ESM in matters of fiscal surveillance.

One thing does seem obvious to me, however. If member states retain fiscal autonomy, the sustainability of public finances cannot be safeguarded by rules alone.

This is why it is not just the binding force of the rules that we need to strengthen; we also need the disciplining effect of the market, just as the founding fathers had envisaged of the monetary union. In other words, interest rate levels have to be aligned more strongly again with the risks in government budgets.

That can only be achieved, however, if the credibility of the no-bail-out clause in the Maastricht Treaty is restored. Investors need to be under no illusion that they risk losing their money if they buy bonds from governments that have unsound public finances.

This is another reason why I take a critical stance of the Eurosystem's government bond purchases, because they weaken the market mechanism which prices sovereign solvency risk. This ends up blurring the boundaries between monetary policy and fiscal policy. And yet a clear division of responsibilities is vital for a stability-oriented monetary policy in the euro area if Eurosystem central banks are not to wind up dancing to the tune of fiscal policymakers. This is why I called for a quick end to government bond purchases at the end of October.

4.2 Automatic ESM maturity extension

And this is also why one of the proposals put forward by the Bundesbank envisages changing the contractual terms for government bonds in the euro area. In future, the maturities of a country's bonds ought to be automatically extended as soon as the country applies for financial assistance.

Under the existing procedure, remember, a large part of the assistance loans go towards paying off legacy creditors. This lets those legacy creditors, such as banks, off the hook – at the expense of taxpayers. Extending maturities, on the other hand, would leave them on the hook, and they could be still held liable if debt is restructured down the line. In an emergency, it can be very difficult to tell for certain whether a debtor is temporarily illiquid or actually insolvent. An automatic extension of maturities, however, would grant the ESM far more time to give careful consideration to the question of debt sustainability – and without releasing legacy creditors from liability during this period.

A maturity extension would have the added advantage of substantially reducing the need for financial aid under an ESM programme. This would also broaden the reach of the existing rescue mechanism. Had we already been able to automatically extend maturities by three

years back in 2011, say, Portugal would have only needed around €43 billion by 2014 instead of the total of €76 billion it received in financial assistance.

I am also convinced that when it comes to resolving future crises in the euro area, the IMF will arguably play a far less prominent role and could, at most, be involved in an advisory capacity. So this increased clout would certainly be helpful.

Incidentally, the ESM stands for a substantial form of fiscal solidarity. ESM chief Klaus Regling has said that an ESM loan costs two-thirds less than an IMF loan because the ESM – unlike the IMF – does not charge a risk mark-up for its loans. In the case of Greece, for instance, the saving comes to 5.6% p.a. of its GDP.

This is an major transfer to governments in need of assistance. But they are not permanent transfers and they are tied to strict conditionality in order to eliminate as much moral hazard as possible. Permanent direct transfers are not necessary in a functioning currency area, as the United States demonstrates. Quite the opposite, in fact: dividing agents into transfer providers and transfer recipients risks undermining public acceptance of monetary union in individual member countries.

Ladies and gentlemen, the proposed automatic extension of maturities will only boost the disciplinary role of capital markets if restructuring sovereign debt really is a realistic option. But that will only ever be the case if the financial system really can absorb a haircut, because if a haircut brought the financial system to its knees, the community of states would still have an incentive to bail out private creditors.

Politicians and supervisory authorities in the euro area have, on more than one occasion, faced the following paradoxical situation: a haircut for overindebted countries drags down the banking system with it. But if banks carrying government bonds at risk of default on their books are resolved, the necessary rescue measures will plunge the country into financial distress once and for all.

This reminds me a little of the novel *Catch-22* by Joseph Heller, in which a “catch-22” is an intolerable situation where every apparent alternative only draws the protagonists ever closer towards their fate. In Heller’s novel, it’s the contradictory rules that put the American soldiers into an absurd situation.

In the euro area, it was primarily the lack of rules regarding this dilemma that was pivotal: there was no rule which stated that, if the worst comes to the worst, it was mainly up to the investors and creditors to shoulder banks’ losses, and not taxpayers.

This is also precisely what makes the new European regime for bank resolution, and its rigorous application, so very important. Because these are the rules which stipulate that if a bank needs to be wound up, investors and creditors will be first in line to bear the ensuing losses. Only after that does a resolution fund financed by banks step in.

Add to that the close-knit sovereign-bank nexus in the euro area, as evidenced by the huge stocks of government bonds which banks hold on their balance sheets. This is why it is not enough to just focus on bank resolution.

4.3 Abolish preferential treatment of sovereign bonds

It would be enough to curb banks' appetite for government bonds to force them to treat sovereign exposures on their books in exactly the same way as private ones.

Because, unlike in the case of corporate bonds, banks are not required to back government bonds denominated in domestic currency with capital, nor do they have to comply with any ceilings or caps. This is the case irrespective of the issuing sovereign's credit rating quality – and even though the euro area debt crisis made it quite plain that government bonds are by no means risk-free.

Only when banks hold sufficient capital against government bonds and limits are placed on the size of individual exposures will banks be able to cushion a restructuring of sovereign debt. And only then will there probably be the political will needed to take this step.

The Bundesbank has put the topic of abolishing the preferential treatment of government bonds on the agendas of international committees. But the talks, particularly on the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, are not straightforward. That's why it's now vital that we give the issue greater prominence on the European committees and make headway there.

Ladies and gentlemen, toughening the fiscal rules, abolishing the preferential treatment afforded to government bonds, and automatically extending the maturity of sovereign debt are three important reforms. They can play a part in putting monetary union on a sound long-term footing.

These proposals put the shine back on the principle of individual fiscal responsibility – which is the key feature of the Maastricht framework.

At the end of the day, any proposals on the future direction of monetary union need to be assessed according to how they impact on the necessary alignment between actions and liability.

In a recent speech which garnered a great deal of attention, French President Emmanuel Macron put forward his vision for advancing the European project, suggesting that more policy areas could be communitised – that is, transferred to Brussels and thus funded jointly.

Such proposals are no substitute for strengthening individual national responsibility in the euro area. Nor, by the same token, do they have to be at odds with the principle of individual responsibility. Indeed, it is quite possible that issues like preventing climate change, securing external borders and developing common communications, energy and transport networks can be handled more efficiently at the European rather than national level.

5. Monetary policy

Ladies and gentlemen

One policy area that we all know has long been dealt with collectively at a euro area level is monetary policy. And, as far as monetary policy is concerned, I can kick off the last part of my speech with some good news. The euro area is experiencing an ever more robust economic upturn which has continued unabated over 17 quarters and spread to all euro area countries.

And this trend looks set to continue for a while yet. In September the ECB's economists raised their forecasts for 2017 economic growth to 2.2%. And they are anticipating growth rates of around 2% for the next two years as well.

An updated forecast will be released in two weeks' time, as is customary in December, and that will be based on detailed country projections. At the moment, there is good reason to believe that the economic outlook will be just as upbeat then, if not even better. At the very least, several short-term indicators have made for surprisingly positive reading.

And the economic situation in Germany is looking exceptionally good, too. Employment levels are at their highest since reunification, business and consumer sentiment is splendid, and the Ifo business climate index has even hit a new record high. And, going by the latest economic indicators we have received, the difficulties Germany is experiencing in forming a government are showing no signs of markedly dampening the mood.

The economic recovery we're seeing in Germany and in the euro area is benefiting in part from the Eurosystem's exceptionally accommodative monetary policy. This monetary policy stance was the ECB Governing Council's response to the subdued inflation outlook.

One of the reasons behind the muted rate of price inflation is that some euro area countries are still in the process of remedying the loss of competitiveness which played a role in triggering the euro area crisis. But improving price competitiveness generally also means greater wage moderation.

The ECB Governing Council initially responded to the weak price pressures by cutting its policy rates. Once it had cut its rates to 0%, it then started to roll out a host of non-standard measures in an effort to loosen up monetary policy still further.

Since March 2015, these measures have included the Eurosystem's large-scale purchases of sovereign and corporate assets, currently at a monthly pace of €60 billion per month. From January this will fall to €30 billion a month – with purchases continuing until September 2018, if not longer. As you know, these purchases have been hotly debated, particularly in Germany. And you are no doubt also aware that I myself view these purchases with scepticism, too.

The Eurosystem has now become the largest creditor of the euro area countries. This means that governments' financing conditions hinge much more directly on our actions than in times of normal monetary policy. My concern, therefore, is that the ECB Governing Council could

end up facing political pressure to keep rates low for longer than is justifiable from a strictly monetary policy perspective.

Ladies and gentlemen, my reading of the ECB's projections, however, is that domestic price pressures in the euro area are gradually building and that the projected path is quite consistent with our definition of price stability.

For if there is one thing that is clear, it's that even after net purchases have been discontinued, euro area monetary policy will remain highly accommodative.

October's monetary policy decisions even mean that our foot is still on the accelerator as far as monetary policy is concerned, just not quite so hard as before. Given the favourable economic outlook and the pick-up in prices, a somewhat less accommodative monetary policy stance would also have been justifiable, in my view.

6. Conclusion

Ladies and gentlemen

I've spoken a lot today about how the euro area is managed – its institutional order – and about monetary policy. On the subject of order, the physicist Georg Christoph Lichtenberg once said that “order leads to all virtues, but what is it that leads to order?” Today, I've endeavoured to make the answer clear in the context of the euro area, with the help of various reference points. In essence, the solution lies in ensuring alignment – though since we are in a philharmonic hall, perhaps I should say harmony – between actions and liability. In debates about the future of monetary union I will make sure that this fundamental harmony is not forgotten.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you have a stimulating panel discussion. And to you, Mr Kösters, may I wish you all the very best for your upcoming retirement.

Thank you.

[1] Badinger, Harald (2005), “Growth effects of economic integration: evidence from the EU member states”, *Review of World Economics* 141, pp 50–78.

[2] Campos, Nauro F, Fabrizio Coricelli and Luigi Moretti (2014), “Economic growth and political integration: estimating the benefits from membership in the European Union using the synthetic counterfactuals method”, IZADiscussion Paper No 8162.

[3] Boltho, Andrea and Barry Eichengreen (2008), “The economic impact of European integration”, CEPR Discussion Paper No 6820.

[4] W Kösters (1996) *Stability culture as a precondition for the sustainability of the European monetary union (EMU)*. In Urban S (eds) *Europe's challenges*. Gabler Verlag, Wiesbaden.

[5] W Kösters (1994). Comments on “European monetary union: sovereignty and hegemony” by Norbert Klöten. In S Frowen and F McHugh : Financial decision making and moral responsibility. St. Martin’s Press, 1994.

[6] Deutsche Bundesbank (2017), Design and implementation of the European fiscal rules, Monthly Report, June 2017, pp 29–44.

Fonte: Bank For International Settlements (BIS)

<https://www.bis.org/review/r171212a.pdf>

Andreas Dombret: Shared challenges, different perspectives, shared solutions?

Speech by Dr Andreas Dombret, Member of the Executive Board of the Deutsche Bundesbank, at the 13th High-level Meeting for the Arab Region “Banking Standards and Regulatory and Supervisory Priorities”, Abu Dhabi, 14 December 2017

* * *

1 Shared challenges, different perspectives

Ladies and gentlemen,

Let me start by asking a question: Why are we here?

Don't worry, I won't get too philosophical. Of course, it only takes a quick glance at this meeting's programme to find the answer. We are here to talk about “Global Banking Standards and Regulatory and Supervisory Priorities”.

But if you compare the economies, the financial sectors and the supervisory institutional set-ups of different countries in the Arab region, Europe or elsewhere, you realise how different they are in many respects. Yet about 150 people from 20 to 30 countries that apparently have little in common travelled all the way to Abu Dhabi for this conference.

So why are we here? The reason is that, despite all the differences between our financial sectors and supervisory set-ups, the challenges financial institutions and supervisors face are surprisingly similar. I am convinced that when faced with complex challenges – some of them familiar, others entirely new – it helps to work together and take different perspectives into account. And given that all of you travelled here for this meeting, you and I clearly share this belief.

Over the next couple of minutes I will offer you my perspective on our shared supervisory challenges. First, I want to quickly remind us all how we got here – what lessons were learned from the global financial crisis and what has been done since then. I'll also give you, of course, my own take on the finalisation of Basel III just last week in Frankfurt. And last, I will touch upon current and future challenges we face, and how I think we should tackle them.

2 Lessons learned and the post-crisis agenda

The global financial crisis that erupted in 2007 has helped us to understand – better than ever before – that markets are not always efficient.

On the contrary, financial markets have a tendency to exaggerate and so experience cyclical instability. You could say that tomorrow's downturn builds up during today's upturn, when optimistic market participants are deaf to sceptics' warnings. Financial crises, we have to acknowledge, are an inherent part of the financial system.

For regulators and supervisors this means that our work must aim to do the following: (1) make crises less likely, and (2) – given that we cannot prevent every crisis – make banks as crisis-proof as possible and feasible.

Over the last decade, we have gone to great lengths to cast these lessons learned into an improved regulatory framework. Our post-crisis reform agenda had many boxes to tick:

- increasing the quality and level of capital;
- enhancing risk capture;
- constraining leverage and excessive concentration;
- adding a macroprudential dimension to the regulatory framework;
- addressing liquidity risk;
- ensuring the resolvability of banks to allow them to fail without putting the entire system at risk.

3 The “grand finale”: Basel III

The “grand finale” of these efforts, you could say, was the finalisation of Basel III just one week ago – despite all the prophecies of doom. Large parts of the reform had already been agreed upon as early as 2010. At that point in time, the Basel framework had already made a huge leap compared to its earlier versions. And some on-lookers back then probably felt that the finalisation of the reform package was imminent.

But in the end, it took us about seven more years to finalise Basel III. Why did it take so long? In my view, the answer is twofold.

First, we had to balance multiple, intertwined goals – and we didn’t shun the details. There were plenty of open questions. Do the new rules distort risk-taking behaviour? Do they truly resolve threats – or simply shift problems? How can we level the playing field for a diverse global banking sector? And so on.

All the members of the Basel Committee knew that if we didn’t genuinely address all of these questions, we would risk seeing unintended consequences sooner or later.

So the finalisation package was about achieving a balanced overall set of rules. This required us to review every single rule with great thoroughness. And this is basically what we did in the past years until we arrived at the final result unveiled last week.

I don’t intend to bore you with the details of the reform package, so let me mention just one aspect. The most hotly debated topic around the finalisation package was its effect on minimum capital requirements. The result is that, for individual financial institutions, there will be some changes in minimum capital requirements. But at the global level, the finalisation

package will not significantly increase capital requirements: we expect to see a slight increase of 0.7 percent for large institutions. This is because we did not have a mandate for tighter rules in general, but for more risk-adequate rules. And I think that, in the end, we fulfilled this mandate.

The second reason why finalisation took so long are the differences I mentioned earlier. Across the globe, you can find various kinds of financial sectors with plenty of regional disparities. Add to this different supervisory cultures and policy traditions and you have a mix of opposing views that are, by nature, difficult to reconcile.

Financial sectors differ in that some are bank-based while others are more capital market-based. They also differ in terms of how high their standards for collateralization are. Supervisory cultures differ in the emphasis they put on short- or long-term developments. And they differ in that they are more open or more sceptical towards model-based solutions.

This obviously means it takes longer to achieve a common ruleset. Tough compromises had to be found. For example, the way we combine risk modelling with standard approaches and the leverage ratio proved to be a tough issue. German authorities were strongly advocating the principle of risk sensitivity, which we saw threatened by potentially overarching limitations on internal risk modelling. For this reason, we opposed an excessively high output floor. And let me be completely honest: in this respect, the final result is not what we had advocated.

But there comes a point where it isn't worth jeopardising an overall agreement over strongly held convictions. Even if reaching compromise sometimes hurts, there is great value to it. Other members of the committee and I were convinced that having common global rules is a crucial long-term investment in financial stability at both the global and regional level. This is what unified us.

The final agreement restricts the use of internal risk models while preserving the principle of risk sensitivity. I welcome this from a German point of view. Due to the long transitional periods, banks have plenty of time to adapt to the new regulatory framework. For German banks I can say that adaption will be a challenge but nevertheless feasible in face of their solid capital base and the long transition periods. Now it is of utmost importance that all member states of the Basel Committee implement the new framework.

We should not forget that the Basel agreements are implemented not only by the members of the committee, but by over a hundred countries worldwide. In the Arab region, for example, only Saudi Arabia is a member of the Basel Committee, but countries from the whole Arab region have adopted the Basel rules to varying degrees.

All in all, I am convinced that the effort we have put into the post-crisis reforms and the compromises we have made will pay off for all of us. They will contribute to a healthier and more sustainable global financial order.

4 No turning back

Considering the many differences between the countries involved – their economies, their financial sectors, their institutional set-ups – we have made remarkable progress over the last couple of years. But what's next?

In my view, we're not done yet. We now need to cement the reform's success. This requires two things. First, we need to take a "constructive break", in which we protect the reform from sceptics and evaluate it. Second, we need to ensure its consistent and comprehensive implementation, while at the same time acknowledging regional differences.

Let me start with that I dubbed a "constructive break". Some voices are already calling for us to turn back the regulatory clock. Take the debate about deregulation in the US, or about competitive deregulation after Brexit. Often, the argument is that capital requirements and regulation in general have become too harsh and that they prevent the financial sector from supporting the real economy.

To put it bluntly: these claims are misleading. They are exaggerated and not backed by empirical evidence. We must not repeat the mistakes made before the financial crisis and deregulate just because we think this would fuel economic growth, while in reality it actually fuels the next crisis. Empirical studies suggest that tighter capital requirements are in fact beneficial, and not just for stability reasons. For example, they reveal that higher levels of equity capital are correlated with higher lending volumes. [1]

This is why I am in favour of a regulatory break. Neither must we give in to calls for yet another wave of deregulation, nor should we tighten the screws of regulation further. There are a few notable areas where action is called for, such as the regulatory treatment of sovereign bonds. But apart from these, we should now wait and see how the new rules play out.

We should use this break to thoroughly evaluate the impact of our recent reforms, and to amend and improve them where gaps and errors are found.

In parallel, we need to focus our energy on the comprehensive and consistent implementation of the Basel rules as well as on the rigorous application of the new rules. This latter point was actually an important precondition for our approval of the agreement.

5 Challenges ahead

But I have also said that no two economies or financial sectors are alike. In that respect, Europe is different from the Arab region. Each individual European or Arab country is different from its neighbours. And each individual bank is different from its competitors.

Cooperation and shared rules can only be successful if we acknowledge these differences.

Let me give you an example. In Germany, the banking system is very diverse – in particular, there are a large number of small banks. If you compare Germany to its neighbour France, you will find that the banking sectors of the two countries are more or less of the same size

in terms of total assets. But at the same time, Germany has about 1,700 credit institutions and foreign branches while France has less than 500. Germany has one global systemically important bank while France has three.

As regulators and supervisors, our task is to remain neutral towards such differences, but nevertheless to acknowledge them. Our regulation and supervision must respect them and not put a particular sector, a particular business model or a particular size at a disadvantage.

At this point, I see room to improve our current regulatory framework in Europe. More precisely, we need to strengthen the principle of proportionality in banking regulation. Right now, proportionality is a hotly debated topic in Europe, and it will be debated right here as well in just a moment.

The key issue arises when the Basel rules are – more or less – applied across the board. This is because originally they were made for large, complex, internationally active banks. As a result, the rules themselves have become extremely complex, especially with Basel III. While appropriate for the global players, the rules tend to overburden small institutions. The main problem is the compliance workload – that is, the effort associated with meeting the requirements as well as demonstrating that they've been met.

In Europe, we are currently busy fine-tuning our regulatory framework by providing some relief for small, low-risk institutions. Importantly, capital requirements will remain untouched. But we are aiming to reduce disclosure requirements, simplify reporting and exempt some institutions from recovery and resolution planning, among other things.

Proportionality is one task for the near future. But there are many more challenges for the near and for the more distant future.

For example, I expect fundamental structural changes in the global financial sector driven by digitalisation, both with respect to internal processes and distribution channels. Digital multinational companies currently active in other sectors are already exploring their opportunities in banking. Cyber-risks are on the rise. And we are only beginning to understand an entirely new set of financial risks that are driven by climate change.

My point is: these and other developments don't stop at borders, so that in many respects we share the same challenges.

6 Shared solutions: the role of cooperation

Ladies and gentlemen, I started this talk by pointing out how different our economies, financial sectors and supervisory architectures are. I consider this an extremely valuable asset. We share the challenges, but we have very different perspectives on them. If we work together and bring our different perspectives to one table, we will be able to arrive at better solutions.

To me, this is what the work of the Financial Stability Institute (FSI) is about. By promoting knowledge-sharing and cooperation, the FSI helps supervisors worldwide to keep pace with the ever-evolving challenges of our job. The Bundesbank is also playing its part. The cooperation with other supervisors and central bankers worldwide – at the Bundesbank, we call it “technical central bank cooperation” – is one of my areas of responsibility as Executive Board member.

In the fall of 2015, we signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Arab Monetary Fund (AMF) that forms the basis of our cooperation with the Arab region. We conducted three seminars this year, and this work will continue in February next year. In fact, we have been working with the AMF since back in 2010, exchanging knowledge, experiences and ideas on issues in the triangle of monetary policy, banking supervision, and financial stability. In many cases, professional contacts have led to reliable personal relations.

It is very important to me personally that we continue and strengthen the fruitful cooperation with the AMF and worldwide.

Ladies and gentlemen, shared challenges, different perspectives, shared solutions: to me, this is also what today’s conference is about. I wish you all an insightful day, and I’m looking forward to hearing your perspectives now.

[1] C M Buch and E Prieto (2014), Do better capitalized banks lend less? Long-run panel evidence from Germany, *International Finance* 17 (1), 1-23. T Kapan and C Minoiu (2013), Balance sheet strength and bank lending during the global financial crisis, *Deutsche Bundesbank Discussion Paper No 33/2013*.