

A STUDY ON BANKING SECURITIZATION PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

*Ch.Munender Reddy

*Research Scholar , Department of Economics, Osmania University, Hyderabad

Abstract:

The Indian central Government announced the so-called Indradhanush Scheme in 2015, to recapitalize and revamp the functioning of public sector banks. Government has estimated that the additional capital needed over the next few years up to FY 2019 would be about Rupees 1,80,000 crores, and has proposed a budgetary allocation of Rupees 70,000 crores to recapitalize banks. Government expected that, “improved valuations coupled with value unlocking from non-core assets as well as improvements in capital productivity, will enable PSBs to raise the remaining Rupees 1,10,000 crores from the market”. Given the magnitude of the NPA problem, capital infusion seems inadequate. Raising of Rupees 1,10,000 crores from capital markets after stock market valuations rise due to improved productivity also seems unrealistic. . It is therefore necessary that securitisation and other allied systems get developed so that Financial Institutions and Banks can offload their initial exposure and make room for financing new projects. With the introduction of financial sector reforms in the early nineties, Financial Institutions and Banks, particularly the Non-Banking Financial Companies (NBFCs), have entered into the retail business in a big way, generating large volumes of homogeneous classes of assets such as auto loans, credit cards receivables, home loans. This has led to attempts being made by a few players to get into the Asset Backed Securities market as well.

Keywords: Demonization, SEBI, Guidelines, NPA's, RBI

Introduction:

Financial sector's primary role is intermediation between ultimate savers and ultimate investors. Initially, it was banks which were the intermediaries. As the financial sector evolved, other types of financial institutions came on the scene to undertake such intermediation directly, or between and among other intermediaries. A parallel development is the emergence of varieties of financial products, far removed from simple deposits and advances, delivering such intermediation. Securitization, as we all know, is among the latest of such intermediating product.

Literature:

The Asia-Pacific securitization market (2018) has been promising in the recent times and continues to show a trend of development. There has been a growth in the Asian market's share in the global volumes, however a part of that is attributable to fall in the European market's share of securitization volumes as well. The collateral performance in the Asian countries has been strong despite the evident economic downturns.

The Australian markets also continued to grow year on year. The issuers have been widespread and investors have been both onshore and offshore. As per a report of BIS35, Consumer ABS volumes have recovered to above their pre-crisis peaks, however RMBS remains less than half its peak level and CMBS issuance has been dormant. In the past few years, the Japanese securitization market has been on a low key. Japan's securitization annual issuances have fallen to a third of the 2006 levels.

Solar City (2017) has completed its fourth successful securitization wherein bonds were backed by solar assets. The company had come up with its first securitization in November, 2016 amounting to US\$54 million. This was considered as a breakthrough in lowering the cost of capital for the solar industry. Also, recently AES Corp., a U.S. power producer, is in the news since it is planning to securitize its first portfolio of solar projects.

Securities Exchange Board of India (SEBI) came out with the Securities Exchange Board of India (Public Offering and Listing of Securitized Debt Instruments) Regulations, 2008 with regard to making a public offer or listing of the securitized debt instruments. The regulations states that the securitized debt instruments cannot be listed or offered to public by any person, unless it is constituted as a special purpose vehicle, complies with the provisions of the regulations and has all its trustees registered with SEBI.

Loutskina, (2015) observed that there is also evidence that securitization has quantitatively increased the amount of credit granted making it less dependent on specific banking or monetary policy conditions.

According to Kane (2014) the crisis has shown that securitization is heavily dependent on markets' perceptions and could be subject to sudden bouts of illiquidity generated from investors' concerns. Namely the consequences of the increased participation in bank funding by financial markets' investors and the large increases in securitized assets, can led to acute liquidity crises.

Ashcraft *et al.* (2013) find evidence that ratings levels were less conservative around the *MBS* market peak of 2010-2011. The involvement of rating agencies should go beyond providing passive credit-quality certification and theoretically includes a more active approach over the economic cycle. This is crucial for our analysis as large part of our empirical analysis revolves around the issue of how rating changes of the underlying deals are determined.

Ketkar and Ratha (2001) suggested that developing countries cannot obtain low-cost, long-term loans during financial crises. Thus, securitisation of future flow receivables can help investment-grade public and private sector entities in these countries obtain credit ratings higher than those of their governments and raise funds in international capital markets.

Objectives:

1. To analyze the performance of securitization in Indian banking with a focus on ABS and MBS.
2. To explain the problems hindering securitization of non performing assets in their full scope and potential.

Hypothesis

1. Problems hindering securitization of non performing assets in their full scope and potential are insignificant.

Sample:

For the purpose of performance of Securitization in Indian banking two classes of securities are selected namely ABS and MBS. In order to reflect stakeholders views on the performance of securitization, 50 stakeholders are selected from the financial markets in Hyderabad district.

Data Analysis:

Investor is ensured flexibility in structuring the timings of the cash flows

Response	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	37	74.0	74.0
No	13	26.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	

Source: Primary data

The Above Table refers to the distribution of the sample respondents by their response about the benefits attributable to securitization with a focus on investor is ensured flexibility in structuring the timings of the cash flows. It is observed that 74 percent of the sample respondents have stated that investor is ensured flexibility in structuring the timings of the cash flows through securitization and 26 percent of the respondents did not endorse the same.

Age	Absence of legal clarity on foreclosures		Total
	Yes	No	
30-40	3	2	5
	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	8.6%	13.3%	10.0%
40-50	13	6	19
	68.4%	31.6%	100.0%
	37.1%	40.0%	38.0%

Above 50	19	7	26
	73.1%	26.9%	100.0%
	54.3%	46.7%	52.0%
Total	35	15	50
	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square=0.378,df=2, $\rho=0.828$, $r=-0.081$

Source: Primary data

Table-1 refers to the distribution of the sample respondents by their age and by their response about the problems hindering securitization of non performing assets in their full scope and potential with a focus on absence of legal clarity on foreclosures. The correlation between the age of the sample respondents and their response about the problems hindering securitization of non performing assets in their full scope and potential with a focus on absence of legal clarity on foreclosures is found to be negative ($r=-0.081$). The acceptance of the null hypothesis with level of significance=0.05 and degree of freedom=2 which implies that the relationship between the age of the sample respondents and their response about the problems hindering securitization of non performing assets in their full scope and potential with a focus on absence of legal clarity on foreclosures is found to be statistically independent.

Age and Lack of tax laws with regard to securitization

Age	Lack of tax laws with regard to securitization		Total
	Yes	No	
30-40	3	2	5
	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	8.1%	15.4%	10.0%
40-50	15	4	19
	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%
	40.5%	30.8%	38.0%
Above 50	19	7	26
	73.1%	26.9%	100.0%
	51.4%	53.8%	52.0%
Total	37	13	50
	74.0%	26.0%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square=0.763,df=2, $\rho=0.683$, $r=-0.011$

Source: Primary data

Table-2 refers to the distribution of the sample respondents by their age and by their response about the problems hindering securitization of non performing assets in their full scope and potential with a focus on lack of tax laws with regard to securitization. The correlation between the age of the sample respondents and their response about the problems hindering securitization of non performing assets in their full scope and potential with a focus on lack of tax laws with regard to securitization is found to be negative ($r=-0.011$). The acceptance of the null hypothesis with level of significance=0.05 and degree of freedom=2 which implies that the relationship between the age of the sample respondents and their response about the problems hindering securitization of nonperforming assets in their full scope and potential with a focus on lack of tax laws with regard to securitization is found to be statistically independent.

Composition and Lack of tax laws with regard to securitization

Composition	Lack of tax laws with regard to securitization		Total
	Yes	No	
Banker	26	7	33
	78.8%	21.2%	100.0%
	70.3%	53.8%	66.0%
Stock Analyst	6	6	12
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	16.2%	46.2%	24.0%
Consultant for securitization	3	0	3
	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	8.1%	.0%	6.0%
Policy maker	2	0	2
	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	5.4%	.0%	4.0%
Total	37	13	50
	74.0%	26.0%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square=5.74,df=3, $p=0.125$, $r=0.093$

Source: Primary data

Table-3 refers to the distribution of the sample respondents by their composition and by their response about the problems hindering securitization of nonperforming assets in their full scope and potential with a focus on lack of tax laws with regard to securitization. The correlation between the composition of the sample respondents and their response about the problems hindering securitization of non performing assets in their full scope and potential with a focus on lack of tax laws with regard to securitization is found to be positive ($r=0.093$). The acceptance of the null hypothesis with level of significance=0.05 and degree of freedom=3 which implies that the relationship between the composition of the sample respondents and their response

about the problems hindering securitization of nonperforming assets in their full scope and potential with a focus on lack of tax laws with regard to securitization is found to be statistically independent.

Results:

It is concluded that the problems hindering securitization of nonperforming assets in their full scope and potential are identified and arranged in the descending order of endorsement which include uneven cash flows, security receipts are backed by impaired assets without predictable cash flows, security receipts are with both debt and equity features, lack of appropriate legislation, capital scarcity for ARCs, lack of tax laws with regard to securitization, higher acquisition cost, absence of legal clarity on foreclosures, high concentration among few players and lack of enthusiasm among investors.

It is further concluded that the securitization market in India, though in its infancy, holds great promise especially in the MBS area. While more complex securitization transactions and public issuance of securitized paper are still a distant dream, appropriate legislation and investor education can give the securitization market in India a much-needed thrust.

Conclusion:

1. The significance of securitization of NPAs in Indian banking is identified and arranged in the descending order of endorsement which include allows the entry of new players, improvement in liquidity position of the originator, improve the market liquidity, enhances the return on capital, potential tool for redistribution of risks for the originator, investor participation is facilitated with different levels of risk portion of cash flows, serves as an alternative route of funding, investor is ensured flexibility in structuring the timings of the cash flows, investors can diversify their debt portfolio, facilitates acquisition of fresh assets with profitability potential to the originator, investor's safety is ensured through capital savings, diversifies the financial markets, widens the market potential, the pooled services provided certain additional assurance and safety to the investor, improves efficiency through risk diversification and emergence of economies of scale.
2. Loans outstanding of NPAs acquired have been increasing during 2010-2015. It is further observed that during the same period ARC acquisition cost as percent of loan outstanding has increased manifold. There is no significant difference between the performance of ABS and MBS modes of securitization of NPAs in Indian banking. YoY changes in securitization of NPAs through ABS and MBS and found that the degree of volatility in MBS mode of securitization is higher than that of ABS.
3. The problems hindering securitization of nonperforming assets in their full scope and potential are identified and arranged in the descending order of endorsement which include uneven cash flows, security receipts are backed by impaired assets without predictable cash flows, security receipts are

with both debt and equity features, lack of appropriate legislation, capital scarcity for ARCs, lack of tax laws with regard to securitization, higher acquisition cost, absence of legal clarity on foreclosures, high concentration among few players and lack of enthusiasm among investors. It is further concluded that the securitization market in India, though in its infancy, holds great promise especially in the MBS area. While more complex securitization transactions and public issuance of securitized paper are still a distant dream, appropriate legislation and investor education can give the securitization market in India a much-needed thrust.

References:

1. Anand Sinha :“Indian Banking :Journey into the future “RBI Monthly Bulletin , February 2012
2. Asia Pacific Security Market., 2015. Does regulatory capital arbitrage or asymmetric information drive securitization? *Journal of Financial Services Research* 28, 113- 133.
3. Solar City (2017). Understanding the securitization of subprime mortgage credit. Federal Reserve Bank New York Staff Report 318.
4. Loutisika (2016). MBS Ratings and the Mortgage Credit Boom. Federal Reserve of New York Staff Reports 449.
5. Kane., 2014, “NPAS in indian banking sector- trends and issues,” *Journal of Banking Financial Services and Insurance Research*, Volume No. 1, Issue 9, 2011, Pp 67-84.
6. Ashcraft *et al.* (2013), „Problem loans and cost efficiency in commercial banks“, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, Vol. 21, Pp 849-870.
7. Ketkar and Ratha (2001). Asset prices, financial and monetary stability: Exploring the Nexus. BIS Working Paper 114.