

# **Bank Performance During the Crisis**

**“This Time is the Same: Using Bank Performance in 1998 to Explain Bank Performance During the Recent Financial Crisis”**

*R. Fahlenbrach, R. Prilmeier, R. Stulz*

**“Safety-Net Benefits Conferred on Difficult-to-Fail-and-Unwind Banks in the US and EU Before and During the Great Recession”**

*S. Carbo-Valverde, E. Kane, F. Rodriguez-Fernandez*

discussion by

**G. Udell**

# Session Overview

- **An alternative session title:**

*We shudda known! ... (?)*

- **What the papers tell us:**

- Banking has recidivists.

- Markets/volatility tell us something about bank behavior.

- **Paper specific comments**

# Fahlenbrach, Prilmeier, Stulz (FPS)

- **Paper summary – key results**
  - Bank returns during 1998 crisis predict returns during current crisis
  - Effect driven by larger banks, but no same-CEO effect
  - Explores underlying common characteristics of recidivists:
    - Reliance on short-term financing
    - Rapid growth in 3 preceding years
    - More leverage

# Comments on FPS

- **Paper's main results quite persuasive**
  - **Results robust**
  - *We shudda known(?)*
    - **Didn't we suspect that Citi was a repeat offender?**
  - **Why didn't supervisors use this as a tool?**
    - **Why did we let Citigroup load up on SIVs/ABCP conduits?**
      - **Where were the firewalls?**

# Comments on FPS

- **Not so clear that the common factors identified in the paper tell the whole story**
  - As authors point out, these “are not sufficient to explain our result ...”
  - Missing from the list of examined factors are asset-side characteristics, most notably:
    - Real estate exposure
- **Was it Citi’s short-term funding of its SIVs or**
  - Was it the assets themselves (Subprime CDOs)?, or
  - Was it the liquidity and default guarantees from the bank sub (Acharya and Schnabl 2009)
- **What about securitization and the adoption of the “originate-to-distribute” model after the S&L demise? (e.g., Rosen 2011)**

# Comments on FPS

- **What about commercial real estate?**
  - **Construction loans have long been viewed as the riskiest component of bank loan portfolios**
  - **Construction lending exposure doubled**

	<u>2000</u>	<u>2007</u>
Small banks	7%	16%
Large banks	4%	7%

- **This does not look like *ex post* bad luck.**
- **Construction lending REITs in 1974!**

# Comments on FPS

- **What is the root cause for the asset/liability decisions associated with residivism?**
  - Some banks routinely exploit safety net benefits (Carbo-Valverde, Kane and Rodriguez-Fernandez 2011)
  - Would this be associated with lip service to risk management (Ellul and Yerramilli 2010)?
  - How long does a residivism last?
- **What about institutional memory?**
  - What causes an institutional memory?
    - Maybe factors driving institutional memory (other than the CEO) differ across banks.
  - There is a short literature on this
    - e.g., Berger and Udell (2004) found some evidence in commercial lending that banks “forget” over time.
- **What about rapid growth?**
  - There is some literature about growth and the S&Ls
    - *History of the Eighties: Lessons for the Future* (1997)
    - Why didn't regulators key on this?

# Carbo-Valverde, Kane, Rodriguez-Fernandez (CKR)

- **Paper summary**

- Uses contingent claims framework to estimate *ex ante* benefits from leverage and volatility

- Analyzes links between benefits and DFU status

- Finds that:

- Benefits significant and higher in EU
    - Benefits are related to DFU status

- Concludes that regulators should contain benefits by focusing on volatility as well as leverage

# Comments on CKR

- ***We shudda known!*** -- **Shouldn't we have known that there was information in a contingent claims analysis?**
  - As the authors point, the technology they use has been around for two decades.
  - Clearly regulators had the expertise.
    - Eg., TRASH section at the Fed
    - Maybe they didn't generate this information?
  - Did we know that it would map this well to *ex post* outcomes?
    - No. This is the contribution of the paper
  - But, we certainly had plenty of reason to believe that a contingent claims approach was informative

# Comments on CKR

- **Would we have been better off if we had used the CKR approach? i.e., Would we have done things differently?**
  - On this point I think the authors could have gone further.
  - The answer partially depends on whether the CKR approach would have provided additional information that regulators didn't otherwise have.

# Comments on CKR

- **Some key questions and issues:**

- What would the incremental value of a contingent claims analysis have been if we had implemented Basle II a decade earlier?

- What would the incremental value of a contingent claim analysis have been if regulators had used the information they had about observable portfolio allocation changes

- Rapid growth in MBS/CDO exposure
    - Rapid growth in CRE exposure (see above)

- The CKR analysis is at the BHC level – and, regulators in the U.S. seemed to believe that MBS/CDO exposure in SIV/ABCP conduits was fire walled

- But SIVs and ABCP conduits not firewalled (Acharya and Schnabl 2009).
    - Regulators appeared to believe in 1974 that construction loans in REITs were commercial loans.

- What about risks unknown to regulators and the market?

- E.g., counterparty risk at AIG?

# Comments on CKR

- **Suggestions**

- **Why limit the analysis to a binary variable for DFU?**

- Why not a continuous variable for the amount of assistance?
    - It would be interesting to see the extent to which the safety net benefits measured before the crisis mapped to *ex post* taxpayer costs.

- **How powerful is a contingent claims approach compared to other approaches**

- A horse race against other proposed tools
      - The recidivism factor (Fahlenbrach, Prilmeier, Stulz 2011)
      - The non-interest income factor (Brunnermeier, Dong, Palia (2011)
      - Systemic risk measures (Adrian, Brunnermeier 2008, Acharya et al. 2010)

# Comments on CKR

- **Other Suggestions**

- Consider adding an adjustment for sovereign debt exposure to your assessment of aid to EU DFU banks

- Add Federal Reserve assistance

- Consider assessing against calculated SCAP gaps (in a non-binary analysis)

- Consider other measures for regulatory capture