Evolving Intermediation

Nicola Cetorelli
Federal Reserve Bank of New York

Fifteenth Annual International Banking Conference
Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago
November 15-16, 2012

The views expressed in this presentation are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York or the Federal Reserve System
Focus on financial intermediation

• Debate on size and complexity of financial sector really centered on financial intermediation

• Systemic externalities associated with financial intermediation activity well recognized
  
  – Maturity transformation and “run” risk

  – Liquidity transformation and shock amplification (e.g., fire sales)

  – Disruption in the provision of essential input (credit) in real economic activity
Two current issues in financial intermediation

1. Costs and benefits of large and complex financial intermediaries
   - Is there a “large” that is “too large”, or “too complex”?
   - What does “large” even mean?
   - Recovery and resolution
Two current issues in financial intermediation

2. The rise and growth of shadow financial intermediation
   - “Credit intermediation involving entities and activities outside the regular banking system.” (Financial Stability Board report)
   - Who does intermediation?
   - What is the role of regulated entities?
   - Should we expand the boundaries of regulatory oversight?
Implications of shadow financial intermediation

• Regulation itself may spur growth of shadow markets and activities

• If intermediation done outside of regulated entities, should we extend scope of government guarantees?

• Perfect tie with issue of size and complexity: What better definition of complexity of something that is even difficult to identify, let alone monitor and regulate?
Evolution of banks and shadow banking

• How has financial intermediation evolved?
• Have banks – regulated intermediaries – adapted and remained central to the process of intermediation?
• To what extent has intermediation activity instead really moved in the shadow?
Traditional model of intermediation

Banks are the main brokers in the process of credit intermediation

Supply of funds → Banks → Users of funds

Intermediation activity on banks’ balance sheet
New model of intermediation. Two views.

1. Intermediation “technology” the same, but banks bypassed by new, unregulated entities

Supply of funds

↓

Banks

↓

Shadow system

↓

Users of funds

Banks lose centrality and become less relevant
New model of intermediation. Two views.

2. Technology changes, new entities and markets emerge, but banks adapt

Supply of funds

↓

Banks

← Shadow system →

↓

Users of funds

Banks remain an integral part in the new model of intermediation
A more detailed view of the modern credit intermediation chain

The shadow credit intermediation process consists of distinct steps. These steps for a credit intermediation chain that depending on the type and quality of credit involved may involve as little as 3 steps and as much as 7 or more steps. The shadow banking system conducts these steps in a strict sequential order. Each step is conducted by specific types of financial entities, which are funded by specific types of liabilities (see Table 2).

Source: Shadow Banking (Pozsar, Adrian, Ashcraft, Boesky (2010))

Slide courtesy of Tobias Adrian
Very different implications depending on what is the “correct” view

• Differences in monitoring and regulatory approaches depending on whether:
  – Shadow banking starts and develops “independently”
  – Banks and shadow banks are intimately connected.
• Current regulatory options on the table refer to what already recognized as previously “in the shadow”

• Necessarily so: Regulation is subordinated to identification
Forward-looking monitoring

• Are the monitoring and regulatory efforts in place suited to capture the dynamic evolution of modern intermediation?

• Much of future evolution itself the result of new monitoring and regulatory measures put in place to handle the recent past
A contribution to this debate

1. *The Evolution of Banks and Financial Intermediation: Framing the Analysis*  
Nicola Cetorelli, Benjamin H. Mandel, and Lindsay Mollineaux

2. *Regulation’s Role in Bank Changes*  
Peter Olson

3. *The Rise of the Originate-to-Distribute Model and the Role of Banks in Financial Intermediation*  
Vitaly M. Bord and João A. C. Santos

4. *The Role of Bank Credit Enhancements in Securitization*  
Benjamin Mandel, Donald Morgan, and Chenyang Wei

5. *The Role of Banks in Asset Securitization*  
Nicola Cetorelli and Stavros Peristiani

6. *A Structural View of U.S. Bank Holding Companies*  
Dafna Avraham, Patricia Selvaggi, and James Vickery

7. *Heterogeneity among Larger Bank Holding Companies: 1994 to 2010*  
Adam Copeland
A new framework of analysis. Two-prongs approach

1. **Role-based** analysis. Modern intermediation requires “new” roles along the intermediation chain. Who offers those roles?
New map of financial intermediation

Map morphologically equivalent to Poszar et al (2010). It stresses roles / functions rather than steps / markets along the chain.
A new framework of analysis. Two-prongs approach

1. **Role-based** analysis. Modern intermediation requires “new” roles along the intermediation chain. Who offers those roles?

2. **Entity-based** analysis. Adaptation by banks through organizational changes: expand the boundaries of the banking firm. Incorporation of non-bank, specialized intermediaries under common ownership and control. Shift focus from *commercial bank* to *bank holding company*. 
Expansion of the boundaries of the banking firm

Supply of funds

BHC

Specialty lenders
  - Underwriters
  - Broker Dealers
  - Guarantors
  - Asset managers
  - Other

Shadow system

Banks

Users of funds
The evidence

• Direct role. Banks are active participants in many of the steps of the credit intermediation chain.
• Indirect role: Banks are main providers of credit and liquidity support to shadow banks
• Organizational adaptation. Banks’ organizational structure has indeed grown increasingly complex over the last twenty years. Increasing role played by non-bank subsidiaries
Back to the map

- Trustee
- Underwriter
- Issuer
- Loan originator
- Fund Supply
- Servicer
- Enhancement
- Fund Demand
Dominant role of BHCs along the credit intermediation chain

Cetorelli and Peristiani, EPR Issue
Dominant role of BHCs along the credit intermediation chain

Banks as input feeders into the chain (Bord and Santos, EPR issue)

Big role maintained by banks as guarantors (Mandel, Morgan and Wei, EPR Issue)
### Organizational dynamics.
Mergers and Acquisition, U.S. Financial Industry, 1982-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buyer</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Asset Manager</th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Broker-Dealer</th>
<th>Fin Techn</th>
<th>Ins Broker</th>
<th>Ins Underwriter</th>
<th>Inv Company</th>
<th>Savings Bank/Thrift</th>
<th>Specialty Lender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
<td>7,802</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker-Dealer</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Underwriter</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings Bank/Thrift/M</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Lender</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>8,415</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>3,145</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>2,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substantial “off-diagonal” asset acquisition by banks
### BHCs organizational structure in 2012

**Number and Distribution of Subsidiaries: Selected Top 50 Bank Holding Companies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BHC rank</th>
<th>BHC Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Asset value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(in billions USD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jpmorgan Chase &amp; Co.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bank Of America Corporation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Citigroup Inc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wells Fargo &amp; Company</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goldman Sachs Group, Inc., The</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metlife, Inc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Morgan Stanley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bank Of New York Mellon Corporation, The</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Regions Financial Corporation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Comerica Incorporated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>First Horizon National Corporation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Webster Financial Corporation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Structure data are as of February 20, 2012. Financial data are as of 2011Q4. The number of subsidiaries of each BHC is determined based on the Regulation Y definition of control. Asset data include approximately 3,700 of the more than 19,600 subsidiaries belonging to the top 50 BHCs that meet particular reporting threshold criteria.

Avraham, Selvaggi and Vickery, EPR issue
Top U.S. Bank Holding Companies
Number of subsidiaries
1990 vs 2012

Notes: Structure data are as of February 20, 2012, and December 31, 1990, and include the top 50 BHCs at each of these dates.

Avraham, Selvaggi and Vickery, EPR issue
Increasing role of non-bank subsidiaries

Contribution of commercial bank subsidiaries to noninterest income of their BHCs

copeland, EPR issue
Summing up

• Modern system of financial intermediation is complex
• Many more entities other than banks involved (rise of “shadow banks”)
• Risks moved away from banks’ balance sheet
• Huge monitoring and regulatory implications
  – Expand regulatory umbrella outside of banking
  – Expand official “wrap”
  – Curb complexity
Bottom line: When looked closely, modern financial intermediation seems less “shadowy” than we thought.

Regulated bank entities have kept a considerable footprint in modern financial intermediation.
How do we track future evolution?

Current regulatory option: expand perimeter of prudential supervision to what recognized as “in the shadow”

But new regulation may be a source of future shadow banking

Our analysis suggests if new products or activities emerge, there’s a very good chance a bank will be part of it.
A tool for effective forward-looking monitoring

Intermediation has certainly grown complex, but the monitoring of banks can still provide an effective window into its continuous evolution, thus allowing for the identification of new risks and the design of prompt regulatory measures.

Stress the role of bank supervisory agencies (focus on whole BHC structure) for effective forward-looking monitoring, before embarking in the possible creation of new regulatory bodies.