

Docket No. OCC-2025-0142-0001 addresses a proposed rule issued by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (collectively known as “the agencies”). The agencies supervise and regulate financial institutions with the goal of keeping a stable, fair, and resilient economy. The rule, *Prohibition on the use of Reputation Risk by Regulators*, establishes a federal standard prohibiting reputation risk as a factor in bank evaluations. I support the agencies proposed rule and believe that objective and transparent supervisory standards are necessary in maintaining a fair banking system. As someone who has grown up in an increasingly polarized political landscape shaped by social media and virality, I find it critical that regulatory oversight be grounded in clear, objective, and measurable supervisory standards.

Reputation risk is a vague and unreliable standard of measurement. Public perception is subjective, ever-changing, and unpredictable. This is evident in the rapid shifts in public opinion driven by social media trends, viral misinformation, and political polarization. Banking activities can quickly become controversial based on perception rather than objective risk. According to the Federal Register notice posted on Justia, “The agencies have not clearly explained how banks should measure the reputation risk from different activities, business partners, or clients, nor have the agencies clearly articulated the criteria for which activities, business partners, or clients are deemed to present reputation risk,” (Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 2025). The absence of clearly defined standards grants regulators excessive discretion, increasing the potential for inconsistent and biased reporting. When regulatory judgements are influenced by political considerations or public sentiment there is greater uncertainty for financial institutions and an increase in the risk of government overreach.

In contrast, other established forms of risk measurement such as credit risk, market risk, and liquidity risk are grounded in quantifiable data and clear, well-established, supervisory frameworks. These categories of risk allow regulators to evaluate using consistent metrics. It also allows banks and other financial institutions to focus on those risks instead of diverting resources towards determining a subjective reputational risk. When determining reputation risk it’s also important to note that other forms of measurement affect the level of reputation risk, “the following six factors that may affect reputational damage following an operational loss: bank riskiness, profitability, level of intangible assets, capitalization, size, the entity of the operational loss and the business units that suffered the operational loss,” (Fiordelisi, Soana, Schwizer, 2013). So using reputation risk along with other risk assessments is repetitive. In volume 9 of *European Research on Management and Business Economics* “Reputation, return and risk: A new approach” demonstrates that, “there are no significant differences between listed and not listed firms in Reputation Quotient concerning firms’ abnormal returns and firms’ systematic risk,” (Febra, Costa, Pereira, 2023). This also shows that reputation risk isn’t a reliable indicator of risk for federal regulators to use. It’s unnecessary and an inefficient use of resources that could be used elsewhere.

In conclusion, it is critical that regulatory programs are grounded in clear, objective, and measurable standards and that is why I am in support of *Prohibition on the use of Reputation*

Bibliography

“:: Prohibition on Use of Reputation Risk by Regulators, 48825-48835 [2025-19715] ::” 2025. Justia Regulation Tracker. 2025.
https://regulations.justia.com/regulations/fedreg/2025/10/30/2025-19715.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com.

“Agencies Issue Proposal to Prohibit Use of Reputation Risk by Regulators; FDIC Removes References to Reputation Risk from Examination and Other Materials | FDIC.gov.” 2025. Fdic.gov. 2025.
<https://www.fdic.gov/news/financial-institution-letters/2025/agencies-issue-proposal-prohibit-use-reputation-risk>.

Audi, Marc, and Razan Al Masri. 2024. “Examining the Impacts of Regulatory Framework on Risk in Commercial Banks in Emerging Economies.” *Journal of Business and Economic Options* 7 (2): 10–19. <https://resdojournals.com/index.php/jbeo/article/view/354>.

Conti-Brown, Peter , and Sean Vanatta. 2025. “View of Risk, Discretion, and Bank Supervision.” Columbia.edu. 2025.
<https://journals.library.columbia.edu/index.php/CBLR/article/view/14250/7831>.

Febra, Lígia, Magali Costa, and Fábio Pereira. 2023. “Reputation, Return and Risk: A New Approach.” *European Research on Management and Business Economics* 29 (1): 100207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2022.100207>.

Fiordelisi, Franco, Maria-Gaia Soana, and Paola Schwizer. 2013. “The Determinants of Reputational Risk in the Banking Sector.” *Journal of Banking & Finance* 37 (5): 1359–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2012.04.021>.

“Prohibition on Use of Reputation Risk by Regulators: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking | OCC.” 2025. OCC.gov. 2025.
<https://www.occ.treas.gov/news-issuances/bulletins/2025/bulletin-2025-30.html>.

“Regulations.gov.” 2025. Regulations.gov. 2025.
<https://www.regulations.gov/document/OCC-2025-0142-0001>.