

Reform of Financial Regulation: How to Make the System More Robust

Randall S. Kroszner

Norman R. Bobins Professor of Economics

The University of Chicago

Booth School of Business

Objective of Regulatory Reform

- The goal of financial regulatory reform should be to support and enhance sustainable economic growth
- Many studies show how a more deep and developed financial system is a driving force behind economic development and growth
 - But might there be a trade-off with volatility?

Interconnectedness and the Crisis

- Increasing layers of financial intermediation -- greater interconnectedness – so information about funders, counterparties, and customers needed to judge soundness of an institution
 - Is increased layers of intermediation due to
 - More efficient allocation/dispersion of risk?
 - Regulatory arbitrage?
- Thus, “Too Big to Fail” is really a subset of “Too Interconnected to Fail”

Funding and Counterparty Fragility

- Fragmented structured leading to excessive reliance on short-term external funding
 - Legacy of Glass-Steagall separation in the US
 - Rise of MMMFs
- Interconnectedness through counterparty and funding chains
 - Legal uncertainty about bankruptcy resolution and contract enforcement
 - In illiquid market, broken hedges can't be repaired so exposure explodes

Implications for Reform

- Focus should be on combination of funding runs and freezing of markets
 - Inability to fund operations
 - Maturity mismatch plus leverage
 - Uncertainty about balance sheet when markets become illiquid and counterparties may fail
 - Inability to hedge/replace broken hedges
 - Thus net exposures can become gross exposures
 - Never sufficient capital to withstand this shock

Unintended Consequences of Very High Capital Requirements

- Crucial to understand unintended consequences
 - Must have skin in the game to get the incentives right
 - Must have cushion against losses to maintain confidence and protect taxpayers
 - **But** must understand the incentives and ability to get around such regulations (difficulty of appropriate “pricing”)
 - Either
 - move off balance sheet again or
 - “unregulated” institutions undertake risky activities

What Should be the Focus of Reform?

- Emphasize not only crisis prevention but also on robustness of market infrastructure
- Key is to give policymakers and market participants sufficient comfort that key institutions can fail without causing the system to collapse
 - Otherwise, cannot eliminate either
 - Uncertainty that leads to implosion of market-wide confidence/liquidity, and
 - Moral hazard problem and uncertainty associated with “too big/interconnected to fail”

Reforms going forward

- Reducing “pro-cyclical” regulation
 - Accounting
 - Liquidity
 - Capital and leverage
 - Contingent capital?

Reforms going forward

- More information for regulators and markets
- Role of Consumer Protection
 - Crucial to integrity and stability of the markets
 - Is a separate agency the most effective approach?
 - What is appropriate coverage?

Reforms going forward

- Systemic risk regulator?
 - Defining systemically important institutions
 - “Boundary Problem”
 - Authority and responsibility
 - Single or council of regulators
 - Higher capital?
 - International cooperation/coordination
 - Financial Stability Board, Basel Committee, G-20?

Making Markets More Robust

- Resolution and bankruptcy regimes
 - Perhaps most important issue for making institutions less likely to be systemically important
 - Crucial cross-border issues should be addressed by the G-20
- Improve secured lending markets
 - Clarify how counterparties will be treated
 - Not operating as truly secured today so external funding still fragile and subject to “runs”

Making Markets More Robust

- Over-the-counter derivatives vs central counterparty clearing
 - Long history of successes through turbulence
 - Clearinghouses have innovated and thrived through more than 150 years of depressions, crises, and wars
 - Improves information disclosure and reduces interconnectedness problem

Making Markets More Robust

- Destabilizing contracts
 - Credit enhancements/guarantees/etc. that might seem to protect against trouble at an individual institution can make the system more fragile (e.g., rating downgrades triggering the posting of more capital)
 - Exacerbates interconnectedness

Making Markets More Robust

- Role of Credit Rating Agencies
 - Is the model broken?
 - More “competition” and disclosure
- Simplify and Standardize contracts
 - Less reliance on Credit Ratings and reduces costs of doing “due diligence”

Housing Finance

- Settle Future Role of GSEs
 - Securitization will be slow to recover with continuing uncertainty
 - Make housing subsidies explicit on the Federal government's budget so subject to debate and approval (not off balance sheet GSE)
 - Can guarantees reduce the demand for information and due diligence?
 - Increase capital to protect taxpayer and reduce portfolio holdings

Volcker Rule?

- Former Chairman Paul Volker has proposed that banks be restricted in their activities
 - Proprietary trading, hedge funds, private equity
- But this was not the cause of the problems at the banks
- And it could cause an increase dependence upon external finance, increasing interconnectedness and perhaps reducing stability

Conclusions

- Crucial to understand limits and unintended consequences of supervision and regulation
 - Regulatory and capital arbitrage can reduce stability
- Focus should be on providing sufficient comfort to policymakers and markets that consequences of failures can be contained
 - Otherwise “too big/interconnected to fail”
- Thus, priority for reforms should be on making markets more robust
 - G-20 cooperation crucial but must get priorities right