

# Assessment of Bank Persero's Health Level Using The RGEC Method In 2018

Dachlevie Riza

Master's Degree Program in Accounting  
Indonesian College of Economics  
Jakarta, Indonesia  
<sup>1</sup>dachlevie@gmail.com

Iman Suriawinata

Indonesian College of Economics  
Jakarta, Indonesia  
iman.suriawinata@stei.ac.id

M. Anhar

Indonesian College of Economics  
Jakarta, Indonesia  
m.anhar@ymail.com

*Submitted* : 11 March 2021

*Revision* : 05 April 2021

*Publish* : 21 June 2021

**Abstract**— Public confidence in choosing a bank as a business partner based on health indicators Bank that existed at the bank. The research objective was to assess the soundness level of state-owned banks or HIMBARA, namely Bank Mandiri, Bank BNI'46, Bank Rakyat Indonesia and Bank Tabungan Negara using the RGEC method, namely the Risk Profile consisting of Net Performing Loans (NPL), Loan To Deposit (LDR), Good Corporate Governance (GCG), Earning namely Return on Assets (ROA), Net Interest Margin (NPM) and Adequacy Capital in 2018. the method's research is descriptive research quantitative is a comparative research. The data used in this research is secondary data, the data is obtained from the 2018 annual reports of each of the state banks' websites. The results of the research on the assessment of the health level of the state-owned banks, the two state-owned banks had the same Composite Rating Percentage value, namely 90% (Bank Mandiri and Bank Rakyat Indonesia) and the BNI'46 Bank Composite Health Rating Percentage value was 93.33% while the Rating Percentage value State Savings Bank Composite Health is 73.33%. Researcher's Conclusion 3 (three) state- owned banks, namely Bank Mandiri, Bank BNI'46 and Bank BRI are in the Very Healthy category, while 1 (one) state- owned bank, namely Bank BTN, is in the Healthy category.

**Keywords**— *Persero Bank, Health Level, RGEC*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Public confidence in choosing a bank as a business partner is based on the indicators of the health of the bank at the bank. The bank is a financial services business that collects funds from the public and distributes these funds in the form of providing loans or credit to the community, both individually and in the form of partnerships or legal entities.

From the moment the pitch two become on Indonesian banks is 1998 monetary crisis as a result of the weakening rupiah level reached Rp. 4,650, - even through the level of Rp. 17,000, - and deposit interest reached 60%, so that many banks were injected with liquidity by the government and closed banks (Monetary Crisis Memory 97/98 - Zulkifli Hasan, Chairman of the 2018 MPR).

In 2008 there was a crisis at Century Bank which resulted in decreased public confidence in saving at the bank, so that Bank Century was closed and this had caused panic among customers. The confusion that occurred caused customers to compete to withdraw their money at various small banks such as Bank Century This incident had an impact on several banks with a sound predicate that began to get involved in problems and increased liquidity risk (Statement by the Governor of BI Budiono 2009).

Of the two incidents, namely the 1998 monetary crisis and the 2008 Century Bank crisis, the government as the regulator tightened general bank supervision by maintaining the health of banks through bank health reports which must be reported every year, namely the January to June period. the end of July of the same year and the period from July to December are reported to be the end of January of the following year, in which all bank operational activities are guarded and supervised by the OJK. The health of the bank as a reference for the level of public trust is if the banking institution in carrying out its bank operations is running well, it is able to fulfill its obligations. And this effort is made to maintain the condition of the bank in order to be able to fight external crises and internal conditions is to maintain the health of the bank. The health of the bank must always be maintained by the bank management so that public trust can be maintained, the intermediation function can be carried out properly,

payment traffic runs smoothly and can carry out various policies from the government, especially monetary policy.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### A. Review of Previous Research Results

Nufus, et al [2] examined the health level of PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk during the period from 2013 to 2017. To determine the soundness of the bank was carried out by using descriptive research techniques with a quantitative approach to the financial statements of the Persero Company Bank Negara Indonesia Tbk. These variables and measurements consist of Risk Profile factors, Good Corporate Governance factors, Earning factors, Capital factors. The results show that the health level of the Pesero Bank Negara Indonesia Tbk, in 2013 to 2017 as measured using the RGEC approach can be said to be a healthy bank, where the Risk Profile factor assessed through NPL, LDR, Cash Ratio describes risk management that has been implemented by good; factors of Good Corporate Governance of Persero Company Bank Negara Indonesia Tbk. already have and implement very good corporate governance; The Earnings or Rentability factor, whose assessment consists of ROA, has increased and this indicates an increase in the number of assets owned by Bank BNI followed by an increase in profits obtained by Bank BNI. By using the CAR indicator, researchers prove that Bank BNI has a good capital factor, which is above the Bank Indonesia regulation of 8%.

Research by Ryan et al . [6] , examined using 3 (three) assessment factors in analysing the health level of one of the state-owned banks, namely PT. Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk. 2013 - 2016 period, which includes the Risk Profile factor, namely the ratio of Non-Performing Loans (NPL) and Loan to Deposit (LDR), Profitability (Earning) factors, namely the ratio of Return to Assets (ROA) and Net Interest Margin (NIM), and the Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) factor. The Good Corporate Governance (GCG) factor is not analysed because it involves bank secrecy. The research method used in this research is descriptive research method with a quantitative approach. The research location was conducted at PT Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk. listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX). The results showed that PT Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk. as a state-owned bank that has the largest assets, measured based on the ratio of Non-Performing Loans (NPL), Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR), Return to Assets ROA, Net Interest Margin (NIM) and Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) get Composite Rating 1 with predicate "very healthy". This reflects the condition of PT Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk. who are considered very capable of dealing with significant negative effects from changes in business conditions and other external factors, however if a weakness occurs it can be said that in general the weakness is insignificant

### B. Foundation Theory

In carrying out the three functions of the bank, the bank is obliged to refer to Law no. 7 of 1992 in particular Article 29 as amended by Law no. 10 of 1998 [7] concerning Banking, namely, banks are required to maintain a soundness level in accordance with the provisions of capital adequacy, asset quality, management quality, liquidity, profitability and

solvency, as well as other aspects related to bank business and are required to conduct business activities in accordance with the prudential principle. Based on POJK No 4 / POJK.3 / 2016 [3] About Health Assessment Commercial Bank and SEOJK No. 14/SEOJK.03/2017 [3] declared a Commercial Bank shall assess their own health stages (Self-assessment), banks are required to conduct assessments (self-assessment) of the Bank with using a Risk-based Bank Rating (RBBR) approach both individually and on a consolidated basis, with the scope of the assessment covering the following factors: Risk profile: NPL and LDR , Good Corporate Governance (GCG), Profitability (earnings ), ROA and NIM, and Capital to produce a Bank Soundness Level Composite Rating.

#### 3.1. Credit Risk using the Non-Performing Loan (NPL) ratio.

Is the ratio used to calculate the percentage of the number of non-performing loans faced by a bank. NPL can be formulated as follows:

$$NPL = \frac{(Substandard Credit + Doubtful + Loss)}{Total Credit Disbursed} \times 100\% \quad (1)$$

Source: SEOJK Number 14/SEOJK.03/2017

Non-performing loans are all loans to non-bank third parties with a collectability of substandard, doubtful, and loss. Total credit is credit to non-bank third parties.

If the ratio calculation results are lower, the NPL at the bank is healthier, and vice versa.

TABLE I. NPL COMPOSITE RATING MATRIX

Rating	Criteria	Predicate
1	0% < NPL ≤ 2%	Very healthy
2	2% < NPL ≤ 3.5%	Healthy
3	3.5% < NPL ≤ 5%	Fairly Healthy
4	5% < NPL ≤ 8%	Unwell
5	> 8%	Not healthy

<sup>a</sup> Source: PJOK No. 4/ PJOK.3/2016

#### 3.2. Liquidity Risk

Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR) is the ratio used to assess the level of liquidity of a bank, by comparing the credit channeled with the funds collected from the public so that the bank's ability to pay its short-term obligations can be seen. LDR can be formulated as follows:

$$LDR = \frac{Credit}{Third Party Funds} \times 100\% \quad (2)$$

Source: SEOJK Number 14/SEOJK.03/2017

TABLE II. LDR COMPOSITE RATING MATRIX

Rating	Criteria	Predicate
1	50% < LDR ≤ 75%	Very Healthy
2	75% < LDR ≤ 85%	Healthy
3	85% < LDR ≤ 100%	Fairly Healthy
4	100% < LDR ≤ 120%	Unwell

5	> 120%	Not Healthy
---	--------	-------------

<sup>a</sup>. Source: PJOK No. 4/PJOK.3/2016

## 2. Good Corporate Governance (GCG)

The GCG factor assessment is an assessment of the quality of bank management on the implementation of GCG principles. The principles of GCG and the focus of assessment on the implementation of GCG principles are guided by Bank Indonesia regulations regarding the implementation of GCG for commercial banks by taking into account the characteristics and complexity of the bank's business. The principles of good corporate governance (GCG) include:

- 2.1. Accountability (*Accountability*)
- 2.2. Accountability (*Responsibility*)
- 2.3. Openness (*Transparency*)
- 2.4. Fairness (*Fairness*)
- 2.5. Independency (*Independency*)

TABLE III. LDR COMPOSITE RATING MATRIX

Rating	Criteria	Predicate
1	$81\% \leq GCG \leq 100\%$	Very healthy
2	$61\% \leq GCG \leq 80\%$	Healthy
3	$41\% \leq GCG \leq 60\%$	Fairly Healthy
4	$21\% \leq GCG \leq 40\%$	Unwell
5	$0\% \leq GCG \leq 20\%$	Not healthy

<sup>b</sup>. Source: PJOK No. 4/PJOK.3/2016

## 3. Earnings (profitability)

Earnings is an indicator of a bank's health assessment in terms of profitability. Profitability assessment indicators are ROA (Return On Assets) and NIM (Net Interest Margin). The characteristics of a bank in terms of profitability are the bank's performance in generating profits, the stability of the components of profit in increasing capital and the prospects for future profits.

The assessment of the earnings factor is based on ratios, namely:

### 1. Return On Assets (ROA)

Return On Assets (ROA) is a ratio used to measure a bank's ability to obtain net profits associated with dividend payments. ROA can be formulated as follows :

$$ROA = \frac{\text{Profit After Tax}}{\text{Total Assets}} \times 100\% \quad (3)$$

Source: SEOJK Number 14/SEOJK.03/2017

TABLE IV. ROA COMPOSITE RATING MATRIX

Rating	Criteria	Predicate
1	> 1.5%	Very Healthy

2	$1.25 < ROA \leq 1.5\%$	Healthy
3	$0.5\% < ROA \leq 1.25\%$	Fairly Healthy
4	$0\% \leq ROA \leq 0.50\%$	Unwell
5	$< 0\%$	Not Healthy

<sup>c</sup>. Source: PJOK No. 4/PJOK.3/2016

## 2. Net Interest Margin

Net Interest Margin (NIM), including an indicator in determining profitability ( Earning ) related to bank net interest income, namely credit interest income less public funds interest expense, can be formulated as follows:

$$NIM = \frac{\text{Net Interest Income}}{\text{Average Earning Assets}} \times 100\% \quad (4)$$

TABLE V. NIM COMPOSITE RATING MATRIX

Rating	Criteria	Predicate
1	> 3%	Very healthy
2	$2\% < NIM \leq 3\%$	Healthy
3	$1.5\% < NIM \leq 2\%$	Fairly Healthy
4	$1\% < NIM \leq 1.5\%$	Unwell
5	$\leq 1\%$	Not healthy

<sup>d</sup>. Source: PJOK No. 4/PJOK.3/2016

## 4. Capital: Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR)

Bank capital refers to the copy of POJK Number 4/POJK.03/2016 [3] concerning Amendments to POJK Number 11/POJK.03/2016 [4] concerning the Minimum Capital Requirement for Commercial Banks and POJK No.12/ POJK.03/2020 [5] Concerning Consolidation of Commercial Banks.

Capital or capital has indicators including the ratio of the capital adequacy ratio and the bank's capital adequacy to anticipate potential losses in accordance with the risk profile accompanied by very strong capital management in accordance with the characteristics, business scale and complexity of the bank's business.

Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) or capital adequacy ratio, the calculation formula is as follows:

$$CAR = \frac{\text{Capital}}{\text{Risk-weighted assets}} \times 100\% \quad (5)$$

TABLE VI. CAR COMPOSITE RATING MATRIX

Rating	Criteria	Predicate
1	$\geq 12\%$	Very healthy
2	$9\% \leq CAR < 12\%$	Healthy
3	$8\% \leq CAR < 9\%$	Fairly Healthy
4	$6\% < CAR < 8\%$	Unwell
5	$\leq 6\%$	Not healthy

<sup>e</sup>. Source: PJOK No. 4/PJOK.3/2016

### III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### A. *Research Approach*

This research is a comparative study, namely the type of research that leads to differences in variables in an aspect under study, conducted to determine how the influence of the independent variables, namely non-performing loans (NPL), loan to deposit (LDR), good corporate governance (GCG), return on assets (ROA), net interest margin (NIM) and capital or capital adequacy ratio (CAR) on the dependent variable, namely bank health. The data used is a quantitative approach or the data is in numeric or numeric form and the data required for research is data from the 2018 financial statements. The form of this research is quantitative descriptive research that uses numerical and graphic methods to identify a number of data, summarizes the information contained in the data and present the information in the desired form Kuncoro, Mudrajad, [1].

This type of research is intended to obtain information on the health of banks based on annual reports: Bank Mandiri, Bank BNI, Bank BRI and Bank Tabungan Negara 2018. The research will focus on reports on GCG implementation and financial reports to determine financial ratios so that can determine the soundness of the bank.

The research data will be analysed and it will be concluded whether the bank is in a very healthy, healthy, fairly healthy, unhealthy or unhealthy condition based on the composite rating obtained.

#### B. *Data Analysis*

The data analysis technique used in this research is descriptive data analysis technique by analysing financial statements using the RGEC method with the approach of the Financial Services Authority Regulation No.4 / POJK.03 / 2016 [3] concerning risk-based assessment of the soundness of commercial banks. The data collected is then processed using a formula in accordance with the operational definition. The steps used to assess the soundness of a bank for each factor and its components are as follows:

- a) Collecting data from financial reports and reports on the implementation of GCG for Bank Mandiri, Bank BNI, Bank BRI and Bank BTN related to research variables.
- b) Ranking the ratio of each factor, namely the ratio of NPL, LDR, GCG, NIM, ROA and CAR with ratings of Very Healthy, Healthy, Fairly Healthy, Unhealthy and Unhealthy.
- c) The final step of assessing the health level of the bank to determine the composite rating for the assessment of the health level of Bank Mandiri, Bank BNI, Bank BRI and Bank BTN in 2018 is to calculate the weight obtained from the overall composite rating (PK) of each assessment component as follows:
  - 1) Rank 1 (PK1) = Very Healthy with a weight of 5

Rating 1: reflects the condition of the Bank which is generally very healthy so that it is considered very capable of dealing with significant negative impacts from changes in business conditions and other external factors as reflected in the rating of the assessment factors, including risk profile, implementation of Good Corporate Governance, profitability, and general capital. very good. In the event that there are weaknesses, in general these weaknesses are not significant.

- 2) Rank 2 = Healthy with a weight of 4

Rating 2: reflects the condition of the Bank which is generally healthy so that it is considered capable of facing significant negative impacts from changes in business conditions and other external factors as reflected in the rating of assessment factors, including risk profile, implementation of Good Corporate Governance, profitability, and generally sound capital. If there are weaknesses, in general these weaknesses are less significant.

- 3) Rank 3 = Fairly Healthy with a weighting value of 3

Rating 3: reflects the condition of the Bank which is generally quite healthy so that it is considered capable of dealing with significant negative impacts from changes in business conditions and other external factors as reflected in the rating of the assessment factors, including risk profile, implementation of Good Corporate Governance, profitability, and general capital. pretty good. In the event that there are weaknesses, in general these weaknesses are quite significant and if they are not successfully resolved by the management it can disrupt the continuity of the Bank's business.

- 4) Rank 4 = Unhealthy with a weight of 2

Rating 4: reflects the condition of the Bank which is generally unhealthy so that it is deemed unable to face significant negative impacts from changes in business conditions and other external factors as reflected in the rating of the assessment factors, including risk profile, implementation of Good Corporate Governance, profitability, and general capital. not good. There are weaknesses that are generally significant and cannot be properly resolved by management as well as disturbing the continuity of the Bank's business.

- 5) Rank 5 = Unhealthy with a weighted value of 1

Rating 5: reflects the condition of the Bank which is generally unhealthy so that it is considered unable to face any significant negative effects from changes in business conditions and other external factors as reflected in the rating of the assessment factors, including risk profile, implementation of Good Corporate Governance, profitability, and generally less capital. good. There are weaknesses that are generally very significant so that to overcome them requires financial support from shareholders or

sources of funds from other parties to strengthen the financial condition of the Bank.

f. Source: PJOK No. 4/PJOK.3/2016

The smaller order of factor ratings reflects a better condition of the Bank.

#### IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

##### A. Bank Soundness Rating Analysis

From the results of the assessment of the health ratings of 4 (four) state-owned banks using the RGEC method, the researchers made a summary as follows:

- d) The composite rating that has been obtained from multiplying each table for each state-owned bank is then determined by weight by percentage. To calculate the weight of each factor, the formula used is as follows:

TABLE VIII. RESULTS OF THE SUMMARY OF SOUNDNESS LEVEL OF STATE-OWNED BANKS IN 2018

$$TS = \frac{NPL + LDR + GCG + ROA + NIM + CAR}{30} \times 100\% \quad (6)$$

RGEC FACTOR	INDEPENDENT		BNI		BRI		BTN	
	% SCORE	COMPOSITE RANKING	% SCORE	COMPOSITE RANKING	% SCORE	COMPOSITE RANKING	% SCORE	COMPOSITE RANKING
<b>RISK PROFILE</b>								
NPL	2.79	PK2	1.90	PK1	2.14	PK2	2.82	PK2
LDR	93.93	PK3	88.80	PK3	89.57	PK3	103.25	PK5
<b>GOOD CORPORATE GOVERNANCE (GCG)</b>								
GCG	93.86	PK1	88.38	PK1	89.06	PK1	87.97	PK1
<b>EARNING (PROFITABILITY)</b>								
ROA	3.17	PK1	2.80	PK1	3.68	PK1	1.34	PK4
NIM	5.52	PK1	5.30	PK1	7.45	PK1	4.32	PK1
<b>CAPITAL</b>								
CAPITAL	20.96	PK1	18.50	PK1	21.21	PK1	18.21	PK1
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>								
TOTAL SCORE		90.00		93.33		90.00		73.33
RESULTS		VERY HEALTHY		VERY HEALTHY		VERY HEALTHY		HEALTHY

What is meant by the total composite value is the sum of the weighted values of the 6 (six) variables resulting from the formula for each of the 6 variable ratios (1. NPL, 2. LDR, 3. GCG, 4. ROA, 5. NIM and 6. CAR) if the percentage. Can be seen in Formula (1) and Table I regarding NPL; Formula (2) and Table II regarding LDR; Table III regarding GCG; Formula (3) and Table IV regarding ROA; Formula (4) and Table V regarding NIM and Formula (5) and Table VI regarding CAR with categories:

- a) PK 1 (Very Healthy) weight value 5
- b) PK 2 (Healthy) weight value 4
- c) PK 3 (Fairly Healthy) weighted value 3
- d) PK 4 (Unhealthy) weight value 2
- e) PK 5 (Unhealthy) weight value 1

Total Composite Value Overall is 6 variables with each weighting the same value, namely 5 (five) or 6 variables multiplied by 5 for a total of 30 (thirty).

So that from the total composite value divided by the total composite value as a whole in times 100%, it can be seen that the overall bank soundness rating is whether the bank is:

- a) Very Healthy (PK1)
- b) Healthy (PK2)
- c) Fairly Healthy (PK3)
- d) Less Healthy (PK4) and
- e) Unhealthy (PK5)

The weight / percentage for determining the composite rating of all components is as follows:

TABLE VII. CAR COMPOSITE RATING MATRIX

Rating	Criteria	Predicate
86-100	PK 1	Very healthy
71-85	PK 2	Healthy
61-70	PK 3	Fairly Healthy
41-60	PK 4	Unwell
≤40	PK 5	Not healthy

From the summary above (Table VII) The percentage Composite Rating of Bank Mandiri and Bank BRI has the same value, namely 90% with very healthy results, but the results of the assessment of the two banks for NPL, GCG, Bank Mandiri ROA are better, but for NIM, BRI Bank CAR is better.

The 4 (four) state-owned banks have 3 (three) banks that have VERY HEALTHY results, namely Bank Mandiri, Bank Negara Indonesia and Bank Rakyat Indonesia. This means that it reflects the condition of the Bank which is generally very healthy so that it is considered very capable of dealing with significant negative effects from changes in business conditions and other external factors as reflected in the rating of the assessment factors, including risk profile, implementation of Good Corporate Governance, profitability, and capital that are generally very good. In terms of weaknesses, in general these weaknesses are not significant (Summary Table), however, 1 (one) state-owned bank, namely Bank Tabungan Negara has HEALTHY results. This means that it reflects the condition of the Bank which is generally healthy so that it is considered capable of facing significant negative effects from changes in business conditions and other external factors as reflected in the rating of the assessment

factors, including risk profile, implementation of Good Corporate Governance, profitability, and generally good capital. If there are weaknesses, in general these weaknesses are less significant (Summary Table).

## V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

### A. Conclusion

The author concludes from the results of the assessment of the health level of a Persero Bank using the RGEC method which consists of 6 variables, namely Non Performing Loans (NPL), Good Corporate Governance (GCG), Return on Assets (ROA), Net Interest Margin (NIM) and Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) in 2018 are as follows:

1. Assessment of NPL Composite Rating.  
Three (3) state-owned banks, namely: Bank Mandiri; Bank Rakyat Indonesia and Bank Tabungan Negara with a composite rating of PK2 means that the condition of the three state-owned banks is healthy while for Bank Negara Indonesia, the composite rating is PK1, which means that the condition of the bank is very healthy.
2. LDR Composite Rating Assessment.  
Three (3) state-owned banks, namely: Bank Mandiri; Bank Negara Indonesia and Bank Rakyat Indonesia with a composite rating of PK3 means that the condition of the three state-owned banks is quite healthy while for the State savings bank with a composite rating is PK5, which means that the condition of the bank is not healthy.
3. Assessment of GCG Composite Rating.  
The four (4) state banks for CGC with a composite rating are PK1 which means they are very healthy.
4. ROA Composite Rating Assessment .  
Three (3) state-owned banks, namely: Bank Mandiri; Bank Negara Indonesia and Bank Rakyat Indonesia with a composite rating of PK1 means that the condition of the three state-owned banks is very healthy, while for Bank Tabungan Negara with a composite rating of PK4, it means that the condition of the bank is not healthy.
5. Assessment of NIM Composite Rating and CAR Composite  
The four (4) state banks for NIM and CAR with a composite rating are PK1 which means they are very healthy.

### B. Suggestions

1. Based on the Risk Profile of the Net Performing Loan (NPL), PT. Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk., Which has an NPL of 2.79% and PT. Bank Tabungan Negara (Persero)

Tbk., Which has an NPL of 2.82%, should be more selective in lending in order to reduce problem loans. Actions are taken to reduce the NPL to get to the level of 0 to 2% by approaching the customer for bank management so that we can find out what causes arrears on loan principal and credit interest so that bank management can provide solutions including restructuring for 1 year to pay the interest first after 1 year then pay the principal instalments or write off by selling the credit guarantee so that from the guarantee the customer can pay off the loan, both principal and interest, to avoid interest on credit, even the possibility of the customer getting excess proceeds from the sale of the guarantee with the loan.

2. Based on the Risk Profile (LDR), PT. State Savings Bank Tbk. those who have a Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR) of 103.25% in lending should ensure optimal use of public funds in order to anticipate if there is a risk of loss not to interfere with the bank's core capital. To reduce the LDR percentage to the level of 75%, management through the marketing funding team by increasing public funds for new customers, for example providing special interest rates for deposits of 3 months, 6 months and 12 months with a certain nominal and by means of a back to back loan, which means a deposit guarantee.

## References

- [1] Kuncoro, Mudrajad 2012. Manajemen Perbankan Teori dan Aplikasi. Yogyakarta: BPEE. Kuncoro, Mudrajad dan Suhardjono 2012. Manajemen Perbankan Teori dan Aplikasi. Yogyakarta: BPEE.
- [2] Nufus Khayatun, Triyanto Fani, dan Muchtar Awaluddin. 2019. Analisis Tingkat Kesehatan Bank Dengan Metode RGEC (Studi Kasus PT. Bank Negara Indonesia (Persero) Tbk. Jurnal Sekuritas ISSN:2581-2777 Vol.3 No.1, 76-96 Akreditasi SK No.005.25812777/jJL3.1/SK.ISSN/2017.09.
- [3] Otorisasi Jasa Keuangan, POJK No 4/POJK.3/2016 Tentang Penilaian Kesehatan Bank Umum dan SEOJK NOMOR 14/SEOJK.03/2017 dinyatakan Bank Umum wajib melakukan penilaian tahapan kesehatan sendiri (Self Assessment).
- [4] Otorisasi Jasa Keuangan, Peraturan Otorisasi Jasa Keuangan Nomor 34/POJK.03/2016 Tentang Perubahan Atas Peraturan Otorisasi Jasa Keuangan Nomor 11/POJK.03/2016 Tentang Kewajiban Penyediaan Modal Minimum Bank Umum.
- [5] Otorisasi Jasa Keuangan, Peraturan Otorisasi Jasa Keuangan Republik Indonesia Nomor 12/POJK.03/2020 Tentang Konsolidasi Bank Umum.
- [6] Ryan Hafidhin, Sri Mangesti, dan Zahroh ZA. 2018. Analisa Kesehatan Bank Dengan Menggunakan Metode Risk Profile, Earning and Capital (Studi pada PT. Bank Mandiri. Tbk. Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB))Vol. 57 No. 2 April 2018 administrasibisnis.studentjournal.ub.ac.id.
- [7] Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No. 10 Tahun 1998 Tentang Perubahan Undang-Undang No. 7 Tahun 1992 Tentang Perbankan yang di tanda tangani Presiden Republik Indonesia Bacharuddin Jusuf Habibie.