

International Monetary Fund

THE FITTET



Global Financial Stability Report April 2022





THE SOVEREIGN-BANK NEXUS IN EMERGING MARKETS: A RISKY EMBRACE

APRIL 2022 GFSR CHAPTER 2

A. DEGHI (TEAM LEAD), S. FENDOGLU, T. IYER, O. KHADARINA, H. R. TABARRAEI, Y. XU, D. YAKOVLEV, M. Y. YENICE





- The sovereign-bank nexus has **intensified** in EMs during the COVID-19 pandemic Ο
- o The nexus has become more complex as interdependencies of the sovereign and banking sectors with the real sector have increased
- o EMs are particularly vulnerable to an adverse shock amid elevated fiscal vulnerabilities and large external financing needs
- Raising the risk of an adverse sovereign-bank feedback loop \bigcirc

- How **relevant** is the risk? What are the **key channels** of transmission?
- What are the **policy options** to mitigate the risk?



Public debt has risen significantly globally

Public Debt: Level and Ratio to GDP (2005-2021)



The COVID-19 Crisis Has Brought the Sovereign-Bank Nexus in EMs to the Fore

Banks' sovereign debt exposure has reached historic highs in EMs

Banks' Sovereign Debt Exposure, 2005-2021

(In percent of banking sector assets, GDP-weighted average)







A worsening credit outlook could trigger sovereign credit rating downgrades and *further raise sovereign funding costs*

Net Ratings Downgrades and Net Negative Outlook (Frequency, 12-month sum)



The EM Sovereign Outlook Has Worsened...

Change in Sovereign Credit Spread by Rating

(Basis points, December 2019-March 2022)



An Adverse Shock Could Be Amplified by a Negative Sovereign-Bank Feedback Loop

Banks' exposures to sovereign debt is higher in countries with higher public debt and lower bank capital

EMs Sovereign Debt and Banks' Holdings of Sovereign Debt (In percent, 2021)



EMs Tier1 Capital and Banks' Holdings of **Sovereign Debt** (In percent, 2021)





....Through Three Key Channels





1. How strong is the sovereign-bank nexus in emerging markets? 2. How relevant are the key transmission channels?

How strong is the sovereign-bank nexus in emerging markets?

The Sovereign-Bank Nexus Has Been Relevant for EMs in the Past

Banking and sovereign debt crises have often occurred together in EMs

Frequency of Sovereign Default Crises and Other Economic Crises in EMs and AEs

(Percentage, 1971-2016)

Type of crisis	EMs	AEs
Sovereign (domestic)	6.3	0.1
Sovereign (external)	18.5	0.5
Banking	15.0	16.1
Currency	25.8	10.9
Banking and sovereign	6.6	0.5
Banking, sovereign, and currency	5.1	0.0

Source: Reinhart and Rogoff (2020); IMF calculations.

Note: Crisis observations in percent of total number of country observations in specified sample. Currency crisis is defined as an annual depreciation of at least 15 percent.

The correlation between banks and sovereign stress increases especially when global financial conditions tighten

Median Correlation Between Sovereign Stress, Bank, and **NFC Sector Stress and Global Financial Conditions**



Stress Transmits Across Sovereign, Banking and Corporate Sectors

An increase in sovereign, bank, and corporate credit risk transmits across sectors, especially from sovereign to banks and the corporate sectors

Strength of the Main Channels of the Nexus across EMs (Effect of a one standard deviation shock on other sectors' default risk)



Higher public debt and a higher sovereign exposure of banks increases the effect of global shocks on the sovereign and banking sector



Note: Full dots indicate significance at 90 percent or higher.





How relevant are the key channels of transmission?

Banks with higher sovereign debt exposure and weaker balance sheets experience a higher default risk postsovereign distress...

Change in Bank EDF following Sovereign Distress with Higher Bank Sovereign Bond Holdings for Different **Levels of Sovereign Distress**



Note: Higher sovereign debt exposure refers to banks with ex-ante 10 ppt (1 std) higher government debt securities-to-total assets ratio. Sovereign distress in the baseline models is identified by explicit defaults and sovereign CDS premia above 500 bps. A full dot or a solid bar indicates significance at 90 percent or higher.

Exposure Channel: The Effect of Sovereign Stress on Banks is Large

...as well as lower capital and lending to the private sector

Change in Bank Capital and Lending following Sovereign Distress with Higher Bank Sovereign Bond Holdings (Percentage points)





Government implicit guarantees to EM banks have increased since the Global Financial Crisis



Safety Net Channel: A Weaker Safety Net After Sovereign Distress Affects Bank Stability

Government guarantees support banks after sovereign distress, but not so much in countries with high public debt

Cumulative Abnormal Returns with one Notch Higher Government Support Rating in Countries with Different **Fiscal Vulnerability**







Macroeconomic channel: Sovereign Downgrades Hurt the Corporate Sector

Firms with a rating equal to or above the sovereign ("bound" firms") have a higher probability of downgrade after a sovereign downgrade...

Distribution of the Change in Corporate Ratings Following a Sovereign Downgrade (Density)



... and lower their investment more than peers after a sovereign downgrade

Change in Investment and Debt Issuance Following a Sovereign Downgrade (Percent)



The effect of sovereign distress on NFCs can also lead to spillover effects on banks' asset quality







What can be done?

- o More targeted and efficient spending and strengthening of medium-term fiscal frameworks to mitigate the impact of an adverse shock.
- o Conducting stress testing exercises for banks considering the multiple channels.
- o Consider measures to avoid excessive sovereign exposure of banks, such as appropriately calibrated capital surcharges on sovereign exposure above certain thresholds, after the economic recovery has taken hold.
- o Promote a deep and diversified local investor base to strengthen market resilience.
- o Improving data disclosure of sovereign exposures and contingent liabilities (BCBS, '21).



Global Financial Stability Report, April 2022, Chapter 3

THE RAPID GROWTH OF FINTECH: VULNERABILITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR FINANCIAL STABILITY

Jose Abad, Parma Bains, Yingyuan Chen, Torsten Ehlers, Antonio Garcia Pascual (chapter lead), Junghwan Mok, Fabiana Melo, Nobuyasu Sugimoto, Nobuyasu Sugimoto, Tomohiro Tsuruga, Kathy Yuan , Xingmi Zheng



- 2. Which risks and opportunities does decentralized finance (DeFi) bring?
- 3. What are the financial stability and key policy implications?

Asset Growth of Traditional and FinTech Lenders (2013:H1=100)



Source: S&P Global Market Intelligence, IMF Staff Note: Sample comprises 13 advanced economies and 7 emerging market economies.

Overview

nking services? centralized finance (**DeFi**) bring? ey **policy implications**?

Total Value Locked in DeFi and the Growth of Stablecoins

(Billions of US dollars)



Source: CoinGecko, DeFi Pulse, IMF Staff

Note: Total value locked represents the total nominal value of assets deposited in DeFi platforms.

- 180 160 140 120 100 80 60 40
- 20
- 0

FinTechs vs Banks in Financial Intermediation – Conceptual Framework



By-passing / short-cutting intermediation chain



By-passing / short-cutting intermediation chain



1. Case Study: Neobanks - High valuations, strong growth in risky exposures



... with higher asset yields driven by the securities portfolio, masking an underpricing of credit risk.



The ratio of liquid assets over deposits falls short of that at traditional peers.



Ш

2. Case Study: US Mortgage Market – FinTechs' impact on banks

FinTechs follow an aggressive growth model...

US home mortgage originations (Growth rates, percent) ----- Total originations -----Non-banks - non-FinTech -Banks — FinTechsNew FinTechs (right axis) 140 450 120 100 350 80 300 60 250 40 200 20 150 0 100 -20 50 -40 -60 0

2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020

Source: US HMDA data; IMF staff.

Note: New FinTechs are Better Mortgages and SoFi, which started to fully operate in 2016

...and tend to be favored by riskier borrowers

Distribution of Loan-to-Value Ratios, 2018–20

(Smoothed cumulative distribution)



Source: US HMDA data; IMF staff.

2. Case Study: US Mortgage Market – FinTechs' impact on banks

FinTech competition impacts traditional bank earnings, but less so for banks investing in technology

Effect of competitive pressure from FinTechs on banks

(Percentage points)



(% of bank equity)

Source: US HMDA data; US CALL reports (FFIEC031/041); IMF staff.

(% of bank equity)

share (% change) share (% change)

Two important take-aways:

1. Aggressive growth model of FinTechs, taking on high credit risk, even if their share is still small (about 11%)

2. Banks are under pressure to adjust; particularly smaller banks with inferior financial technology



3. DeFi: Opportunities and Risks





- Market Risks: heavy reliance on crypto collateral, particularly stablecoins • Liquidity Risks: concentration of liquidity providers (no deposit insurance and CB liquidity)
- Cyber Risks: cyber attacks
- Other risks related to crypto assets: operational, governance, AML/CFT

Opportunities:

• Enhanced efficiency: lower intermediation cost (no labor or operational costs) Promote competition: between DeFi and traditional financial institutions



3. DeFi: Cyberattack is a Critical Risk

Cyber attack increased substantially after 2021...



Source: Chaianalysis, CoinGecko, CryptoSec.info, DeFi Lhama, ImmuneFi, rekt, IMF staff



... and in most cases over 30% of deposit was lost or went away after attack

Cumulative abnormal growth of total value locked after **cyberattack** (% deviation relative to total market growth)





3. DeFi: Market and Liquidity Risks

High volatility of crypto asset prices lead to frequent liquidation of DeFi lending



Source: Aave v2, Compound v2, CoinGecko, C.R.E.A.M. Finance, DeFi Pulse, The Graph, IMF staff



Liquidity is provided by only few accounts

Number of Accounts Providing 50% of Liquidity Pool

(interquartile distribution across collateral assets)





3. DeFi: More Cost-Efficient but More Vulnerable Than Banks

DeFi is cost-efficient in lending compared to incumbents, having lower marginal costs.



Source: FitchConnect, Aave, Compound, IMF Staff

However, DeFi has riskier borrowers than banks with thinner margins.

> **Estimated Margins and Expected Loss** (in percent)



Note: Each dot represents the average margin and expected loss of banks in a country. Source: EBA Risk Dashboard, Aave, Compound, CoinGecko, IMF Staff



Policies that target both fintech firms and incumbents proportionately are needed

- their risks are desirable.
- advanced banks, as their existing business models may be less sustainable over the long term
- responsible for the governance:
 - Regulation should focus on elements of the crypto ecosystem that enable DeFi (stablecoin issuers and centralized exchanges.)

Neobanks: more robust risk-management requirements (capital, liquidity, and OpRisk) commensurate with

For incumbents: prudential supervision may need greater focus on the health of less technologically

DeFi poses fundamental challenges to effective regulation and supervision due to lack of centralized entity

DeFi platforms should be subject to robust governance schemes, including industry codes and selfregulatory organizations (these entities could provide an effective conduit for regulatory oversight)

