Banking on the Edge: Liquidity Constraints and Illiquid Asset Risk

Joshua Bosshardt

Federal Housing Finance Agency

Ali Kakhbod

UC Berkeley

Farzad Saidi

University of Bonn & CEPR

April 5, 2024

Motivation

- Post-crisis liquidity regulations
 - Liquidity Coverage Ratio \rightarrow short-term liquidity stress
 - Net Stable Funding Ratio \rightarrow maturity mismatch

Motivation

- Post-crisis liquidity regulations
 - Liquidity Coverage Ratio \rightarrow short-term liquidity stress
 - Net Stable Funding Ratio \rightarrow maturity mismatch
- Financial-stability implications
 - How do liquidity regulations affect bank risk taking on remaining illiquid assets?
 - How does the effect depend on funding stability?
 ⇒ Trade-off between funding resilience over the short and long run

The Liquidity Coverage Ratio in the U.S.

- Requires BHCs to hold sufficient HQLA relative to net cash outflows over a 30-day stress period
- Eligibility
 - 100% LCR: assets >\$250 bn or foreign exposures >\$10 bn
 - 70% LCR: assets between \$50 bn and \$250 bn
- Timeline
 - 2013: proposal of U.S. implementation
 - Starting January 2015: phase-in of U.S. implementation

- Stable funding captured via investment in long-term bank bonds by insurance companies
 - Comprises $\frac{1}{6}$ of LCR banks' long-term funding



Non-banks should not be affected by the LCR

Bank bonds in insurance companies' portfolios



Channels by which liquidity risk interacts with credit risk

Date t=0: bank balance sheet

Liabilities

- Mass 1 of investors each invests 1 unit in the bank
- Deposits are insured with fixed payoff
- Fraction λ corresponds to unstable funding sources

Assets

- Liquidity regulation requires the bank to hold a fraction / of liquid assets
- Invest remainder in either safe or risky long-term assets
 - Both generate the same expected return μ
 - Risky assets are more volatile

Date *t*=1: liquidity shock

- With some probability, fraction λ of investors withdraw their 1 unit

- If the bank has insufficient liquid assets to pay the early investors, it can sell a fraction of its illiquid assets on the long-term debt market:
 - Safe assets sell at price *p*_s
 - Risky assets sell at a lower price $p_r < p_s$ (Morris and Shin, 2016; Duchin et al., 2016)

- Advantage of safe assets: better performance in liquidity shock state because of higher liquidation price
- Advantage of risky assets: better performance in normal times due to limited liability

Lemma

The bank's asset choice can be summarized by a threshold μ^* such that it invests in safe assets if $\mu > \mu^*$, and it invests in risky assets if $\mu < \mu^*$.

Bank asset choice: dependence on /

Proposition

There exists a threshold $I^*(\lambda)$ such that μ^* is decreasing in I for $I < I^*(\lambda)$ and μ^* is increasing in I for $I > I^*(\lambda)$. The threshold $I^*(\lambda)$ corresponds to the minimum level of liquidity at which the bank can survive liquidity stress if it invests in risky assets.



Proposition

Decreasing the fraction of unstable funding λ increases the range for I on which risk taking increases in the tightness of liquidity requirements: $\frac{dI^*(\lambda)}{d\lambda} > 0.$



Robustness

Bosshardt, Kakhbod, and Saidi

Liquidity Constraints and Illiquid Asset Risk

April 5, 2024

- Bank risk taking with their illiquid assets in response to tighter liquidity requirements (e.g., LCR introduction)
 - If they source more long-term funding (e.g., bank bonds)

 \Rightarrow Use granular, loan-level data to test this conjecture

Evidence on liquidity regulation and risk taking

Transaction-level data

- Syndicated loans from DealScan
 - U.S. banks to U.S. non-financial companies
 - Package-lead bank observations
 - Risk measures: stock-return volatility, z-score of borrower
- HMDA mortgage applications
 - U.S. banks to U.S. households
 - Risk measure: acceptance rate for high-LTI borrowers

- U.S. BHC balance sheets during 2010Q1-2019Q4 from Compustat Bank
- NAIC Schedule D Part 1: U.S. insurance company holdings of bank bonds
 - $lns.bonds/liabilities_{it-1y} \in [0, 100]$ to capture bank i's funding stability
 - Insurers' demand relevant for pricing of banks' long-term debt and resilience during crises (Koijen and Yogo, 2019; Coppola, 2022)

Summary statistics

Analysis at the level of a loan *I* granted by bank *i* to borrower *f* in industry j(f) at date *t*:

 $\begin{aligned} y_{l} &= \beta_{1}LCR_{i} \times Post_{t} + \beta_{2}LCR_{i} \times Post_{t} \times Ins.bonds/liabilities_{it-1y} \\ &+ \beta_{3}LCR_{i} \times Ins.bonds/liabilities_{it-1y} + \beta_{4}Post_{t} \times Ins.bonds/liabilities_{it-1y} \\ &+ \beta_{5}Ins.bonds/liabilities_{it-1y} + \psi_{i} + \phi_{j(f)t} + \underbrace{\gamma \mathbf{X}_{ift-1}}_{t=0} + \epsilon_{l} \end{aligned}$

e.g., avg. maturity of i's bonds

Analysis at the level of a loan *I* granted by bank *i* to borrower *f* in industry j(f) at date *t*:

 $\begin{aligned} y_{l} &= \beta_{1}LCR_{i} \times Post_{t} + \beta_{2}LCR_{i} \times Post_{t} \times Ins.bonds/liabilities_{it-1y} \\ &+ \beta_{3}LCR_{i} \times Ins.bonds/liabilities_{it-1y} + \beta_{4}Post_{t} \times Ins.bonds/liabilities_{it-1y} \\ &+ \beta_{5}Ins.bonds/liabilities_{it-1y} + \psi_{i} + \phi_{j(f)t} + \gamma \mathbf{X}_{ift-1} + \epsilon_{l} \end{aligned}$

e.g., avg. maturity of *i*'s bonds

 β_2 reflects insurers' demand, rather than supply:

- Need to rule out banks targeting long-term investors, e.g., maturity structure
- Bank bonds all carry similar capital requirements
- Insurers do not adjust portfolios based on expected bank risk taking

Bank bonds in insurance company portfolios—by LCR status



Bank risk taking in corporate lending

| | Baseline | + controls | + funding | 100% LCR | Fix date |
|---|----------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| $LCR \times Post$ | 0.111 | 0.008 | | | |
| | (1.26) | (0.04) | | | |
| $LCR \times Post \times Ins. \ bonds/liab.$ | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| LCR $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Post \times Ins. bonds/liab. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Ins. bonds/liab. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Observations | 3,948 | 3,467 | | | |
| R^2 | 0.550 | 0.632 | | | |
| Controls | No | Yes | | | |
| Industry-quarter FE | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Bank FE | Yes | Yes | | | |

Effect depends on whether banks are in the region where μ^* increases or decreases with liquidity requirements /

| | Baseline | + controls | + funding | 100% LCR | Fix date |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------|----------|
| $LCR \times Post$ | 0.111 (1.26) | 0.008 (0.04) | -0.527 (-1.68) | | |
| LCR \times Post \times Ins. bonds/liab. | | | 0.440** (2.49) | | |
| LCR \times Ins. bonds/liab. | | | -0.122 (-0.62) | | |
| Post \times Ins. bonds/liab. | | | -0.507*** (-3.03) | | |
| Ins. bonds/liab. | | | 0.212 (1.63) | | |
| Observations | 3,948 | 3,467 | 3,467 | | |
| R^2 | 0.550 | 0.632 | 0.633 | | |
| Controls | No | Yes | Yes | | |
| Industry-quarter FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Bank FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |

Funding stability $\rightarrow I^*(\lambda) \Downarrow \rightarrow$ range \Uparrow where tighter liquidity requirements increase $\mu^* \rightarrow$ risk taking \Uparrow

| | Bacolino | + controls | + funding | 100% LCP | Fix date |
|---|----------|------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| | Dasetine | + controts | + fulluling | 100% LCK | FIX UALE |
| $LCR \times Post$ | 0.111 | 0.008 | -0.527 | -0.420*** | |
| | (1.26) | (0.04) | (-1.68) | (-3.38) | |
| | | | | | |
| LCR $	imes$ Post $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | | | 0.440** | 0.267*** | |
| | | | (2.49) | (3.76) | |
| | | | | | |
| LCR $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | | | -0.122 | -0.344 | |
| | | | (-0.62) | (-1.41) | |
| | | | , | | |
| Post $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | | | -0.507*** | -0.233*** | |
| | | | (-3.03) | (-5.11) | |
| | | | (33/ | (5, | |
| Ins. bonds/liab. | | | 0.212 | 0.190* | |
| | | | (1.63) | (2.07) | |
| Observations | 2.0/.8 | 2 / 67 | 2.67 | 2 / 67 | |
| | 3,940 | 3,407 | 3,407 | 3,407 | |
| R- | 0.550 | 0.632 | 0.633 | 0.633 | |
| Controls | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| Industry-quarter FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| Bank FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | |

Holds also when restricting the LCR designation to larger banks that were subject to the strict 100% LCR

Bosshardt, Kakhbod, and Saidi

| | Baseline | + controls | + funding | 100% LCR | Fix date |
|---|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| $LCR \times Post$ | 0.111 | 0.008 | -0.527 | -0.420*** | -0.128 |
| | (1.26) | (0.04) | (-1.68) | (-3.38) | (-1.52) |
| LCR $	imes$ Post $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | | | 0.440** | 0.267*** | 0.147** |
| | | | (2.49) | (3.76) | (2.72) |
| LCR $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | | | -0.122 | -0.344 | |
| | | | (-0.62) | (-1.41) | |
| Post $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | | | -0.507*** | -0.233*** | -0.146** |
| | | | (-3.03) | (-5.11) | (-2.70) |
| Ins. bonds/liab. | | | 0.212 | 0.190* | |
| | | | (1.63) | (2.07) | |
| Observations | 3,948 | 3,467 | 3,467 | 3,467 | 3,383 |
| R^2 | 0.550 | 0.632 | 0.633 | 0.633 | 0.633 |
| Controls | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry-quarter FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bank FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Robust to using time-invariant *Ins.bonds / liabilities*; as of the end of 2012

Bosshardt, Kakhbod, and Saidi

Role of LCR banks' long-term funding for borrower stock-return volatility



Note: series have been smoothed using a moving average

Bosshardt, Kakhbod, and Saidi

Robustness to time-invariant measure of funding stability



Note: series have been smoothed using a moving average

Effect of LCR on borrower Altman's z-score

| | Baseline | + controls | + funding | 100% LCR | Fix date |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| $LCR \times Post$ | -0.491 (-0.69) | 2.771 (1.66) | 14.556** (2.71) | 2.837** (2.63) | 2.821*** (3.29) |
| LCR \times Post \times Ins. bonds/liab. | | | -10.026** (-2.41) | -1.529** (-2.24) | -1.919** (-2.99) |
| LCR $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | | | 3.351 (1.20) | -0.737 (-0.67) | |
| Post \times Ins. bonds/liab. | | | 10.351** (2.53) | 1.668*** (3.21) | 1.736*** (6.79) |
| Ins. bonds/liab. | | | -4.136 (-1.58) | -0.761 (-1.20) | |
| Observations | 3,712 | 3,279 | 3,279 | 3,279 | 3,204 |
| R^2 | 0.364 | 0.507 | 0.509 | 0.508 | 0.509 |
| Controls | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry-quarter FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bank FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Effect of LCR on borrower Altman's z-score

| | Baseline | + controls | + funding | 100% LCR | Fix date |
|---|----------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| $LCR \times Post$ | -0.491 | 2.771 | 14.556** | 2.837** | 2.821*** |
| | (-0.69) | (1.66) | (2.71) | (2.63) | (3.29) |
| LCR \times Post \times Ins. bonds/liab. | | | -10.026** | -1.529** | -1.919** |
| | | | (-2.41) | (-2.24) | (-2.99) |
| LCR $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | | | 3.351 | -0.737 | |
| | | | (1.20) | (-0.67) | |
| Post $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | | | 10.351** | 1.668*** | 1.736*** |
| | | | (2.53) | (3.21) | (6.79) |
| Ins. bonds/liab. | | | -4.136 | -0.761 | |
| | | | (-1.58) | (-1.20) | |
| Observations | 3,712 | 3,279 | 3,279 | 3,279 | 3,204 |
| R^2 | 0.364 | 0.507 | 0.509 | 0.508 | 0.509 |
| Controls | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry-quarter FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bank FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Syndicated loans not necessarily representative of banks' total illiquid-asset positions

Bosshardt, Kakhbod, and Saidi

Bank risk taking in mortgage lending

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | + funding | 100% LCR | Fix date | + funding | 100% LCR | Fix date |
| $LCR \times Post$ | 0.007 | 0.019 | 0.000 | 0.003 | 0.007 | -0.025 |
| | (0.25) | (0.95) | (0.00) | (0.15) | (0.46) | (-0.91) |
| LCR \times Post \times Ins. bonds/liab. | 0.005 | 0.021 | 0.056 | 0.058 | 0.043* | 0.118*** |
| | (0.12) | (1.23) | (1.57) | (1.13) | (1.72) | (2.90) |
| LCR $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | 0.062 | 0.155 | | 0.007 | 0.266*** | |
| | (1.15) | (1.29) | | (0.11) | (2.81) | |
| Post $	imes$ Ins. bonds/liab. | -0.003 | -0.008 | -0.012 | -0.047 | -0.019 | -0.023 |
| | (-0.07) | (-0.51) | (-0.70) | (-1.00) | (-1.60) | (-1.27) |
| Ins. bonds/liab. | -0.018 | 0.016 | | 0.075 | 0.045*** | |
| | (-0.39) | (1.08) | | (1.24) | (3.02) | |
| Observations | 913,249 | 913,249 | 884,602 | 996,904 | 996,904 | 958,554 |
| R^2 | 0.051 | 0.051 | 0.051 | 0.061 | 0.062 | 0.061 |
| Controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| MSA-year FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bank FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| LTI subsample | Low | Low | Low | High | High | High |

- LCR associated with riskier syndicated-loan and mortgage originations for banks with greater funding stability
 Tensions between ensuring funding resilience over different horizons and credit risk
 - Insurers as providers of banks' long-term funding
- Calibrated model suggests modest reduction of the total surplus at the individual bank level

 \Rightarrow Real effects more relevant for welfare effects of the LCR

Banks' reliance on insurance companies' investment in long-term bonds



Back

The results are robust to:

- Requiring the bank to hold a ratio of liquid assets relative to unstable funding (I/λ)
- Allowing the bank to choose intermediate levels of risk, i.e., choose $X \in [0, 1]$ to generate a return of $\mu + X \epsilon \mu$

We derive conditions under which the results are robust to:

- Generalizing the returns on liquid assets and returns to depositors in the two periods, i.e., generalizing from $R_{l,1} = R_{d,1} = 1$ and $R_{l,2} = R_{d,2} = R$
- Imposing costs on risky assets as in risk-based capital requirements
- Allowing / to reduce liquidity shock propensity q

| | Ν | Mean | SD | Min | Max |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|-----------|
| 70% LCR | 23,080 | 0.019 | 0.137 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| 100% LCR | 23,080 | 0.016 | 0.124 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Either LCR | 23,080 | 0.035 | 0.183 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Long-term debt/liabilities (%) | 21,614 | 6.443 | 7.698 | 0.000 | 96.274 |
| Ins. bonds/liabilities (%) | 22,209 | 0.125 | 1.098 | 0.000 | 42.790 |
| Ins. bonds/liabilities (cond. $>$ 0) | 2,255 | 1.228 | 3.244 | 0.000 | 42.790 |
| Liquid assets/assets (%) | 20,062 | 9.606 | 9.081 | 0.114 | 95.873 |
| Log(liquid assets) | 20,064 | 4.840 | 1.857 | -1.197 | 13.376 |
| Log(illiquid assets) | 20,062 | 7.514 | 1.603 | -4.343 | 14.637 |
| Log(assets) | 22,119 | 7.499 | 1.604 | -1.155 | 14.832 |
| Tier 1 ratio (%) | 19,589 | 13.043 | 3.873 | -19.650 | 110.620 |
| Nonperforming assets/loans (%) | 20,255 | 2.860 | 7.918 | 0.000 | 337.884 |
| Non-interest expenses/assets (%) | 21,987 | 0.882 | 13.438 | 0.011 | 1,990.476 |
| Net income/assets (%) | 22,082 | 0.781 | 4.905 | -27.082 | 666.667 |
| Sensitivity to market risk (%) | 17,602 | 74.233 | 9.087 | 1.179 | 95.873 |
| Average maturity (years) | 23,080 | 1.596 | 5.426 | 0.000 | 49.000 |

| | LCR-exempt | LCR | T-statistic |
|--------------------------------------|------------|--------|-------------|
| Long-term debt/liabilities (%) | 7.592 | 9.629 | 2.115 |
| Ins. bonds/liabilities (%) | 0.040 | 1.279 | 6.969 |
| Ins. bonds/liabilities (cond. $>$ 0) | 1.047 | 1.392 | 1.001 |
| Liquid assets/assets (%) | 10.569 | 15.446 | 2.018 |
| Log(liquid assets) | 4.489 | 9.900 | 15.116 |
| Log(illiquid assets) | 7.033 | 11.949 | 19.508 |
| Log(assets) | 7.082 | 12.126 | 19.868 |
| Tier 1 ratio (%) | 13.128 | 12.463 | -1.314 |
| Non-performing assets/loans (%) | 4.728 | 2.727 | -6.84 |
| Non-interest expense/assets (%) | 1.095 | 0.791 | -1.093 |
| Net income/assets (%) | 0.542 | 0.796 | 2.045 |
| Sensitivity to market risk (%) | 73.448 | 59.526 | -4.045 |
| Average maturity (years) | 0.726 | 15.315 | 8.133 |



Summary statistics: syndicated loans

| | Ν | Mean | SD | Min | Max |
|--------------------------------------|-------|---------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| 70% LCR | 6,769 | 0.060 | 0.237 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| 100% LCR | 6,769 | 0.927 | 0.260 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Either LCR | 6,769 | 0.987 | 0.115 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Long-term debt/liabilities (%) | 6,769 | 12.929 | 3.300 | 1.285 | 24.262 |
| Ins. bonds/liabilities (%) | 6,769 | 0.583 | 0.479 | 0.085 | 3.396 |
| Ins. bonds/liabilities (cond. $>$ 0) | 6,769 | 0.583 | 0.479 | 0.085 | 3.396 |
| Bank log(assets) | 6,769 | 14.229 | 0.895 | 9.556 | 14.832 |
| Tier 1 ratio (%) | 6,769 | 12.405 | 1.023 | 7.010 | 16.210 |
| Nonperforming assets/loans (%) | 6,769 | 1.757 | 1.070 | 0.103 | 6.173 |
| Non-interest expense/assets (%) | 6,769 | 0.730 | 0.135 | 0.443 | 1.163 |
| Net income/assets (%) | 6,769 | 0.895 | 0.536 | -1.561 | 10.823 |
| Bank liquid assets/assets (%) | 6,762 | 18.770 | 6.163 | 0.450 | 45.771 |
| Sensitivity to market risk (%) | 6,134 | 46.997 | 11.292 | 26.559 | 85.323 |
| Average maturity (years) | 6,769 | 10.310 | 4.926 | 5.174 | 30.000 |
| Stock return volatility | 5,745 | -2.406 | 0.495 | -5.234 | 2.441 |
| Altman z-score | 5,512 | 1.683 | 131.711 | -9,771.599 | 100.217 |
| Borrower log(assets) | 6,619 | 8.010 | 1.632 | -6.908 | 13.498 |
| Market-to-book ratio (%) | 6,074 | 313.893 | 2,974.004 | -1.420e+05 | 75,064.04 |

| | Ν | Mean | SD | Min | Max |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|--------|--------|---------|-----------|
| 70% LCR | 6,054,963 | 0.132 | 0.338 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| 100% LCR | 6,054,963 | 0.601 | 0.490 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Either LCR | 6,054,963 | 0.733 | 0.443 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Long-term debt/liabilities (%) | 6,054,963 | 10.248 | 5.808 | 0.000 | 36.232 |
| Ins. bonds/liabilities (%) | 5,937,535 | 0.504 | 0.546 | 0.000 | 3.229 |
| Ins. bonds/liabilities (cond. $>$ 0) | 4,714,267 | 0.635 | 0.541 | 0.000 | 3.229 |
| Average maturity (years) | 6,054,963 | 8.132 | 8.460 | 0.000 | 49.000 |
| Bank log(assets) | 6,054,963 | 12.491 | 2.230 | 6.495 | 14.761 |
| Tier 1 ratio (%) | 6,054,963 | 11.594 | 1.565 | 4.500 | 18.820 |
| Nonperforming assets/loans (%) | 6,054,963 | 2.690 | 2.231 | 0.094 | 23.235 |
| Non-interest expense/assets (%) | 6,054,963 | 0.896 | 0.461 | 0.271 | 4.606 |
| Net income/assets (%) | 6,054,963 | 0.814 | 1.164 | -13.744 | 10.823 |
| Bank liquid assets/assets (%) | 5,976,119 | 12.798 | 8.102 | 0.638 | 35.439 |
| Sensitivity to market risk (%) | 5,496,100 | 60.783 | 12.411 | 32.156 | 86.862 |
| Acceptance | 6,054,963 | 0.840 | 0.366 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Conventional | 6,054,963 | 0.657 | 0.475 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Loan amount/income | 5,913,515 | 2.844 | 6.176 | 0.003 | 3,835.000 |