CHAPTER -7

SUMMARY, FINDING,

SUGGESTION AND CONCLUSION

CHAPTER -7

SUMMARY, FINDING, SUGGESTION AND CONCLUSION

7.1Initiation

7.2 Summary of the study

7.3 Findings as per C.A.M.E.L. Parameter

7.3.1 Capital adequacy ratio

7.3.2 Asset quality ratio

7.3.3 Regulatement Aptitude ratio

7.3.4 Earning quality ratio

7.3.5 Liquidity ratio

7.3.6 All together C.A.M.E.L. parameter

7.3.7 Brief findings of F-test one way anova

7.4 Suggestion and recommendation

7.5 Significance

7.6 Limitations

7.7 Future scope

7.8 Conclusion

7.1 INITIATION

Banking is indispensable for fostering economic progress, promoting pecuniary aptitude, enhancing productivity, and improving overall welfare in any country. A well-functioning zone of banking supports diverse economic activities, facilitates innovation and entrepreneurship, and provides to sustainable development goals. Therefore, ensuring the realiability and coherence of banking systems remains decisive for achieving broad-based economic prosperity and resilience.

Banking shows a pivotal contribution in the economic development and aptitude of any country. Here are key points highlighting the importance of banking Banks facilitate the flow of funds from savers to borrowers, providing indispensable pecuniary intermediation that supports economic activities for instance fundings, consumption, and business expansion. Banks mobilize savings from households and channel them into productive fundings, fostering capital formation and economic progress. This helps in the creation of jobs, infrastructure development, and overall rallyment in living standards.Banks extend credit to individuals, businesses, and governments, enabling them to finance a number of needs, containing business expansion, education, housing, and infrastructure projects. Admittance to credit promotes entrepreneurship, innovation, and economic diversification.Banks provide efficient reckoning and settlement systems, for instance electronic fund transfers, checks, debit cards, and online banking platforms. These systems facilitate seamless transactions, enhancing economic coherence and reducing transaction costs.

Banks suggests a range of pecuniary products and services, containing insurance, hedging instruments, and jeopardy regulatement advisory services. These help individuals and businesses synchronize pecuniary jeopardys associated with currency fluctuations, interest rate changes, and unexpected events.Banks play a decisive contribution in promoting pecuniary inclusion by providing banking services to underserved and marginalized populations. This includes admittance to savings accounts, credit conveniences, and reckoning services, empowering individuals and communities economically.Banks are integral to the implementation of pecuniary policy extents by central banks.

They influence the economy's liquidity through lending and deposit activities, affecting interest rates, inflation, and overall economic aptitude.Banks participate in government debt arcades by underwriting, trading, and holding government securities. They also facilitate the collection of taxes and distribution of public funds, supporting fiscal policy objectives.A vigorous zone of banking provides to pecuniary aptitude by retaining confidence in the pecuniary system, ensuring the safekeeping of deposits, and managing systemic jeopardys. It serves as a buffer against economic shocks and crises.Infrastructure Development: Banks finance infrastructure projects, for instance roads, bridges, power plants, and telecommunications networks. These fundings are critical for long-term economic progress, job creation, and regional development**.**

The C.A.M.E.L. rating system was developed in the United States in the late 1960s by federal regulators as a utensil to consider the overall vigor and aptitude of banks and other pecuniary institutions. The acronym C.A.M.E.L. stands for the following key areas of considerment:

Each component is graded on a scale, and the cumulative C.A.M.E.L. rating provides regulators and stakeholders with a standardized method to appraise and monitor the pecuniary realiability of banks. The C.A.M.E.L. structure has from become widely adopted internationally, influencing banking supervision applies universally to safeguard pecuniary aptitude and mitigate jeopardys inside the zone of banking.

Basel III aims to strengthen the resilience of the zone of banking, rally jeopardy regulatement and authority applies, and promote pecuniary aptitude universally. The implementation of Basel III norms has been phased in gradually by national regulators, with full compliance expected to enhance the safety and realiability of banks worldwide.

C.A.M.E.L. is an acronym representing the five key constituents accustomed consider a bank’s overall vigor:

- **C - Capital Adequacy:** Appraises the sufficiency of a bank’s capital in consideration to its jeopardy. It consideres that if the bank wants to cover losses from a number of jeopardys.

- **A - Asset Quality:** Examines the quality of a bank's assets, focusing on the level of non-performing loans (NPLs) and the adequacy of loan loss reserves. It extents the jeopardyiness of the bank's asset portfolio.
- **M - Regulatement Quality:** Consideres the competence and effectiveness of the bank's regulatement, containing board lapse, jeopardy regulatement applies, strategic planning, and internal controls.
- **E - Earnings Strength:** Analyzes the profitaptitude and earning capacity of the bank. It looks at factors for instance to determine the bank's aptitude to produce sustainable earnings.
- **L - Liquidity Position:** Appraises the bank's aptitude to reach its short-term devoirs without causing substantial harm to its pecuniary position. It focuses on liquidity jeopardy regulatement and the availaptitude of liquid assets.

Importance of the C.A.M.E.L. Structure in Banking

1. Jeopardy Considerment: Provides a comprehensive configuration for considering and observing a number of jeopardys faced by banks, containing credit jeopardy, arcade jeopardy, operational jeopardy, and liquidity jeopardy.

2. Regulatory Compliance: Helps regulatory authorities appraise the pecuniary realiability of banks and safeguard compliance with capital adequacy requirements and other regulatory standards.

3. Strategic Decision-Making: Assists bank regulatement in identifying areas of strength and feebleness, enabling informed decisions on capital allocation, jeopardy regulatement strategies, and operational rallyments.

4. Execution Benchmarking: Facilitates comparisons of banks inside the industry and over time, supporting stakeholders in valuing relative execution and identifying finest applies.

5. Primary Warning System: Serves as primary warning system for potential pecuniary distress, allowing preemptive actions to mitigate jeopardys and retain aptitude in the zone of banking.

6. Financier Confidence: Enhances transparency and credibility by providing stakeholders, containing financiars, analysts, and depositors, with standardized and structured considerments of a bank's pecuniary vigor.

In summary, the C.A.M.E.L. structure shows a decisive contribution in the banking industry by a structured configuration for considering and observing the pecuniary vigor, jeopardy regulatement applies, and overall aptitude of pecuniary institutions. It helps safeguard realiability, transparency, and resilience in the zone of banking, contributing to pecuniary aptitude and financier confidence.

7.2 SUMMARY

The structure of study is organized into 7 chapters, each focusing on different phases related to the Indian banking Diligence and the application of the C.A.M.E.L. structure:

1. Chapter 1: Recapitulation of Indian Banking Diligence

   Background of the study

   Recapitulation of the Indian banking Diligence

2. Chapter 2: Execution Appraisal and Conceptionual Configuration of C.A.M.E.L. Structure

   Execution appraisal of the C.A.M.E.L. structure

   Conceptionual configuration of the C.A.M.E.L. structure

   Laws and Acts related to the C.A.M.E.L. structure rating arrengement

3. Chapter 3: Review of Literature

   Review of literature discussing previous analyses and discussions on C.A.M.E.L.scrutiny in the form of theses and journals

   Scrutiny of existing gaps in the literature

4. Chapter 4: Research Methodology

Research problem

Objectives and hypotheses

Research design, approach, and strategy

Sampling methodology

Data collection procedures and span of study

Data processing and scrutiny utensils and techniques

5. Chapter 5: Profile of the Sampling Banks

6. Chapter 6: ExecutionScrutiny of Banking Diligence through C.A.M.E.L. Structure Rating Arrengement

7. Chapter 7: Findings, Recommendations, Conclusions, and Future Prospects of Research

Findings of the study

Conclusions drawn

Recommendations

Significance of the study

Limitations encountered

Future prospects for further research

This structured approach safeguards a comprehensive exploration and scrutiny of the Indian banking zone using the C.A.M.E.L. structure

7.3 FINDINGS

Execution of Banking Diligence through C.A.M.E.L. Parameters

Capital Adequacy Test (CAR) Scrutiny:

1. Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR):

- K.M.B.(K.M.B.) has the highest average CAR of 18.94%, followed by J.K.B. Bank with 17.77%, and I.C.I.C.I. with 17.68%. S.I.B. has the lowest position with an average of 13.49%.
- F-test result: F = 48.64, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.

- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkabledifferentiations in CAR included inobtained banks.

2. Total Debts to Owner's Fund (Debt Equity) Ratio:

- S.I.B. (S.I.B.) has the highest average Debt Equity Ratio of 0.407, followed by J.K.B. Bank with 4.295, and K.M.B.(K.M.B.) with 5.624. F.B. has the lowest average of 10.25.
- F-test result: F = 69.95, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkabledifferentiations in Debt Equity Ratio included inobtained banks.

3. Advance to Total Assets Ratio:

- S.I.B. (S.I.B.) R.P.s first with an average of 66.93%, followed by F.B. with 65.04%, and H.D.F.C. with 64.19%. I.D.B.I.R.P.s last with 50.78%.
- F-test result: F = 13.98, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkabledifferentiations in Advance to Total Assets Ratio included inobtained banks.

4. Coverage Ratio:

- H.D.F.C.R.P.s first with an average Coverage Ratio of 82.116. I.C.I.C.I. follows closely with 78.826, K.M.B.with 76.225, and J.K.B. Bank with 27.78.
- F-test result: F = 14.77, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkabledifferentiations in Coverage Ratio included inobtained banks.

5. Government Security to Total Funding Ratio:

- H.D.F.C. holds the top position with an average of 75.23, followed by I.I.B.with 71.98, F.B. with 70.07, and J.K.B. Bank with 56.42.
- F-test result: F = 72.11, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.

- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkabledifferentiations in Government Security to Total Funding Ratio included inobtained banks.

All together Capital Adequacy Scrutiny:

Rank Based Scrutiny:

- H.D.F.C.R.P.s first with a R.P. of 2.8, followed by K.M.B. with 3.4, and I.D.B.I. with 8.
- F-test result: F = 1.885, thevalue tabulated of F = 2.12 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis obtained, indicating equal capital adequacy included inobtained banks based on R.P..

C.t. Average Scrutiny:

- H.D.F.C. has the highest average CAR with 49.16, while J.K.B. Bank has the lowest with 32.77.
- F-test result: F = 0.1815, thevalue tabulated of F = 2.12 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis obtained, indicating equal capital adequacy included inobtained banks based on C.T. average.

Asset Quality Ratios Scrutiny:

1. Net NPAs to Net Advances Ratio:

- H.D.F.C.R.P.s first with an average ratio of 0.33, indicating the finest execution in managing Net NPAs relative to Net Advances. I.I.B. follows closely with 0.59, and K.M.B.(K.M.B.) is third with 1.03. S.I.B. (S.I.B.) has the highest ratio at 17.42.
- F-test result: F = 57.35, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkabledifferentiations in Net NPAs to Net Advances ratios included inobtained banks.

2. Net NPA to Total Assets Ratio:

- H.D.F.C. leads with an average ratio of 0.27, followed by I.I.B. with 0.32. K.M.B.(K.M.B.) R.P.s third with 0.57, and I.D.B.I. is last with 2.32.
- F-test result: F = 3.6, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkable differentiations in Net NPA to Total Assets ratios included inobtained banks.

3. Fundings to Total Assets Ratio:

- S.I.B. (S.I.B.) R.P.s first with an average ratio of 20.11, closely followed by I.I.B. with 20.64. I.C.I.C.I. R.P.s third with 21.89, and J.K.B. Bank has the highest ratio at 34.57.
- F-test result: F = 3.243, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkable differentiations in Fundings to Total Assets ratios included inobtained banks.

4. % .change in Net NPAs:

- K.M.B.(K.M.B.) shows the finest execution with an average % .change of -8.46%. F.B. follows with -5.39%, and A.B. is third with -2.73%. Y.B.has the highest increase at 66%.
- F-test result: F = 1.43, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis obtained, indicating no remarkable differentiations in % .change in Net NPAs included inobtained banks.

All together Asset Quality Scrutiny:

Rank-Based Scrutiny:

- I.I.B.R.P.s first with an average R.P. of 2, indicating the finest All togetherexecution in Asset Quality. H.D.F.C. follows with an average R.P. of 3, and S.I.B.R.P.s third with an average R.P. of 5. I.D.B.I.R.P.s last with an average R.P. of 9.25.
- F-test result: F = 2.322, thevalue tabulated of F = 2.21 at 5% significance level.

- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkable differentiations in All together asset quality included inobtained banks based on R.P.C.T.s.

C.t. Average Scrutiny:

- K.M.B.(K.M.B.) R.P.s first with an average C.T. of 4.10, followed by F.B. with 4.85, and A.B. with 5.69. Y.B.R.P.s lowest with an average C.T. of 22.97.
- F-test result: F = 0.587, thevalue tabulated of F = 2.21 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis obtained, indicating equal asset quality included inobtained banks based on C.T. averages.

<u>7.3.3 Regulatement Aptitude ratio</u>

Business per Employee Ratio:

- I.D.B.I. leads with an average of 2,389.63, securing the top spot.
- F.B. follows closely with an average of 1,851.04, securing second place.
- K.M.B.(K.M.B.) is in third place with an average of 1,642.73.
- H.D.F.C.R.P.s last with an average score of 928.50.
- F-test result: F = 1.47 (Fc < Ft), indicating no remarkable differentiation in business per employee included inobtained banks.

 Profit per Employee Ratio:

- I.I.B.emerges as the top-performing institution with the highest average of 37.781, securing the first position.
- H.D.F.C. follows closely with an average of 19.836, securing the second position.
- I.C.I.C.I. is in third place with an average of 13.941.
- I.D.B.I.R.P.s last with an average of -20.304.

- F-test result: F = 5.71 (Fc > Ft), indicating remarkable differentiations in profit per employee included inobtained banks.

 Total Advances to Total Deposits Ratio:

- J.K.B. Bank secures the top position with the highest average of 152.833.
- Y.B.follows closely with an average of 99.62.
- I.C.I.C.I. is third with an average score of 91.79.
- I.D.B.I.R.P.s last with an average score of 69.12.
- F-test result: F = 3.39 (Fc > Ft), indicating remarkabledifferentiations in the advances to deposits ratio included inobtained banks.

 Return on Net Worth Ratio:

- H.D.F.C. tops the R.P.ings with an average return of 16.146.
- S.I.B. (S.I.B.) follows with an average return of 13.199.
- I.I.B.is third with an average return of 13.173.
- I.D.B.I.R.P.s last with an average return of -16.28.
- F-test results for C.T. of R.P.:
    - F = 0.479, thevalue tabulated of F = 2.21 at 5% significance level.
    - From Fc < Ft, the null hypothesis (all banks have equal regulatement quality based on C.T.) is obtained, suggesting no remarkable differentiation in regulatement quality based on R.P.C.T..
- C.t. of average execution:
    - I.D.B.I.R.P.s first with an average C.T. of 605.5.
    - F.B. is second with a C.T. of 487.4.
    - K.M.B. is third with a C.T. of 438.
    - H.D.F.C.R.P.s lowest with a C.T. of 262.4.

- F-test results for C.T. of average:
    - F = 0.0604, thevalue tabulated of F = 2.21 at 5% significance level.
    - From Fc < Ft, the null hypothesis (all banks have equal regulatement quality based on C.T.) is obtained, suggesting no remarkable differentiation in regulatement quality based on average C.T..

7.3.4.Earning Capacity Scrutiny:

1. Return on Assets Ratio:

- J.K.B. Bank leads with an average score of 1.82, followed closely by H.D.F.C.with 1.72 and K.M.B. with 1.69. I.D.B.I.R.P.s last.
- F-test result: F = 0.086, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis obtained, indicating no remarkable differentiation in Return on Assets among banks.

2. Interest Income to Total Income Ratio:

- F.B. performs finest with an average score of 87.0667, followed closely by H.D.F.C.with 87.05. K.M.B.R.P.s third, while S.I.B. is last with 86.85.
- F-test result: F = 15.299, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkable differentiations in Interest Income to Total Income among banks.

3. Net Interest Margin Ratio:

- K.M.B. tops with an average score of 4.12, followed by I.I.B. with 3.97 and H.D.F.C.with 3.89.
- F-test result: F = 8.94, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkable differentiations in Net Interest Margin among banks.

4. Operating Profit Margin Ratio:

- H.D.F.C.leads with an average of 3.41, followed by I.I.B. with 3.36 and I.C.I.C.I. with 3.08. J.K.B.R.P.s lowest with 1.45.
- F-test result: F = 29.68, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkable differentiations in Operating Profit Margin among banks.

5. Net Profit Margin Ratio:

- H.D.F.C.R.P.s first with an average score of 23.10, followed by K.M.B. with 22.10 and I.C.I.C.I. with 16.95. I.D.B.I.R.P.s last.
- F-test result: F = 0.35, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis obtained, indicating no remarkable differentiation in Net Profit Margin among banks.

All togetherScrutiny of Earning Quality:

- Rank Based Scrutiny:
    - H.D.F.C.emerges as the top bank with an average R.P. of 2.4, followed by K.M.B. and S.I.B.. I.D.B.I.R.P.s lowest with an average R.P. of 9.
    - F-test result: F = 3.4, thevalue tabulated of F = 2.12 at 5% significance level.
    - Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating unequal earning quality based on R.P. among banks.
- C.t. Average Scrutiny:
    - H.D.F.C.R.P.s first with an average score of 23.02, followed by K.M.B. with 22.57 and S.I.B. with 21.97. I.D.B.I. has the lowest average score of 13.43.
    - F-test result: F = 0.0301, thevalue tabulated of F = 2.12 at 5% significance level.

- Conclusion: Null hypothesis obtained, indicating no remarkabledifferentiation in earning quality based on C.T. average among banks.

7.3.5.Liquidity Position Scrutiny:

1. Liquid Assets to Total Assets Ratio:

- I.I.B.secures the top spot with an average score of 9.67.
- I.C.I.C.I. follows in second place with an average of 9.07, and S.I.B.R.P.s third with 8.83.
- F-test result: F = 3.56, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkable differentiations in Liquid Assets to Total Assets Ratio among banks.

2. Liquid Assets to Total Deposits Ratio:

- F.B. holds the top spot with an average score of 15.67, followed closely by I.I.B. with 13.83. H.D.F.C.R.P.s last with an average of 9.01.
- F-test result: F = 0.56, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis obtained, indicating no remarkable differentiation in Liquid Assets to Total Deposits Ratio among banks.

3. Government and Approved Securities to Total Assets Ratio:

- J.K.B. Bank leads with an average score of 1.57, followed by I.D.B.I. with 1.63, and S.I.B. with 1.81. Y.B.has the highest score of 2.48.
- F-test result: F = 0.086, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis obtained, indicating no remarkable differentiation in Government and Approved Securities to Total Assets Ratio among banks.

4. Liquid Assets to Demand Deposits Ratio:

- I.C.I.C.I. R.P.s first with an impressive average of 88.93, followed by Y.B.with 86.90. K.M.B.R.P.s third with 84.85, while H.D.F.C.R.P.s last with 47.34.
- F-test result: F = 21.733, thevalue tabulated of F = 1.99 at 5% significance level.
- Conclusion: Null hypothesis discarded, indicating remarkable differentiations in Liquid Assets to Demand Deposits Ratio among banks.

All togetherScrutiny of Liquidity Position Ratios:

- Rank Based Scrutiny:
  - I.I.B.is R.P.ed first with an average score of 9.67, followed by I.C.I.C.I. and S.I.B.. J.K.B. Bank R.P.s lowest with an average score of 4.59.
  - F-test result: F = 0.88, thevalue tabulated of F = 2.21 at 5% significance level.
  - Conclusion: Null hypothesis obtained, indicating equal liquidity regulatement based on R.P. among banks.
- C.t. Average Scrutiny:
  - I.C.I.C.I. R.P.s first with an average score of 28.47, followed by Y.B.with 27.19, and K.M.B. with 26.90. H.D.F.C.has the lowest average score of 16.29.
  - F-test result: F = 0.0696, thevalue tabulated of F = 2.21 at 5% significance level.
  - Conclusion: Null hypothesis obtained, indicating equal liquidity regulatement based on C.T. average among banks.

7.3.6 ALL TOGETHERSCRUTINY OF C.A.M.E.L. RATIO:

(C) CAPITAL ADEQUACY TEST

(A) ASSET QUALITY TEST

(M) REGULATEMENT COHERENCE TEST

(E) EARNING QUALITY TEST

(L) LIQUIDITY REGULATEMENT TEST

Rank of Parameter:

- All together C.A.M.E.L. Rank (Rank of Ratio):
    - First Rank: I.I.B. BANK
    - Followed by: H.D.F.C., K.M.B., I.C.I.C.I., S.I.B., F.B., A.B., J.K.B., Y.B.
    - Last: I.D.B.I.
    - Lower average values specify higher or better All together C.A.M.E.L.R.P. based on the average score of ratios across all categories.
- F-test Result for Rank of Ratio:
    - Calculated F-value: 6.129
    - Tabular F-value (at 5% significance level): 2.21
    - Explication: From the calculated F-value (6.129) is higher than the tabular F-value (2.21), the null hypothesis (all banks have equal All togetherC.A.M.E.L. ratio based on R.P.) is discarded. This suggests that there are remarkable differentiations in the All together C.A.M.E.L.R.P.included inobtained banks based on the R.P. of ratios.

Average of Ratio:

- All together C.A.M.E.L. Rank (Average of Ratio):
    - First Rank: I.D.B.I.
    - Followed by: F.B., K.M.B., A.B., Y.B., J.K.B., I.C.I.C.I., S.I.B., I.I.B.
    - Last: H.D.F.C.

- Higher average values specify higher or better All together C.A.M.E.L.R.P. based on the average score of ratios across all categories.

- F-test Result for Average of Ratio:
  - Calculated F-value: 0.0516
  - Tabular F-value (at 5% significance level): 2.12
  - Explication: From the calculated F-value (0.0516) is least the tabular F-value (2.12), the null hypothesis (all banks have equal All togetherC.A.M.E.L. ratio based on average) is obtained. This suggests that there are no remarkable differentiations in the All togetherC.A.M.E.L.R.P.included inobtained banks based on the average of ratios.

7.3.7 Aggregate suggestion of finding of F test one way ANOVA in brief

TABLE NO. 7.1

AGGREGATE SUGGESTION OF FINDING IN BRIEF FOR F TEST RATIO (ONE WAY ANOVA)			
NAME OF RATIOS	**HO/H1**	**OBTAINED**	**FINDINGS**
Capital adequacy ratio (C)			
Capital Adequacy to Jeopardy Weighted Ratio	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have remarkablely differentiation in capital adequacy test.
Debt- Equity Ratio	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have remarkablely differentiation in Debt- Equity Ratio
Total Advances to Total Asset Ratio	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have remarkablely

			differentiation in Total Advances to Total Asset Ratio
Coverage Ratio	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have remarkablely differentiation in Coverage Ratio
Government Securities to Total Fundings Ratio	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have remarkablely differentiation in Government Securities to Total Fundings Ratio
All togetherscrutiny of CAR ratio as per the R.P.	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have no remarkablely differentiation in All togetherscrutiny of CAR ratio as per the R.P.
All togetherscrutiny of CAR ratio as per the average	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have remarkablely differentiation in All togetherscrutiny of CAR ratio as per the average
Asset Quality Ratio (A)			
Net NPA'S to Net Advances Ratio	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have remarkablely differentiation in Net NPA'S to Net Advances Ratio
Net NPA to Total Assets Ratio	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have remarkablely differentiation in Net NPA to Total Assets Ratio
Fundings to Total Assets Ratio	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have remarkablely differentiation in Fundings to Total Assets Ratio
% .change in Net NPAs	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have no remarkablely differentiation in % .change in npa test

All togetherScrutiny of AQ as per the R.P.	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have remarkablely differentiation in All togetherScrutiny of AQ as per the R.P.
All togetherScrutiny of AQ as per the average	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained privatizedbanks have no remarkablely differentiation in All togetherScrutiny of AQ as per the average
Regulatement Quality Ratios (M)			
Business per Employee Ratio	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have no remarkablely differentiation in capital business per employee test.
Profit per Employee Ratio	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have remarkablely differentiation in profit per employee test.
Total Advances to Total Deposits Ratio	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have remarkablely differentiation in advance to deposited test.
Return on Net worth Ratio	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have remarkablely differentiation in return on net worth test
All togetherScrutiny of MQ as per R.P.	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have no remarkablely differentiation in regulatement quality test on the bases of R.P..
All togetherScrutiny of MQ as per average	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have no remarkablely differentiation in regulatement quality test on the bases of C.T..
Earning Capacity Ratio (E)			

Return on Assets	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained bank have no remarkablely differentiation in Return on Assets Ratio test
Interest Income to Total Income	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have remarkablely differentiation in Interest Income to Total Income test.
Net Interest Margin	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have remarkablely differentiation in net interest margin
Operating Profit to Total Income	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have remarkablely differentiation in operating profit margin test.
Net Profit Margin	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have no remarkablely differentiation in Net Profit Margin test
All togetherScrutiny of EC as per R.P.	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have remarkablely differentiation in earning quality test as per R.P.
All togetherScrutiny of EC as per average	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have no remarkablely differentiation in earning quality test as per average
Liquidity Position Ratio (L)			
Liquid Assets to Total Assets	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have remarkablely differentiation in Liquid Assets to Total Assets
Liquid Assets to Total Deposits	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have no remarkablely differentiation in Liquid Assets to Total Deposits Ratio test

Approved Securities to Total Fundings	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have remarkablely differentiation in Government and Approved Securities to Total Assets Ratio
Liquid Assets to Demand Deposits	H1	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have remarkablely differentiation in Liquid Assets to Demand Deposits Ratio
All togetherScrutiny of LR as per R.P.	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have no remarkablely differentiation in All together liquidity regulatement test as per R.P.
All togetherScrutiny of LR as per average	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have no remarkablely differentiation in All together liquidity regulatement test as per average
All togetherC.A.M.E.L.Scrutiny as per the R.P. parameter			
As per R.P. parameter	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have remarkablely differentiation in All togetherC.A.M.E.L. ratio test as per R.P.
All togetherC.A.M.E.L.Scrutiny as per the average parameter			
As per R.P. parameter	H0	OBTAINED	It is determined that all the obtained banks have no remarkablely differentiation in All togetherC.A.M.E.L. ratio test as per average

7.4 RECOMANDATION OR SUGESSIONS:

For progress of pecuniary execution of chosen public area and private area banks, following ideas arises for thought and consideration.

(A) Currently, the Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) appears satisfactory, yet considering Basel-III requirements and existing NPAs, banks can take a number of actions to bolster their capital base and enhance adequacy:

1. Increase capital through equity or debt issuance.

2. Seek government or pecuniary assistance to boost capital.
3. Retain earnings to strengthen reserves.
4. Rally asset quality to reduce jeopardy.

Banks can enhance CAR by increasing regulatory capital (numerator) and mitigating jeopardy associated with weighted assets (denominator). Observing CAR is pivotal to safeguard sufficient buffers against potential losses.

(B) Addressing asset quality, there's a requisitefor RBI to enforce stringent standards to reduce NPAs. Privatizedbanks must reduce their Total Funding against Total Assets ratio and adopt strategic pricing for services to minimize revenue leakage. They should optimize earnings from fees like those from letters of credit and guarantees inside prudential limits.

In an economy driven by banks, asset quality remains pivotal as it influences credit flow to productive zones, particularly critical during economic recovery. Recent data specifys noticeable rallyment in asset quality, notably during the pandemic span. Valuing this rallyment's sustainaptitude is pivotal. Timely loan recovery has always been vigorous for pecuniaryarrengement sustainaptitude. Post-liberalization, a number of loan recovery mechanisms have been developed, leading to a decline in Gross Nonperforming Assets (GNPAs) in recent times.

(C) Regarding Regulatement Coherence, the review specified that some banks are not maximizing their resources meritoriously. Profit per employee ratios in certain banks are notably low. Therefore, it's pivotal for public zone banks to enhance devision coherence by either boosting business through incentives and training for employees or by reducing costs.

Improving your bank's coherence involves eliminating unnecessary pecuniaryoperations that drain time and resources. Focusing on core strengths enables streamlined operations and scalaptitude. Whether aiming to grow a community bank or reduce operational expenses, refining bank operations is key to long-term success.

(D) In the case of PrivatizedBanks, revenue-based income is favorable, but their earnings from operating profit to Average Working Assets and non-interest income (for instance fees, commissions, etc.) are relatively low. PrivatizedBanks perform well in terms of Net Interest Margin to Total Assets but requisiterallyment in their Return on Assets Ratio.

To enhance pecuniaryvigor and coherence, banks should focus on increasing revenue, adopting technology, streamlining operations, managing costs meritoriously, and implementing vigorous process rallyment initiatives. These steps will help rally their cost-to-income ratio and All togetherpecuniaryexecution.

(E) A higher liquidity level specifys lower profitaptitude, in whichas low liquidity can lead to credit losses. Banks retain excess liquid assets (liquidity) relative to their deposits or total assets. It's pivotal for banks to deploy their liquidity in ways that maximize profitaptitude.

The liquidity ratio of an organization extents its aptitude to reach current devoirs with current assets. Companies can enhance their liquidity ratios by employing cash regulatement strategies, reducing overhead costs, and managing liabilities. However, it's salient to note that an excessively high liquidity ratio may not always be advantageous.

(F) To enhance their competitiveness, banks should focus on optimizing their execution. Findings from the survey specify that some banks are not utilizing their resources optimally. Therefore, banks requisiteto rally resource utilization to increase their coherence.

(G) Some banks exhibit poor execution in terms of profitaptitude and asset quality. These issues can be addressed through better portfolio regulatement. The survey revealed that banks with a higher amount of fundings in government securities have lower rates of nonperforming assets. Meritoriousportfolio regulatement is indispensable to increase revenue and achieve an optimal balance between returns and jeopardy.

(H) Innovation has profoundly impacted all zones universally, containing the pecuniaryzone. Technology not only enhances service coherence but also reduces costs. Banks have been relatively slow in adopting innovation and cost reduction extents. There is a pressing requisitefor banks to leverage technology, for instance info technology and e-commerce, to transform their deposits into advances and rally operational coherence.

(I) Banks should mitigate their Nonperforming Assets (NPAs) by implementing a number of extents inside the configuration of RBI regulations. Banks should prioritize certain zones for loans and advances. They might opt for dispense loans over corporate loans to reduce NPAs.

(J) Banks should leverage their devision network to attrperformlow-cost deposits and enhance their arcade regulatement strategies. Developing appropriate instruments for raising funds will be pivotal in managing arcade dynamics meritoriously.

7.5SIGNIFICANCE

- The utilization of the C.A.M.E.L. rating configuration serves as an meritoriousutensil for considering the pecuniarystrengths of banks, aiding internal considerments by regulatement. Internationally, a number of academic studies have explored the usefulness of confidential regulatory data in supervising banks.

- The study provides deeper future visions into the pecuniaryexecution of obtained banks as captured by C.A.M.E.L. ratings spanning a decade from 2013-2014 to 2022-2023.

- The study suggestss future visions into the relativeexecution of obtained privatizedbanks through cross-zoneal comparisons using statistical utensils, facilitating conclusions on the significance of changes in bank execution across zones.

- The study furnishes pertinent info about the pecuniary vigorousness of banks to stakeholders for instance financiars, creditors, clients, shareholders, and internal bank regulatement

7.6 LIMITATIONS

There were a number of limitations inherent in the study.

Firstly, the study relied entirely on ratios derived from income statements and balance sheets.

Moreover, the study was constrained to a span of ten years.

The sample size was limited to ten privatized banks in India.

7.7 SCOPE OF FUTURE STUDY

Conducting a similar layout money onigation on different category of banks in India, for instance Public zone Banks, cooperative Banks, gramin banks, and bank outside Indias, using the "C.A.M.E.L." parameter over a number of time spans can provide valuable future visions into their pecuniaryexecution and aptitude. Each type of bank may have unique challenges and strengths, and scrutiny them through the C.A.M.E.L.configuration can help in considering their regulatement quality, asset quality, capital adequacy, earnings capaptitude, and liquidity position.

7.8 CONCLUSION

Here, we have R.P.ed ten obtained privatizedbanks based on their C.A.M.E.L. variable strengths linked to asset holdings. Ranking these banks is inherently challenging as Explications of the ratios used can fluctuate widely. This analytical approach simplifies complex pecuniaryinfo, presenting a reader-friendly version that facilitates indulgent of the pecuniarydynamics among key players in the banking zone. The R.P.ing arrengementremarkablely aids in valuing and scrutiny bank pecuniarydata, making it more admittance.I.B.le to a broader audience.

Therefore, based on this specific dataset, it can be observed that some privatizedbanks hold the highest positions on the list, demonstrating excellent execution across sufficiency extents for instance Capital Adequacy, Asset Quality, and Regulatement Coherence. Conversely, other banks R.P. lower, indicating lower pecuniarysufficiency in comparison. This highlights the requisitefor banks with lower R.P.ings to focus on improving key criteria.

While these rallyments are pivotal for enhancing bank adequacy, they may sometimes conflict with the main purpose of banks is lending at lower rates and give more focus on priority zone lending. Regarding unification, using the parameters of the C.A.M.E.L. structure, we observe that many banks are moving towards unification, albeit not for the short term but rather for long term. Most of these banks operate inside a similar position range. However, their assets and other factors fluctuate remarkablely, and they should not be solely judged which is based on the absolute values of the C.A.M.E.L. ratios. it's evident that the progress rate of of private bank at a faster pace and are poised for rapid expansion.