Journal of Advanced Zoology

ISSN: 0253-7214
Volume 43 Issue 1 Year 2022 Page 784-786

Assessing the Stability of Banks Using the Camel Rating Model

Mr. Vikram Bajaj[1*]

[1*]*RNB Global University-Bikaner*

***Corresponding Author:** Mr. Vikram Bajaj*
**RNB Global University-Bikaner*

Received: 16th June 2022
Revised: 15th July 2022
Accepted: 20th Aug 2022

Abstract

The Aim of Camel Ratings Is To Assess A Bank's Overall Status And Pinpoint Its Strengths And Weaknesses Across Financial, Operational, And Managerial Aspects. Each Bank Receives A Standardized Composite Rating Derived From Five Key Elements. This System Offers A Comprehensive Framework For Evaluating Banks, Taking Into Account Factors Such As Capital Adequacy, Asset Quality, Management Competence, Earnings Potential, And Liquidity.

Keywords: asset quality, banking industry, capital adequacy, earnings capability, liquidity position

CC License
CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0

Introduction

The banking industry is primarily service-oriented, emphasizing efficient resource utilization and exceptional customer service for successful longevity and continual growth. Efficiency, often gauged through profitability, plays a crucial role in reflecting a bank's effectiveness. Productivity, on the other hand, is a significant determinant of a bank's profitability, representing the relationship between inputs and outputs.
The current banking structure in India has evolved through phases of expansion, reorganization, and consolidation over several years, with this process ongoing. The evolution of the banking system can be categorized into three distinct phases: the Pre-nationalization phase, the Post-nationalization phase, and the Market Development phase.
The Pre-nationalization period and the Post-nationalization period mark two distinct phases in the development trajectory. In recent times, a third phase, Market Development, has emerged, characterized by innovation, diversification into new areas, and a sharp focus on customer service, often facilitated through mergers.
Before nationalization, bank growth was predominantly driven by economic factors. However, the post-nationalization era witnessed a shift towards social objectives, leading to the expansion of branch networks across the country, increased mobilization of savings through bank deposits, and greater allocation of resources to targeted sectors. Presently, the evaluation of bank soundness encompasses both quantitative and qualitative aspects.

The CAMEL Rating Model

The CAMEL model, which stands for Capital Adequacy, Asset Quality, Management Capability, Earnings Capacity, and Liquidity, serves as an internal tool for supervising banks, assessing their stability, and flagging those in need of heightened regulatory attention. Originating in the 1970s, this model was crafted by the three

main U.S. federal banking supervisors—the Federal Reserve, the FDIC, and the OCC—as part of the "Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System." Its purpose was to offer a streamlined snapshot of a bank's condition during on-site examinations. Prior to 1991, the Reserve Bank conducted two forms of inspection: Financial Inspection and Annual Financial Reviews. In 1995, the RBI established a working group chaired by Shri S. Padmanaban to evaluate the banking supervision system. The Padmanaban Committee recommended a refocus of banking supervision towards parameters such as financial soundness, managerial and operational efficiency, and firmness. Consequently, the committee proposed the CAMEL rating system.
Each of the five performance dimensions in CAMEL is evaluated on a scale from 1 to 5, indicating a bank's position from fundamentally strong to fundamentally weak. The RBI conducts periodic on-site inspections utilizing this model. The CAMEL Rating comprises six components: Capital Adequacy (20%), Asset Quality (20%), Management (20%), Earnings (15%), Liquidity (10%), and Sensitivity to Market Risk (10%). Its objective is to gauge a bank's overall condition and pinpoint its strengths and weaknesses across financial, operational, and managerial domains. Each bank is assigned a composite rating based on these five elements, providing a standardized approach to evaluating banks according to established criteria, thereby offering a meaningful rating system.In essence, the CAMEL model provides a comprehensive framework for assessing banks, ensuring consistency and comparability across evaluations. By focusing on critical aspects such as capital adequacy, asset quality, and management capability, it enables regulators to identify areas of concern and take appropriate supervisory actions. As a standardized method endorsed by regulatory bodies, the CAMEL rating system plays a crucial role in maintaining the stability and resilience of the banking sector.

Framework of CAMEL Rating
A brief outline of the framework of CAMEL Rating is being presented hereunder:

C- Capital Adequacy
Capital adequacy determines how well financial institutions can cope with shocks to their balance sheets. It indicates whether the bank has enough capital to absorb unexpected losses. It is required to maintain depositors' confidence and preventing the bank from going bankrupt. The following ratios measure capital adequacy: □ Capital Adequacy Ratio

- Debt-Equity Ratio
- Advance to Assets Ratio
- Government Securities to Total Investments

A-Asset Quality
Asset quality determines the healthiness of financial institutions against loss of value in the assets and it indicates the type of debtors of the bank. The weakening value of assets, being prime source of banking problems, directly pour into other areas, as losses are eventually written-off against capital, which ultimately expose the earning capacity of the institution. The following ratios measure Asset quality:

- Net NPAs to Total Assets Ratio
- Net NPAs to Net Advances Ratio
- Total Investments to Total Assets Ratio

M - Management Capability
It involves analysis of efficiency of management in generating business and in maximizing profits. The performance of management capacity is usually qualitative and can be understood through the subjective evaluation of management systems, organization culture and control mechanisms and so on. However, the capacity of the management of a bank can also be gauged with the help of certain ratios of off-site evaluation of a bank. The following ratios measure Management Capability:

- Total advances to Total Deposits Ratio
- Profit per employee
- A Business per employee

E-Earnings Capacity
Good earnings and profitability of banks reflects the ability to support present and future operations. Specifically, this determines the capacity to absorb losses, finance its expansion, pay dividends to its shareholders, and build up an adequate level of capital. To survive in the competitive financial environments, banks have to generate adequate earnings to meet out all the non-operating expense and to maintain adequate spread by avoiding burden. The following ratios measure earning capacity:

- Return on Assets
- Spread to Total Assets Ratio
- Operating Profit to Average Working Funds Ratio
- Cost to Total Income Ratio

L-Liquidity

Banks are in a business where liquidity is of prime importance. Among assets, cash and investments are the most liquid of a bank's assets. An adequate liquidity position refers to a situation, where institution can obtain sufficient funds, either by increasing liabilities or by converting its assets quickly at a reasonable cost. Risk of liquidity is curse to the image of bank. Bank has to take a proper care to hedge the liquidity risk; at the same time ensuring good percentage of funds are invested in high return. Generating securities, so that it is in a position generate profit with provision liquidity to the depositors. The following ratios measure liquidity.

- Liquid Assets to Total Deposits Ratio
- Liquid Assets to Total Assets Ratio
- G-Sec to Total Assets Ratio
- Approved Securities to Total Assets Ratio

Rating Provisions

Each element is assigned a numerical rating based on five key components □
Strong performance, Sound Management no cause for supervisory concern.

- Fundamentally sound, compliance with regulations, stable, limited supervisory needs
- Weaknesses in one or more components. Unsatisfactory practices, weak performance but limited concern for failure.
- Serious financial and managerial deficiencies and unsound practices. Need close supervision and remedial action
- Extremely unsafe practices and conditions, deficiencies beyond management control. Failure is highly probable and outside financial assistance needed.

Based on the ratings of each element, a composite rating of 1 through 5 is assigned to the bank All the factors reflected in the key components ratings are considered in assigning the composite rating.

Conclusion

The economic development of any nation heavily relies on the growth of its banking industry, and in India, the banking sector stands out as one of the fastest-growing sectors. However, assessing the Indian banking sector is increasingly challenging due to its growing complexity. Differentiating between strong and weak banks requires careful consideration of numerous factors. Given the critical role banks play in capital formation and the nature of banking, close monitoring of banks is essential. The CAMEL supervisory system represents a significant advancement over previous systems in terms of frequency, coverage, and focus. It offers a ratio-based model that is user-friendly and easily comprehensible to all stakeholders, providing a more robust framework for overseeing the banking sector.

References

1. Bodla B, Verma R. Evaluating Performance of Banks Through CAMEL Model: A Case Study of SBI and ICICI, The ICFAI Journal of Bank Management,2006:5(3):49-63.
2. Gangadharan K. Dynamics of Banking in India, Abhijeet Publications, New Delhi, 2019.
3. Gangrade Shailendra, Telang Vidya. CAMEL’s Model as An Effective Measure of Financial Performance, Prestige International Journal of Management and Research,2019:1(2):113-120.
4. Shahi Ujjwala. Banking in India: Past, Present and Future, New Century Publications, New Delhi, 2013.
5. Sharma M. Financial Appraisal of Industrial Corporation in India, Pratiksha Publication, Jaipur, 1986.
6. Sharma Meera. Management of Financial Institutions: with Emphasis on Bank and Risk Management, PH1 Learning Private Limited, New Delhi, 2010.
7. Shetty MS. Banking in India, Atlantic Publishers and Distributors Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, 2019.
8. www.corporatefinanceinstitute.com
9. www.investopedia.com