INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 4 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

BASEL III ENDGAME: A CRITICAL LEGAL ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL ALLOCATION AND GOVERNANCE IN THE EVOLVING BANKING REGULATORY REGIME

AUTHOR - SHWETA ROUT, LLM, KIIT SCHOOL OF LAW

BEST CITATION – SHWETA ROUT, BASEL III ENDGAME: A CRITICAL LEGAL ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL ALLOCATION AND GOVERNANCE IN THE EVOLVING BANKING REGULATORY REGIME, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR),* 6 (4) OF 2026, PG. 541-558, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

Abstract

The Basel III Endgame is the final phase in the series of regulatory reform measures initiated in response to the global financial crisis. These measures have been principally designed to enhance the soundness, transparency and resilience of the international banking system, altogether. Developed by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, these measures introduce significant changes to the capital adequacy standards mainly through the recalibration of risk-weighted assets (RWAs), the restriction of internal risk models, and the imposition of an output floor to promote harmonization in the computation of capital. This article undertakes a detailed legal study of the Basel III Endgame and its ripple effect on capital allocation and corporate governance in the banking sector. Using a doctrinal and comparative research approach, the research looks at both international regulatory systems as well as domestic versions, such as the Indian regulatory regime under the reserve bank of India. It assesses the reorganization of the legal responsibilities of banks by the Endgame reforms, the role of the supervisory activities and the governance arrangements through the establishment of more stringent compliance, disclosure, and risk management provisions. In this paper, the author asserts that on one hand, the Basel III Endgame enhances prudential regulation, decreases systemic risk, and enhances global comparability of banks, on the other hand, it creates the issue of regulatory overreach, compliance overheads, and possible limitations on credit expansion. The challenges are especially severe in the developing economies whereby the banking systems are considered to be a key factor in the development of the economy. In addition, the research paper indicates the existence of jurisdictional differences in the application in leading economies, which can compromise the goal of global regulatory harmonization. It considers that the Basel III Endgame is relevant and should be implemented based on a fair and proportional balance between the aims of financial stability and the need for economic growth. Also, it should allow national regulatory frameworks some degree of flexibility.

Keywords: Basel III, Financial crises, Banking, RBI, Indian Regulatory, Compliance, Disclosure, and Risk management.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Banking regulation, particularly in the fields of capital sufficiency, risk management, and institutional governance, has indeed played a significant role in the long-term stability of the global financial system. The financial crisis of 2007-2009 uncovered the fact that most banks had a very thin capital base and a very high level of leverage. The crisis also showed the banks had major flaws in their risk assessment processes, which then led to a breakdown of these institutions and the wider market.

In addition, the reliance on very complex internal models combined with insufficient supervisory controls not only destabilized the financial system but also led to the collapse of the biggest financial institutions. In order to tackle these gaps, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) designed a set of measures constituting Basel III, aimed at reinforcing the banking sector. Even though Basel III introduced stricter liquidity standards, enhanced supervisory practices, and a higher capital requirement, there have been concerns raised regarding the differences in risk-weighted assets (RWAs) and the level of variability due to the usage of internal models.

The comparability and credibility of capital adequacy ratios between jurisdictions were compromised by these concerns. In response to these deficiencies, the BCBS has developed a reform package in 2017, which is also known as the Basel III Endgame. This last stage of reforms is a major change in the international banking regulation, aimed at winning the lost confidence in the measurement of capital, decreasing regulatory arbitrage, and providing the transparency and more consistency of the implementation of the prudential norms. Basel III Endgame provides revolutionary changes to the capital distribution by the banks according to their risk exposures. The key part of such reforms is the re-calibration of RWAs by using standardised methods and the prohibition of using sophisticated internal models. The fact that there is an introduction of an output floor, which is at 72.5% of the standardised RWAs, means that internal modelling techniques used by the banks cannot lower their capital requirements to a certain extent. Further, the reforms restructure the way credit risk, operational risk and market risk are treated, thus reforming the general capital regulation structure. The implications of these changes are far reaching in regard to the financial position of banks as well as in regard to their lending behaviour, profitability, and strategic decisions. Legally speaking, Basel III Endgame could be interpreted as a transition from a principles-based regulatory framework to a rules-based and prescriptive regime. This transition raises major issues about the scope of regulatory power, the balance between supervisory intervention and institutional independence, and the ever-evolving nature of corporate governance in banking institutions. More emphasis on disclosure, accountability, and risk management requires boards of directors and top management to undertake significant responsibilities, which changes the governance requirements for banks. At the same time, there is the problem of increased compliance costs and operational complexity that goes with these reforms, particularly for small banks and banks in developing countries. Basel III Endgame means different things in different countries. The economic structure, regulatory capability and banking sector dynamics have led to differences in the way regulations are implemented. For example, developed economies such as the US and the EU have been engaged in extensive consultations and restructuring to make sure that their competitiveness is in line with their regulation objectives, whereas emerging countries are facing challenges in harmonizing global standards with their national interests. In India, the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) has been cautious and phased in the implementation of Basel III, which is due to the fact that financial stability and the demand to achieve economic growth and financial inclusion are in conflict. It is within this context that the current research paper critically examines the Basel III Endgame and specifically its influence on the distribution of capital, and corporate governance. It aims at investigating whether the reforms are reaching their targeted goal of increasing financial stability without restricting economic activity to an undue degree. The paper also addresses broader regulatory and legal aspects of these reforms, including the problem of regulatory overreach, compliance costs, and international coordination. With this Basel III Endgame placed in the context of the dynamic international financial regulation, this research adds to the current discussion on the future of the banking governance and capital regulation. Endgame reforms are a crucial step towards strengthening the worldwide financial system; however, their effectiveness depends largely on a balanced and situation-specific implementation that not only conforms to global standards but also takes into account domestic realities.

Review Of Literature

The Basel III Endgame has become a hot topic within banking law, financial regulation, and economic policy circles. The current academic discourse mainly revolves around three major topics: capital adequacy frameworks, risk-weighted asset (RWA) methodologies, and the governance implications of enhanced prudential regulation. One of the basic threads of literature under consideration is the importance of capital regulation in obtaining financial stability. Some scholars like Anat Admati and Martin Hellwig have stated that increased capital requirements have the benefit of decreasing systemic risk and enhancing the resilience of the banks without always limiting their lending. Their contribution cuts across the traditional banking industry stance that increases in capital requirements negatively impact on credit supply. Conversely, other requirements increase the cost of lending and may limit the flow of credit especially in developing economies. This difference indicates one of the most significant controversies that focus on the best balance between economic growth and financial stability. Basel III has received a lot of scholarly analysis since it has succeeded Basel II. The dependence of Basel II on the internal risk models has been discussed as allowing banks to be more compelled to underprice risk and resorts to regulatory arbitrage. Some researchers, including Viral V. Acharya, note that the over-flexibility in the use of internal models was a contributing factor in the weaknesses that were revealed in the global financial crisis. Basel III tried to overcome such shortcomings by increasing the quality of capital and putting in place liquidity requirements. Nevertheless, later research found that further discrepancies in RWA computations remained, and thus issues regarding comparability banks arose. The recent literature on Basel III Endgame notes that it pays attention to decrease variability in RWAs and increase transparency. Introduced output floor is thought to be a daring reform that can curb the degree of dependence of banks on internal models. Whereas it is considered by regulatory bodies and policy institutions as a necessary move towards standardization, critics believe that it will decrease the level of risk sensitivity and punish those banks that have more sophisticated risk management systems. This dispute illustrates the broader issue of regulatory uniformity versus institutional flexibility. The Endgame reforms have also been the subject of much discussion concerning their economic implications. Data shows that raising capital requirements could lead to an increase in lending rates and reduced credit availability, particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). On the other hand, some works argue that well-capitalized banks are better positioned to maintain their lending activities during financial downturns and thus contribute to long-term stability. This two-sided approach underscores the trade-offs that are involved in regulating capitalism. In recent scholarship, the dimension of governance of Basel III Endgame has become a more important subject. The increase in the level of capital and disclosure requirements leads to increased capital and disclosure practices, and increases the accountability of both boards of directors and senior management. Researchers focus on how risk management can become a part of strategic decision-making and the necessity of enhanced transparency. Nevertheless, it has been objected that it has led to an augmented compliance load and complexity to operations especially to smaller banking institutions. In legal terms, the Basel III Endgame indicates that there has been a move towards a more rules-based regulatory framework rather than a principles-based one. Legal commentators observe that the shift increases the enforceability but restricts the discretion regulations. Also, non-binding character of Basel norms leads to the implementation in different jurisdictions, which complicates harmonization of global regulations. Comparative analysis shows that the developed economies have the ability to accommodate these reforms but the developing economies have limitations that regard capital adequacy and regulatory infrastructure. Although a lot of research has been conducted, there are still gaps in the process of incorporating legal and economic analysis of the Basel III Endgame, especially when it comes to the developing nations. This paper attempts to fill these gaps by offering a detailed legal assessment of the capital allocation and governance within the changing regulatory environment.

Methodology and Scope

This study uses a doctrinal and analytical research method to assess the legal and regulatory effects of the basel III Endgame, focusing on capital allocation and corporate governance. The doctrinal method involves a structured review of core legal documents like regulatory structures, policy papers, and supervisory guidance issued by international standard setters and national regulators. Key sources include the basel Committee on banking Supervisions publications, national rules from central banks and financial agencies, and existing banking laws. National regulations directly affect how institutions follow capital rules and manage boards. In addition to primary sources, the analysis draws from academic studies, policy briefs, and expert opinions. The most important contribution comes from comparing how global standards are put in place in domestic systems. The sources provide significant viewpoints of both economic and legal implication of Basel III Endgame reforms, making it easy for one to understand both theoretical and practical sides. Furthermore, it points out the method of comparative analysis that entails studying the response and implementation of Endgame reforms by various jurisdictions, particularly the developed economies and emerging markets. This kind of perspective from different locations is essential to identify regulatory divergences and their effects on international financial harmonization. The analytical part of the methodology will focus on analysing the effectiveness, limitations, and legal implications of the Basel III Endgame framework. It deeply analyses the degree to which the reforms have succeeded in achieving their original objectives of enhancing the stability of financial systems and reducing systemic risks, while also delving into potential issues such as regulatory overreach, the cost of compliance, and credit constraints.The paper goes on to discuss how the reforms might affect corporate governance especially on accountability of the board, the practice of risk management, and the disclosure. This study would be limited to the legal and regulatory aspects of the Basel III Endgame. Although the study does not ignore the economic aspects of capital adequacy reforms, it does not involve quantitative or empirical analysis of financial data. It is rather concerned with the normative and structural elements of regulation, such as the design, implementation, and effects of legal regimes of banking institutions. The study is geographically comparative, which is specifically based on key regulatory jurisdictions like the United States, the European Union, and India. The fact that the Indian context has been included is particularly remarkable, considering that the most difficult issue emerging economies have to deal with is the fact that, despite the international standards of regulation, domestic economic priorities have to be addressed, as well. All things considered, the method tries to provide a thorough and critical legal overview of Basel III Endgame. However, it also strives to maintain the clarity of the focus and the depth of the analysis at the same time. This paper will help the ongoing discussions about the changing bank regulation and governance by combining the doctrinal, comparative, and analytical approaches to this issue.

Chapter 2

Evolution of Basel Norms

The changes in Basel norms are an indication of the gradual change in the international banking regulation due to the impact of the financial crisis, the complexity of the market and systemic risks. These norms, developed by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) seek to bring about standard capital adequacy, risk management, supervisory norms and practices across the jurisdictions. As the Basel I is being changed to Basel III Endgame, it can be viewed as a shift to more complicated and risk-sensitive regulatory frameworks.

Basel I: Capital Regulation Pillar.

Basel I, the first aimed at standardising banking regulation on an international basis, was introduced in 1988. It set a capital adequacy ratio of 8 per cent of risk-weighted assets (RWAs), thus enabling banks to have a minimum financial strength. The risk buckets of the assets were grouped and the capital requirements were set accordingly. Although Basel I has been effective in establishing a common global standard, it was simple, and as a result; it has serious drawbacks. The framework was not risk sensitive since it would place different assets in the same classification as similar assets, irrespective of their risk profiles. This had a regulatory arbitrage effect, which meant that banks could structure their assets to find ways of minimising capital requirements and not reducing underlying risk. Basel II: Improving the Risk Sensitivity. Basel II was launched in 2004 in response to the weaknesses of Basel I, but with a more sophisticated and comprehensive approach.

It was organised on three pillars:

Pillar I: Minimum capital requirements.

Pillar II: Supervisory review process:

Pillar III: Disclosure of market discipline.

One of the major innovations of Basel II was the introduction of Internal Ratings-Based (IRB) strategies, which enabled banks to apply their internal models in order to measure credit risk and calculate capital requirements. This dramatically increased the sensitivity of risk and the regulatory capital became more closely related to actual risk exposure. Nevertheless, the use of internal models in Basel II was problematic in the global financial crisis of 20072009. A large number of banks failed to estimate the risks because of the assumptions made in inaccurate modelling, transparency, and poor supervisory practices. This caused the lack of capital buffers to absorb losses causing widespread financial instability. Basel III: Resilience after a Crisis. The BCBS, in their response to the crisis, came up with Basel III in 2010 which is an overall package of reforms that targeted to make the banking industry strong.

Key features included:

• Increased quality capital especially Common Equity Tier 1 (CET1).

• Capital buffers and countercyclical buffers.

• The introduction of leverage ratio to reduce excessive borrowing.

• Liquidity thresholds, that include the Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR) and the Net Stable Funding Ratio (NSFR).

Basel III aimed at resolving both liquidity and solvency risks, and in such a way that banks would be able to survive through a financial crisis. It also focused more on closer supervisory controls and better approaches to risk management. Although these had been made, there were still issues with the variability between RWAs among banks, which was mainly as a result of the internal model dependence. This inconsistency destroyed the comparability and reliability of capital adequacy ratios. Basel III End game: To Standardisation and

Consistency. Basel III Endgame, which was completed in 2017, is the last stage of post-crisis reforms. Its main intention is to regain trust in the calculation of RWAs and minimize the excessive variability among institutions. Key features include: • Standardised method of credit risk, operational risk and market risk, revised. • - Constraints on the use of internal models, especially for some asset classes. Setting a minimum level (72.5%) below which model-based RWAs cannot fall as a percentage of standardised RWAs. The introduction of the output floor is a very important step, as it prevents banks from using internal modelling to an extent that would drastically reduce their capital requirements. This enhances consistency and comparability while at the same time it reduces the level of flexibility for banks with sophisticated risk management systems. From a legal and regulatory point of view, the Basel III Endgame is the transition to a rule-based environment, where greater importance is attached to supervisory control and standardisation. On the one hand, this improves the enforceability and leastens the possibilities for regulatory arbitrage; on the other hand, it may lead to regulatory overreach and may also impact banking efficiency. In sum, Basel standards evolution is an effort to achieve a balance between the efficiency of financial markets and their stability. The shortcomings of the previous stage have been addressed with each stage till the Basel III Endgame that is set to establish a more robust, transparent, and globally harmonized regulatory framework.

Chapter 3

Legal Framework Governing Basel III Endgame

The Basel III Endgame will seek to operate under a multi-layered legal framework that aims to blend the international standard-setting and local regulatory enforcement. The Basel norms are not legally binding but very influential in the sense that they are adopted by countries into their legal systems. This part looks at the international and local legal framework through which the implementation of the Basel III Endgame is being done.

International Framework

The Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS), which operates under the bank for international settlement, has come up with the Basel III Endgame. The BCBS is not a legislative but a standard setting body and the norms it sets are classified as soft law. The standards lack legal enforceability, but are very much embraced by jurisdictions as they are very crucial in ensuring global financial stability and market confidence. Capital adequacy, risk measurement and governance standards are defined in the Basel III Final Reforms (2017) to offer a basic framework. They have a restrictive legal role due to their integration into domestic regulations.

Domestic Implementation

The success of the Basel III Endgame is conditioned upon its conversion into the domestic legal provisions.

United States: It is implemented by regulatory agencies:

Federal Reserve, office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) by statute, such as the Dodd-Frank Act. The U.S. has a codified and systematic strategy of regulatory enactment in place. European Union: the capital requirements under Basel are established by the use of binding documents that consist of the Capital Requirement Regulation (CRR) and Capital Requirement Directive (CRD) which are regulated by such institutions as the European Central Bank (ECB). The EU has a rather lenient policy of transitional accommodations. India: In India, Basel standards are applied by the Reserve bank of India (RBI) through bank regulation act, 1949, and the RBI Act, 1934. The RBI takes a gradual and measured process of aligning international standards to the national economic situation.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 4 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

Legal Requirements and Adherence.

Banks under Basel III Endgame are prone to a number of legal requirements:

• Minimum capital adequacy ratios maintenance.

• Embarkation on standardised methods of risk assessment. • Adherence to reporting and disclosure standards.

• Introduction of effective risk management and governance packages. These requirements are implemented by the supervisory tools, like inspections, stress testing, and regulatory finances.

The increased prescriptive nature of the Endgame makes banks and their management more legally accountable. Governance and Harmonisation Problems. The Basel III Endgame enhances corporate governance by making the boards of directors, the quality of internal controls, and transparency stronger. The application of these norms however differs across the jurisdictions resulting in a regulatory divergence. As there is no binding effect of Basel standards on a global basis, the disparity in their domestic use is a problem to global harmonisation and can lead to competitive imbalance. Soft Law Hard Law Transition. One of the characteristics of the Basel framework is the shift into a hard law. Although Basel norms are not binding guidelines, their integration into the national laws makes them enforceable. The Basel III Endgame is a reaction to a more rules-based and more stringent regulatory environment, making enforcement easier, but increasing concerns of less flexibility and regulatory overreach. To conclude, the law structure of the Basel III Endgame refers to a hybrid structure, which incorporates international regulations and national laws on legal enforcement. Although it facilitates economic stability and consistency in regulations, it relies on moderated practice that favors international goals and national interests.

Chapter 4

Capital Allocation Basel III Endgame

The capital allocation is the most fundamental banking regulation which dictates the capital deployed by the different financial institutions in relation to their different risk exposures to make sure they are solvent and stable. The Basel III Endgame proposes major changes in the capital allocation system, namely by re-calibrating the risk-weighted assets (RWAs), limiting the application of the internal models, and increasing the standardisation. This has brought with it major legal and economic consequences in the banking institutions. Risk-Weighted Assets (RWAs) recalibration.

Basel III Endgame essentially reforms the way in which the RWAs are calculated that are the foundations of setting the minimum capital requirements. In previous frameworks, especially Basel II, banks were allowed to estimate the risk exposures using their own models. Although this method increased the sensitivity of risk, it has also contributed to high variability and low comparability between institutions.

The Endgame reforms bring changed standardised strategies on key categories of risk, as including:

• Credit risk

• Market risk

• Operational risk

These are the standardized procedures that are meant to bring consistency and transparency in the calculation of capital. The reforms aim to reinstate credibility in the risk measurement process and minimise regulatory arbitrage by limiting overreliance on internal models.

Limitations of Internal Models

The limitation of the application of the Internal Ratings-Based (IRB) approaches is one of the most significant developments according to the Basel III Endgame. A bank is no longer allowed to take advantage of sophisticated internal model on some of its asset classes especially those with low default portfolio. This becomes a turn in the direction of model-driven regulation, to a more prescriptive one. Legally, this limit increases regulator overreach over the discretion of banks to set their capital levels and yields greater supervisory power. But it also creates questions about the possible loss of risk sensitivity where standardised methods are not necessarily able to reflect the risk profiles of individual institutions. Output Floor Introduction. One of the main characteristics of the Basel III Endgame is the establishment of an output floor, which is determined at 72.5 per cent of standardised RWAs. This implies that the capital requirements of a bank, as calculated by the use of internal models, cannot be below 72.5 percent of that calculated in standardised approaches. The output floor plays a number of important roles: • It restricts the ability of banks to keep down capital requirements by internal modelling. • It increases inter-institutional comparability. Otherwise, it minimizes systemic risk that are caused by underestimation of exposures. The output floor is also an important regulatory intervention, legally, as it provides a binding limit on capital calculations. Although it enhances prudential regulation it also limits the institutional freedom and can raise capital standards of banks that in the past made much use of internal models.

Impact on Capital Structure

The end game reforms will raise the total capital requirements especially among big and complex banking institutions. Banks must have more Common Equity Tier 1 (CET1) capital that is regarded as the best quality of capital. This has a number of implications: As a requirement, banks might be required to issue more capital in the form of equity. • There can be an impact on profitability because it is associated with increased capital costs. Asset portfolios can be redefined in order to maximize the use of capital. This is likely to make the capital allocation decisions more conservative and there is a migration towards less risky assets. Lending and Economic Activity Implications. Capital allocation effects directly affect the lending behaviour of banks.

Increased capital requirements could result in:

• Increased cost of credit

• Less lending to risk areas.

• Increased non-discriminatory in giving credit.

Though these effects can contribute to financial stability, they also pose some issues concerning declining credit availability, especially to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and those emerging economies that are more dependent on bank-funding. Market and Operational risk Reforms. The Basel III Endgame presents a standardised method of measuring operational risk instead of model-based operational risk methods of the past. This method associates capital requirements with the income of the bank and a history of losses thus enhancing uniformity. To the same extent, the Fundamental Review of the Trading Book (FRTB) changes the approach to market risk by establishing more capital requirements and more effective risk measurement methods. These reforms make capital allocation more transparent and robust and put additional compliance complexity. Legal and Regulatory Implications. Legally, the Basel III Endgame is a change in capital allocation, more of a model driven, highly internal process, to a standardised and more regulated process.

Key implications include:

• Greater regulatory control and less managerial discretion.

• Improved accountability of reporting and disclosure that is standardised.

• Increased legal responsibility on non-conformance.

The change in prescriptive rules embodies a wider trend in implementing financial regulation that is focused on reducing systemic risk by supervising in a stricter manner. In short, Basel III Endgame changes the way capital is allocated to a greater extent, as it focuses more on standardization, transparency, and consistency rather than flexibility. Even though the banking sector will become more resilient as a result of these reforms, they will reduce institutional independence and may have more general economic effects. This is why the implementation of this should be done with a balancing mind so that the objectives of financial stability and economic growth can be well coordinated.

Chapter 5

Implication of Basel III Endgame on Governance

The Basel III Endgame brings major changes to capital rules,plus adjustments in how banks are governed. Boards, senior leaders, and internal controls face new duties under stronger prudential standards. Supervision expectations have grown really. This isnt just about meeting government compliance anymore. Risk management and top-level choices now rely heavily on these updates. The setup is no longer optional - it shapes how banks operate daily. Governance decisions are now directly tied to risk exposure. Oversight is tighter and more consistent across institutions. A shift has happened in how leadership handles accountability. Enhancing Board Supervision and Responsibility. The role of board of directors is also another of the most significant governance implications of the Basel III Endgame. The banks are now made to state that their boards are actively supervising capital adequacy, risk exposure and regulatory compliance.

This includes:

• The ratification of risk appetite frameworks. • Capital planning process monitoring.

• The alignment between the regulatory requirements and the business strategy.

Board-level responsibility also indicates the trend of more transparency and responsibility in the highest management in the company.

Legally, this puts the fiduciary responsibility of the directors in more question and creates the possibility of increased scrutiny and liability in regulatory compliance failures. Incorporation of Risk Management in FA of Corporations.

The Endgame reforms would require a greater use of risk management in the general governance structure.

Banks must develop holistic risk governance systems which include:

• Risks identification, measurement and monitoring.

• Internal auditing and controls.

• Constant capital adequacy evaluation.

Risk management is not an independent activity as it is now ingrained in the strategic decision making processes. This integration guarantees that the decisions of capital allocation are made based on the risk profile of the bank, and this increases the institutional resilience. Improved Leadership of Top Management.

Managing Basel III Endgame needs is a top priority. Senior leaders matter a lot in driving these changes. They must ensure policies align with the institutions goals. Now, they oversee compliance and enforce policy adherence. Now, they review performance regularly and make adjustments as needed. Their decisions directly affect the banks.

• Formulation and implementation of capital strategies.

• Adherence to regulatory standards.

• Ensuring good internal control systems.

The reforms enhance a greater level of responsibility among the top executives, which calls them to show due diligence and active response to the requirements of the regulatory bodies. The inability to fulfill these requirements could lead to regulatory fines, PR crisis, and lawsuits. Disclosure, Transparency and Market Discipline. Basel III Under Basel III, the Basel III

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 4 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

Endgame puts much more emphasis on disclosure requirements of Pillar III of the Basel framework.

Banks must give comprehensive information about:

• Capital adequacy ratios

• Risk exposures and methodologies.

• Risk management practices and governance.

These reveals are set to enhance market discipline as stakeholders, such as the investors and regulators will be able to evaluate the financial health and risk profile of the banks. Although more transparency enhances accountability, it presents huge reporting and costs of operation. Operation Problems and Compliance Cost. The additional governance requirements of the Endgame present more compliance to banks.

Institutions must invest in:

• State of the art data management systems.

• Infrastructure of regulatory reporting.

• Competent risk and compliance staff.

The smaller banks may find it especially difficult to adhere to these requirements, and may not have the resources needed to establish complex governance structures. This results in the possibility of uneven effects across institutions, which may have an effect on the competition in the banking industry.

Criminal Responsibility and Law Organisation.

Basel III Endgame enhances the enforcement mechanisms of the regulation, which adds the legal risks of non-observance.

Banks and their management can be faced with:

• Financial penalties

• Supervisory restrictions

• Reputational consequences

In certain jurisdictions, nonconformance with the standards of governance can lead to personal liability to the directors and senior executives, as well. This is an increased enforcement environment and this strengthens the significance of strong governance structures.

Trade-offs and Criticisms of Governance.

While the governance reforms put forward in the Basel III Endgame are overall beneficial as they increase the accountability of management and motivate them to take fewer risks, a few apprehensions can be identified: Such problems illustrate the need for a situation that is well-balanced to deliver effective governance without stifling productivity and the spirit of innovation. In brief, governance under Basel III Endgame is transformed more as a facilitator than a main component of banking regulation. Through enhancing board supervision, the integration of risk management, and greater openness, the reforms will not only make banks more accountable but also more capable of withstanding crises. Nonetheless, compliance requirements and legal risks imply that implementation of the improvements must be done with caution to guarantee that the changes in governance do not affect the operational performance and economic development.

Chapter 6

Regulatory and Legal Problems with Basel III Endgame

Although the Basel III Endgame intends to make the global banking system more resistant to the risks by improving capital and governance requirements, there are a number of complex law and regulatory issues concerning its implementation. These are brought by the conflict between the global standardisation and the domestic autonomy as well as the augmented compliance expenses on the financial institutions and the broader economic effects of the tightening of the regulatory demands. Regulatory Excess and Reasonableness. Among the major complaints about the Basel 3 Endgame is that it can be the case of regulatory overreach. The rules in the framework significantly restrict the flexibility of banks in the management of their capital by making internal models highly prescriptive and putting an output floor. On legal grounds, this brings up the issue of the principle of proportionality, which holds that regulation should not go further than is necessary to accomplish their goals. Standardizing rules may limit banks' ability to adjust risk practices to fit their unique operations. It is especially applicable to smaller or less complicated institutions which might be disproportionately impacted by identical regulatory demands driven by the largest international active banks. Lack of harmony and jurisdiction Divergence. Even though Basel III Endgame is supposed to establish a regulatory framework that is globally consistent, the implementation of this pillar still does not seem to be uniform in all jurisdictions. As the standards are formulated by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision as non binding principles, national regulating authorities are still free to adopt and amend them.

This leads to:

• Disagreements in schedules and transitional arrangements.

• The differences in capital requirements.

• Conflicting supervisory practices.

These discrepancies pose a challenge to the cross-border banking operation and it can lead to an imbalance in competition. Depending on the jurisdiction in which they operate, banks might have to incur increased compliance costs instead of competing globally, as those in more lenient jurisdictions.

Operation Pains and Penalty Costs.

The Basel III Endgame has compliance requirements that are high to the banks such as: • Adoption of standardised risk evaluation structures. • Improved disclosure and reporting. • Ongoing stress testing and supervisory interaction. These demands make it necessary to spend heavily on technology and data management machines and personnel. Legally, the augmented compliance cost imposes issues of cost effectiveness and regulatory sustainability especially to smaller banks and institutions in developing economies. In addition, the regulatory structure is too complex; this increases the chances of unintentional non-compliance making banks vulnerable to penalty and supervision measures. Effects on the Availability of credit and economic growth. The more draining capital conditions of the Basel III Endgame can be more widespread in economic terms. Increased capital buffers may result in: • Increased cost of lending • Minimal credit supply. • Increased loan portfolios selectivity. This is mostly important in industries whose operations are overly dependent on bank financing like the small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). These impacts can also prevent economic growth and financial inclusion in developing economies where other channels of finance are scarce. Regulatory wise, this poses a difficulty in achieving equilibrium between financial stability and development goals particularly in jurisdictions such as India. Issues of Legal Uncertainty and Interpretation. The Basel III Endgame framework has the potential to create legal ambiguities in interpretation and implementation due to its complexity. Uncertainties in regulatory requirements may cause: • Lack of consistency in the enforcement by supervisory authorities. • Conflicts of bank and regulator. Communication issues in judicial review of regulation. Courts can also be challenged to interpret a case involving capital adequacy and risk assessment, which is technical in nature, and makes the legal area more complicated. Abdicate Principles-Based to Rules-Based Regulation. A wider inclination towards a rules-based regulatory methodology, with elaborated and prescriptive requirements, is reflected in the Basel III Endgame. This increases the extent of enforceability and minimizes ambiguity although it constrains flexibility and innovation. Legally this change is worrisome in matters like: • Less flexibility to new market conditions. •

Heightened regulatory inflexibility. • Possible choking of financial innovation. This is because it is difficult to balance between strict rules that can be enforced and the flexibility to address the changing financial risks. Emerging EconomiesChallenges to Emerging Economies. Emerging economies are having peculiar issues in adopting Basel III Endgame. These include: • Limited capital resources • Underdeveloped financial markets. • Institutional and regulatory limitations. In India, the Reserve Bank of India, in its turn, has to reconcile international standards with national priorities, i.e. financial inclusion and credit growth. This could put a lot of pressure on the banking sector by implementing this strictly without proper adaptation. To sum up, Basel III Endgame is associated with the set of legal and regulatory issues that need to be effectively addressed to facilitate its success. Although the reforms will boost financial stability and bring about consistency, it also raises some issues regarding regulatory overreach, compliance costs and economic impact. To deal with these challenges, there must be a balance and proportionate measure and an aspect that is flexible so that national regulators can adjust global standards to fit national conditions without neglecting the overall goals of stability and resiliency.

Chapter 7

Critical Analysis: Basel III Endgame and its legal implications.

Basel III Endgame is a notable development of the international banking regulation, which is meant to improve the financial stability and decrease the systemic risk. But on a legal-regulatory level, the framework has attracted a few major issues associated with proportionality, institutional autonomy, economic effect and efficiency in governing. This section gives an objective analysis of the weaknesses and strengths of the Endgame with reference to judicial developments and regulatory practices especially in the Indian context. Enhancement of Financial Stability: a regulatory requirement. Among the strongest arguments in favour of Basel III Endgame, one must mention the focus on the capital adequacy enhancement and the minimization of the systemic vulnerabilities. The structure reduces overreliance on internal models that were popularly blamed as being a foremost contributor to the financial crisis of 2008 by introducing standardised methods and the output floor. The significance of having good banking regulation can be judicially noted in the case of ICICI Bank Ltd. v. Official Liquidator of APS Star Industries Ltd. the Supreme Court made it clear that there should be the maintenance of financial discipline and the integrity of the banking operations. The Court recognized that banking institutions are important to the stability of the economy and as such the regulation should take place. In the same vein, Basel III Endgame improves the level of macroprudential regulation, such that banks have sufficient capital cushions to absorb financial shocks. This helps in systemic resiliency and goes hand in hand with preventing crisis in the future worldwide. Regulatory Excess and Drain of Institutional Independence. Even though it has its positive sides, Basel III Endgame has been accused of over-regulation. The existence of standardised methods and restrictions on internal model greatly reduces the freedom of banks in their risk management. Legally, it brings up the issue of proportionality which holds that regulatory actions should not go beyond what it takes to accomplish their goals. In the case of Peerless general finance and investment company ltd vs. reserve bank of India, the Supreme Court affirmed the regulatory powers of reserve bank of India but also pointed out that these powers are to be used in a reasonable and in the interest of the people. The prescriptive model by Basel III Endgame can weaken innovation and flexibility especially to banks whose risk management systems are highly developed. The reforms will have risks of using one-size-fits-all approach since they will be limiting the use of internal models which might not reflect the various risk profiles of the financial institutions. Compliance Burden and Disproportionate Impact. The other significant issue is the burden of compliance that the Endgame has brought. Data infrastructure, reporting systems and governance mechanisms needed by banks are expensive. This cost can be absorbed by big banks, but small banks have a lot of difficulties with it. The question of proportional regulation has also been raised in the Indian jurisprudence. Internet and Mobile Association of India v. In the case of reserve bank of India, the Supreme court has used the principle of proportionality to evaluate the regulatory limitations offered by the RBI. The Court believed that the regulation steps should avoid favoring the interests of the people at the expense of the concerned entities. Using the same principle in the case of Basel III Endgame, one can state that common capital regulations and governance levels can have a disproportionate impact on smaller banks and new economies which can have the consequence of decreased competition and financial exclusion. Economic Growth and Effect on Credit Flow. One of the most devastating economic consequences of the Basel III Endgame is that it may affect credit provision. Increased capital requirements can drive the cost of lending up and decrease the willingness of banks to lend, especially to the high-risk sectors like small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). This issue is especially topical in the Indian context with the role of banks in helping the economy grow. The reserve bank of India has several times stressed that there is the need to balance financial stability and credit growth. As an example, the Basel III Capital Regulations Master Circular of the RBI, 2015, which is updated on a regular basis, emphasizes the necessity of having sufficient capital and at the same time making sure that the flow of credit to productive sectors is not disrupted. Equally, the RBI provisions regarding Prompt Corrective Action (PCA) Framework put limitations on lending in case banks cannot meet capital requirements proving the direct correlation between capital adequacy and credit access. Therefore, although Basel III Endgame is more stable, a trade-off between prudential regulation and economic growth can be introduced, especially in developing economies. Governance Benefits vs Regulation Cost. The Basel III Endgame provides a strong corporate governance approach by improving board supervision, risk management, and disclosure terms and conditions. These reforms enhance accountability and transparency, which is in line with best practices in the world. But the heightened requirements of governance also lead to: • Increased administration expenses. • More intricacy in decision-making. • Possibility of box-ticking compliance and not substantive governance. In Central Bank of India v. The Supreme Court through Ravindra emphasised on the need to be fair and transparent in the operations of banks. Although the case does not specifically concern capital regulation, it highlights the general rule that governance systems must be accountable yet not extremely demanding. The dilemma is hence to ensure that governance reforms are practical and not just procedural such that they do not lead to excessive bureaucratisation. Divergence in Jurisdiction and International Co-ordination. Among the other serious shortcomings of the Basel III Endgame, there is the absence of uniformity in jurisdictions. The Basel norms being not legally binding are followed by countries with a certain level of adaptation. This creates: • Regulatory fragmentation • Competitive differences between banks. • Cross-border supervision problems. The Basel framework is not as effective as there is no binding international enforcement mechanism. Although coordination at the global level is preferable, national regulators are more concerned with the economic interests on the domestic level and therefore they are not uniform in the implementation. Indian Regulatory Viewpoint. The implementation of Basel III in India is associated with a careful and moderate policy. The Reserve Bank of India has embraced: • A

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 4 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

timeline of a gradual implementation. • Increased minimum capital requirements than Basel requirements. • Well-developed supervisory systems. The main RBI regulatory tools are: • Basel III Capital Regulations Master Circular of RBI. • RBI Policies regarding Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR). RBI Prompt Corrective Action (PCA) Framework. These actions indicate that India is committed to financial stability but is flexible to the domestic economic needs.

Although, the governance requirements are also increased, though, they lead to: • Increased administrative expenses. • Experience more intricate decision-making. • Risks of box-ticking compliance and not substantive governance. In Central Bank of India v. The Supreme Court stated the need to be fair and transparent in banking activities (Ravindra). Although this is not a capital regulation case as such, the case highlights the overall principle that governance structures should be accountable and yet not overly burdensome. The problem thus is to make governance reforms effective and not procedural to prevent over bureaucratisation. Jurisdictional Divergence and Global Coordination Problems. The second weakness of the Basel III Endgame is the absence of consistency in the implementation jurisdictions. Basel norms do not have legal obligations, and thus countries implement them with different levels of adjustments. This creates: • Regulatory fragmentation General differences in competition between banks. Woes of cross-border oversight. The lack of an international enforcement mechanism is a limiting element to the success of the Basel framework. Although international coordination would be preferable, national regulators give more attention to the country economic interests that results in unequal implementation. Indian Regulatory Approach. The Indian strategy of executing Basel III is pursued with a mild and moderate attitude. The reserve bank of India has adopted: • A staged roll out plan. • Increased minimum capital requirements than Basel. • Effective supervision systems. The major instruments of the RBI regulations are: • Basel III Capital Regulations Master Circular of RBI. RBI Directive on Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR). Only after obtaining a new loan does an individual understand they are carrying out this action with the bank's agreement, believing they are undergoing a customer audit.<|human|>RBI Prompt Corrective Action (PCA) Framework When an individual takes out a new loan, it is only then that he realizes he is doing so through the consent of the bank thinking he is being audited as a customer. Such actions illustrate that India is committed to financial stability and fits the local economic needs. Nevertheless, there are still issues of capital sufficiency amongst the banks in the public sector and the necessity to maintain the growth in credit. The Basel III Endgame is an important initiative to enhance the global banking sector, and it has major advantages in the financial stability, transparency and governance. Nonetheless, the legal and regulatory implications of it highlight a number of challenges such as the overreach of regulation, compliance cost, and the possibility of limiting economic growth. The judicial precedents and RBI regulatory practices emphasize the need to be proportionate, flexible, and implement it with balance. Although the capital standards and the governance standards are very important, they should be highly adjusted without causing any unwanted effects especially in the emerging economies. Finally, Basel III Endgame is only successful when the balance between the prudential regulation of the economy and efficiency is reached, and that the goals of the stability and the growth are reconciled under a coherent legal framework.

Chapter 8

Basel III Endgame Implementation Comparative Analysis

The Basel III Endgame is aimed at achieving a worldwide uniform regulatory system in the banking industry. Nonetheless, its application differs greatly in different jurisdictions as a result of variations in legal systems, values on economy and regulatory abilities. A comparative study of the leading jurisdictions, especially of the United States, the European Union, and India, reveals both similarity and dissimilarity in the practices of regulation, including the difficulties of establishing global harmonisation. United States: Strict and Rational Approach. The US has had a long tradition of using a rules-based regulatory system, which is full of prescriptive legal provisionsThere have been proposals to the Basel III Endgame reforms through the regulatory Franken-Rules by Federal Reserve, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC). The United States approach mainly focuses on: The banking sector has mounted a strong protest against the introduction of the Endgame reforms, arguing that higher capital requirements will undermine their competitiveness and lead to a lower supply of credit. The ongoing debates are essentially a larger conflict between regulation stringency and market efficiency. More balanced and flexible, the European Union implements Basel standards as binding statutory texts both in the form of the Capital Requirements Regulation (CRR) and the Capital Requirements Directive (CRD). The implementation of these regulatory frameworks is done through the supervisory authorities like the European central bank (ECB). Some of the major features of EU policy are :

The EU, unlike the U. S., tries to keep finance stable. It also promots economic growth by allowing some room in how Basel standards are applied. Plus, this approach reduces pressure on banks - though it can also lead to slight differences from global rules. The flexibility helps banks adjust their operations - Mostly when conditions change - without breaking international expectations. India: Hedging and Developmental Strategy. In India, the Reserve Bank of India has exercised a very careful and gradual method of Basel III reforms. The domestic factors that influence the regulatory framework include the financial inclusion, economic development and the banking sector structure. The major features of the Indian approach are: • Increased minimum capital requirements over Basel requirements. • Stepwise adoption to prevent inconvenience. • High levels of supervisory control. The Indian banking system and its banks especially the banks of the public sector have some issues pertaining to the capital adequacy and non-performing assets (NPAs). Consequently, Basel III Endgame should be done in a controlled manner that will not negatively impact priority areas in regards to credit availability. First vs. Third World Economies. A wider comparative approach demonstrates that there is a great disparity between the developed and the developing economies: • Developed economies (e.g., U.S., EU): o Healthy banking systems in terms of capital. o Developed risk management facilities. o An increased ability to internalize regulatory costs. • Emerging markets (e.g., India): o Increased reliance on bank-related funding. - Limited capital resources - High regulatory flexibility required. These variations highlight the challenges of implementing uniform global standards in different economic contexts. It is: - feasible to strictly implement the rules in hardcore economies - but at the same time, it might cause disproportionate impact on developing countries. Opponents of Global Harmonisation While the target of a single regulatory framework is common amongst all, there are still various hurdles: Lack of a binding international enforcement mechanism makes harmonisation efforts difficult. A national regulators give priority to domestic economic interests, which lead to regulatory changes being fragmented. Convergence and the Way Forward Despite these differences, there is some degree of convergence in the Basel III Endgame principles implementation like higher capital standards and strengthened risk management methods.The challenge is to find a middle ground between global consistency and the regulatory independence of countries. To be effective, the Basel III Endgame requires a coordinated strategy that foster international cooperation and discussion. A comparison revealed that despite the fact that the Basel III

Endgame provides a common set of regulatory requirements, the local factors of each jurisdiction have an impact on how it is implemented. Due to differences in legal systems, as well as varied economic priorities and levels of institutional development, there is a diversification of approaches in different countries. Only a flexible and relative application of Basel standards can lead to global harmonization, which will enable the objective of financial stability to be met without negatively impacting economic growth and competitiveness.

Chapter 9

Basel III Endgame Critical Evaluation.

Basel III Endgame Basel III Endgame is one of the major breakthroughs in banking regulation in the world. Its main objective was to increase the financial stability, make the system more risk-sensitive, and strengthen the governance. However, effectiveness of this regulation should be assessed not only by the benefits, but also by the drawbacks. One of the biggest advantages of the framework is that it results in higher financial stability. The Endgame curbs excessive volatility in risk-weighted assets through the use of standardised approaches and the output floor, and limits the several ways internal models can be manipulated. This will lead to uniformity, transparency and comparability among banks and strengthen supervisory effectiveness and systemic risk mitigation. Besides, the framework results in the corporate governance improvement. It is due to the greater accountability of bank institutions as a result of the more thorough disclosure requirements, the reinforced board oversight and the more rigorous risk management procedures. These tools are instrumental in building market confidence and making banks behave more responsibly and transparently. While the above are the benefits, Basel III Endgate has also been criticized as overly restrictive and even prescriptive.The shift to standardized methods limits banks' capacity to change. It may also not be a good enough reflection of individual risk profiles of different institutions. This kind of one-size-fits-all model may actually be risky in terms of it limiting the practice of creativity and also lead to less effective risk management. Another major problem is the heavy compliance burden. Implementing complex regulatory requirements is costly when it comes to infrastructures, data platforms, and governance models. While it is likely that big banks might be able to absorb these costs, smaller banks, on the other hand, can face very big challenges hence regulatory proportionality is an issue. The same framework can also impact the credit availability as well as the pace of growth of the economy. Raising capital requirements may also result in an increase in the cost of lending and a drop in the flow of credit particularly to the riskier sectors such as small and medium-sized enterprises. This is a major challenge especially for developing countries where bank financing plays a major role. Finally, it's always the question of regulatory divergence. Since Basel standards are not legally binding, different countries make changes to the implementation of these standards which lead to inconsistencies and disparities in competition across countries. This totally ruins the idea of global harmonisation.Overall, the Basel III Endgame will make the banking sector more robust and better regulated but also highlight issues such as flexibility, compliance costs, and the economic impact. Its long-term success will rely on a reasonable and relative adoption that balances both the international regulatory objectives and the national economic situations. The Basel III Endgame has certain implications in the future. The Basel III Endgame is likely to impact substantially on the future of the global banking regulation by enhancing the financial stability, the transformation of the banking practices, and improving the standards of governance. Among its major implications is that it enhances financial resilience. Higher and steadier capital requirements will enable banks to manage economic downturns more effectively and consequently, system risk will be less and there will be more stability in the financial system. Furthermore, it is very likely that the new framework will change the banking business models. Banks will be able to switch to low risk and capital efficient operations and reduce the high risk areas. Besides leading to more stability, this is expected to cause a lowering in the supply of credit especially to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). In such a situation, regulators like the Reserve Bank of India are expected to take the moderate and gradual approach ensuring that the regulatory goals do not hamper economic growth and financial inclusion. Most probably, another implication will be that technology will become increasingly important in regulatory complianceBanks will, at a larger scale, rely on data analytics, automation, and highly risk evaluation software that will not only boost productivity but also give rise to problems related to cybersecurity and data protection. Basel III Endgame is aligned with the notion of strengthening corporate governance and sustainability matters, and it is also expected to emphasize more transparency and other ESG dimensions. However, the problem of regulatory differences at cross-jurisdictional level might be forgotten, and effective coordination of actions on the international level will be necessary. Generally, Basel III Endgame will bring about a superior and a more resilient banking system however the realization of this depends on the proportional application and efficient cooperation of all countries.

Chapter 10

Conclusion

The Basel III Endgame represents an important milestone in the evolution of the global banking regulation network as the collaborative effort to repair the existing structural weaknesses revealed by the 2008 financial crisis. Through tightening capital adequacy requirements, reducing the variation in risk-weighted assets, and enhancing the quality of governance mechanisms, the banking system will become more robust and transparent. Its emphasis on standard procedures and the introduction of the output floor mark a step towards greater uniformity and comparability among banks. At the same time, the Basel III Endgame raises some important regulatory and legal questions. It is more and more prescriptive in nature such that the shaping of risk does not give banks more flexibility and is possibly not fully reflective of the institution-specific or jurisdiction-specific situations. The higher compliance cost mainly in areas related to capital requirement and reporting requirements pose a challenge to smaller banks and developing countries. The role of the stricter capital norms may have the unintended effect of limiting credit availability that could hamper economic growth and access to finance, especially in bank-dependent economies. Apart from that, regulatory divergence is yet another problem that renders the framework ineffectiveBecause Basel standards are soft law at the international level, how they are implemented domestically vary from one jurisdiction to another which results in inconsistencies and competitive advantages. This highlights the limitations of an informal global regulatory system and the non-functioning of a stronger coordination of national regulations. The Reserve Bank of India has chosen the path of careful and measured performance in the context of Basel III implementation in India when the striking world regulation goals and national economic interests were at odds. This shows that the notion of proportionality and the use of flexible international standards in the different economic settings are quite significant. In the future, it will be a matter of time and the success or failure of Basel III Endgame will be known thereafter if it will find a reasonable balance between financial stability and economic efficiency. Just as it is necessary to have a strong regulation that prevents systemic crises, it should not be so restrictive that it stifles innovation, competition, and credit growth. It is however necessary to have a strong regulation that avoid systemic crisis, but at the same time it should not be so restrictive as to put a cap on innovation, competition and credit growth. An a forward-looking approach which embraces the rise of technology, strengthens governance and deepens international cooperation will be the key. In short Basel III Endgame represents both an opportunity and a risk. After all, it is set to deliver a uniform, yet adaptable set of rules that will safeguard stability and help the economies grow in line with the natural resources of the world.

References

1. Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, *Basel III: Finalising Post-Crisis Reforms* (Bank for International Settlements 2017).
2. Bank for International Settlements, *Basel III: A Global Regulatory Framework for More Resilient Banks and Banking Systems* (rev. ed. 2011).
3. Basel III Framework (2010, rev. 2017).
4. Reserve Bank of India, *Master Circular – Basel III Capital Regulations* (2015).
5. Reserve Bank of India, *Report on Trend and Progress of Banking in India* (latest ed.).
6. Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (India).
7. Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (India).
8. International Monetary Fund, *Global Financial Stability Report*.
9. World Bank, *Global Financial Development Report*.
10. Anil K. Kashyap et al., An Analysis of the Impact of Basel III on Bank Capital, *J. Econ. Persp.*
11. Viral V. Acharya, The Dodd-Frank Act and Basel III: Intentions and Consequences, *J. Fin. Reg.*
12. Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203 (2010).
13. Capital Requirements Regulation (EU) No. 575/2013 & Directive 2013/36/EU.