Knightian Uncertainty and Interbank Lending

Matt Pritsker

Federal Reserve Board

46th Annual Bank Structure Conference

May 5, 2010

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Housing Market: Case-Shiller Index



Bank Spreads: LIBOR-OIS



◆□> ◆□> ◆三> ◆三> ・三 ・ のへ()・

• Markets breakdown because of asymmetric information, risk, and

• Markets breakdown because of asymmetric information, risk, and

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

• Confusion, Knightian Uncertainty (KU)

- Markets breakdown because of asymmetric information, risk, and
- Confusion, Knightian Uncertainty (KU)
 - KU creates problems if agents don't understand the environment when it matters.
 - Agents behave more cautiously with KU causing market function to deteriorate.

- Markets breakdown because of asymmetric information, risk, and
- Confusion, Knightian Uncertainty (KU)
 - KU creates problems if agents don't understand the environment when it matters.
 - Agents behave more cautiously with KU causing market function to deteriorate.

• Application: Interbank market.

- Structural uncertainty about banks risk exposures built-up pre-crisis.
- 2 During the crisis knowledge about risk exposures mattered.
- Private institutions can help reduce the effects of KU, but govt intervention may be needed.
- Policy proposals to reduce uncertainty through enhanced transparency:
 - Stress-test like policy to reduce uncertainty during a crisis.

• Enhanced info on key banks total exposures to reduce uncertainty ex-ante.

- 2 Banks *i* and *j*.
- Timeline: 3-Dates.

Date 0 K-structure chosen. Banks invest in LT loans w/ret R.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

- 2 Banks *i* and *j*.
- Timeline: 3-Dates.

Date 0 K-structure chosen. Banks invest in LT loans w/ret R.

Date 0: $R \sim \mathcal{N}[\mu(0), \Sigma(0)]$. Date 1: $R \sim \mathcal{N}[\mu(1), \Sigma(1)]$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- 2 Banks *i* and *j*.
- Timeline: 3-Dates.

Date 0 K-structure chosen. Banks invest in LT loans w/ret R.

Date 0: $R \sim \mathcal{N}[\mu(0), \Sigma(0)]$. Date 1: $R \sim \mathcal{N}[\mu(1), \Sigma(1)]$

Date 1 News arrives about asset performance; $\mu()$ and $\Sigma()$ are updated. Bank *i* receives a ST borrower w/ reservation value \bar{R}_L Bank *j* receives a positive funding shock. Trade in interbank loan market.

- 2 Banks *i* and *j*.
- Timeline: 3-Dates.

Date 0 K-structure chosen. Banks invest in LT loans w/ret R.

Date 0: $R \sim \mathcal{N}[\mu(0), \Sigma(0)]$. Date 1: $R \sim \mathcal{N}[\mu(1), \Sigma(1)]$

Date 1 News arrives about asset performance; $\mu()$ and $\Sigma()$ are updated. Bank *i* receives a ST borrower w/ reservation value \bar{R}_L Bank *j* receives a positive funding shock. Trade in interbank loan market.

Date 2 All loans mature. Banks default if not solvent.

Remark: Tension at date 1.

 Assumption: i's default probability only depends on the performance of its long-run loan portfolio ⇒

$$PD_i(\omega_i, t) = \Phi\left(rac{L_i}{1+L_i}R^D - \omega_i'\mu(t)\over \sqrt{\omega_i'\Sigma(t)\omega_i}}
ight)$$

Where portfolio weights are ω_i , Assets A_i , Deposits D_i , Equity E_i ,

Leverage $L_i = D_i/E_i$, R^D is the insured rate on deposits.

 Assumption: i's default probability only depends on the performance of its long-run loan portfolio ⇒

$$PD_i(\omega_i, t) = \Phi\left(rac{L_i}{1+L_i}R^D - \omega_i'\mu(t)\over\sqrt{\omega_i'\Sigma(t)\omega_i}}
ight)$$

Where portfolio weights are ω_i , Assets A_i , Deposits D_i , Equity E_i ,

Leverage $L_i = D_i/E_i$, R^D is the insured rate on deposits.

 Uncertainty: Bank j is uncertain about bank i's LT portfolio weights:

$$\omega_i \in \mathcal{C}[\underline{\omega}, \overline{\omega}]$$

 Assumption: i's default probability only depends on the performance of its long-run loan portfolio ⇒

$$PD_i(\omega_i, t) = \Phi\left(rac{L_i}{1+L_i}R^D - \omega_i'\mu(t)\over\sqrt{\omega_i'\Sigma(t)\omega_i}}
ight)$$

Where portfolio weights are ω_i , Assets A_i , Deposits D_i , Equity E_i ,

Leverage $L_i = D_i/E_i$, R^D is the insured rate on deposits.

 Uncertainty: Bank j is uncertain about bank i's LT portfolio weights:

$$\omega_i \in C[\underline{\omega}, \overline{\omega}]$$
 $PD_i \in [\underline{PD}_i, \overline{PD}_i]$

 Assumption: i's default probability only depends on the performance of its long-run loan portfolio ⇒

$$PD_i(\omega_i, t) = \Phi\left(rac{L_i}{1+L_i}R^D - \omega'_i\mu(t)\over\sqrt{\omega'_i\Sigma(t)\omega_i}}
ight)$$

Where portfolio weights are ω_i , Assets A_i , Deposits D_i , Equity E_i ,

Leverage $L_i = D_i/E_i$, R^D is the insured rate on deposits.

 Uncertainty: Bank j is uncertain about bank i's LT portfolio weights:

$$\omega_i \in \mathcal{C}[\underline{\omega}, \overline{\omega}]$$

$$PD_i \in [\underline{PD}_i, \overline{PD}_i]$$

 $\widehat{PD}_i = \overline{PD}_i$ w/ extreme uncertainty aversion

Bank i's Borrowing Spread at Date 1

$$\overline{PD}_i LGD_i = PD_i LGD_i + (\overline{PD}_i - PD_i) LGD_i$$

= Default Prem + Uncert Prem

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Bank i's Borrowing Spread at Date 1

$$\overline{PD}_i LGD_i = PD_i LGD_i + (\overline{PD}_i - PD_i) LGD_i \\ = \text{Default Prem} + \text{Uncert Prem}$$

lf

 $\bar{R}_L < R_f + \overline{PD}_i LGD_i,$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

then *i*'s spread is too high to finance its ST loan opportunity.

Bank i's Borrowing Spread at Date 1

$$\overline{PD}_i LGD_i = PD_i LGD_i + (\overline{PD}_i - PD_i) LGD_i$$

= Default Prem + Uncert Prem

lf

$$\bar{R}_L < R_f + \overline{PD}_i LGD_i,$$

then *i*'s spread is too high to finance its ST loan opportunity.

 \Rightarrow Uncertainty over *i*'s portfolio exposures can cause its borrowers to get cut off.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ



(a) Uncertainty Premium and Expected Loan Return

◆□> <圖> < 글> < 글> < 글</p>



(b) Uncertainty Premium and Loan Volatility

・ロト・日本・日本・日本・日本・日本

Results So Far

- Uncertainty premia depend on Leverage, Volatility, and Expected Asset Returns.
- Uncertainty premia can be low with high leverage if volatility is low, and/or expected returns are high [**Pre-Crisis Situation**].
- Uncertainty premia can become very elevated if leverage is high, and expected returns for some assets are lowered, or volatility for some assets becomes elevated [Crisis Situation].

Interbank Market: Anonymous Brokered Market

- Large (Core) banks extend loans to each other in an anonymous brokered market.
- Bank *j* forms worst case beliefs over the risk of the banks it could be dealing with.
- Bank j is uncertain about other large banks total exposure to "bad assets" and how all assets Y_M are distributed among the banks.

Interbank Market: Anonymous Brokered Market

- Large (Core) banks extend loans to each other in an anonymous brokered market.
- Bank *j* forms worst case beliefs over the risk of the banks it could be dealing with.
- Bank j is uncertain about other large banks total exposure to "bad assets" and how all assets Y_M are distributed among the banks.

$$\overline{PD} = \max_{\omega_k, k=1,\dots,2N} \frac{1}{2N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{2N-1} PD_k(\omega_k)$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Notation: A \equiv assets, $Y_M \equiv$ LT loans of 2N banks.

Interbank Market: Anonymous Brokered Market

- Large (Core) banks extend loans to each other in an anonymous brokered market.
- Bank *j* forms worst case beliefs over the risk of the banks it could be dealing with.
- Bank j is uncertain about other large banks total exposure to "bad assets" and how all assets Y_M are distributed among the banks.

$$\overline{PD} = \max_{\omega_k, k=1,...2N} \frac{1}{2N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{2N-1} PD_k(\omega_k)$$

Notation: $A \equiv assets$, $Y_M \equiv LT$ loans of 2N banks.

() Adding up constraint: $\sum_{k=1}^{2N} \omega_k A_k = Y_M$

Individual bank maximization constraint: ω_k ∈ C(<u>ω</u>, w̄), k = 1,...2N

The anonymous brokered market structure with only large banks is resilient to problems in small sectors of the economy,

The anonymous brokered market structure with only large banks is resilient to problems in small sectors of the economy, but less so for large sectors.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- The anonymous brokered market structure with only large banks is resilient to problems in small sectors of the economy, but less so for large sectors.
- The market may break-down and because of positive externalities government audits that reveal information on exposures may be needed to restore market function.

- The anonymous brokered market structure with only large banks is resilient to problems in small sectors of the economy, but less so for large sectors.
- The market may break-down and because of positive externalities government audits that reveal information on exposures may be needed to restore market function.

Solution Audits should "leverage" off of examiner knowledge.

- The anonymous brokered market structure with only large banks is resilient to problems in small sectors of the economy, but less so for large sectors.
- The market may break-down and because of positive externalities government audits that reveal information on exposures may be needed to restore market function.
- **③** Audits should "leverage" off of examiner knowledge.
- Reducing uncertainty about "core" banks total exposures Y_M ex ante reduces the likelihood of market breakdown, and reduces the costs of breakdowns if they occur.

Effect of Uncertainty About Y_M in Bad Conditions



◆□> ◆□> ◆三> ◆三> ・三 ・ のへ()・

Closing Thoughts

- I have shown that transparency initiatives may improve market function by reducing uncertainty and confusion ahead of and during a crisis.
- The transparency is needed so that financial intermediation can take place.
- The transparency initiatives I propose do not make individual banks fully transparent.
- Many proposals to address future crisis are based on market information. For these to work, we need to improve the quality of information that the market uses to price risk.