

Prudential policies and their impact on credit in the US

By Paul Calem, Ricardo Correa, and Seung Jung Lee

Discussion by Frederic MALHERBE (London Business School)

Part I: stress tests

London

Business

School

Tested banks' market shares of Jumbo mortgage

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	1 quarter	2 quarters	3 quarters	4 quarters
SCAP 2009	0.905	2.908	4.816^{***}	2.020
	(0.356)	(1.208)	(2.997)	(0.705)
CCAR 2011	-4.874^{***}	-4.163^{***}	-3.372^{**}	-4.392
	(-4.029)	(-2.809)	(-2.111)	(-1.556)
CCAR 2012	-0.880	-0.609	-0.192	-3.319
	(-0.741)	(-0.439)	(-0.145)	(-1.217)
CCAR 2013	-1.230^{*}	-0.576	1.115	-2.951
	(-1.819)	(-0.531)	(0.704)	(-0.713)
CCAR 2014	-0.095	0.748	1.370	-3.940
	(-0.094)	(0.509)	(1.541)	(-0.753)
Growth in house prices	0.278^{*}	0.239	0.162	0.123
•	(1.692)	(1.261)	(1.300)	(0.574)
Unemployment rate	-1.186	-1.221	-1.530^{**}	-2.027^{**}
1 0	(-1.316)	(-1.369)	(-2.449)	(-2.506)
Growth in per capita GSP	-0.093	0.017	0.143	-0.050
	(-0.367)	(0.065)	(0.669)	(-0.190)
Num. of observations	1200	1200	1200	1200
R-squared	0.78	0.79	0.79	0.78

Table 4: State-level regressions of CCAR banks' jumbo loan origination shares on stress test episodes

Part I: stress tests (2)

Plausible interpretation

London

Business

- CCAR 2011 caused a contraction in Jumbo mortgage
- But why no effect for other stress tests?
- What is the right counterfactual?
- Are stress-tests comparable?
 - Scenario stringency
 - Current + future
 - Adjustment to Basel III
 - Market conditions (control group is quite different)

Part I: stress tests (3)

- Does it work in theory?
- Formalisation

London

Business

- v What is it that we should expect?
- v Does a more stringent stress test decrease lending?
- Think of a stress test has a change in capital requirements
 - If regulator unhappy with capital position (and path)
 - Restrictions on future actions
 - Raise more capital (or cut dividend)
 - And/or cut lending

Part I: stress tests (4)

- Does an increase in requirements decrease lending?
- Bahaj et al. (2016)
 - v <u>It depends</u>

London

Business

- Interaction between debt overhang and risk-shifting incentives
- v Three effects
 - Composition
 - Price
 - Internalisation
- Can the price effect dominate?
 - Economic conditions matter, initial requirement, etc.

London Business School

Part I: stress tests (5)

	(1) 1 quarter	(2) 2 quarters	(3) 3 quarters	(4) 4 quarters
SCAP 2009	0.905 (0.356)	2.908 (1.208)	$\begin{array}{c} 4.816^{***} \\ (2.997) \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{r} 2.020 \\ (0.705) \end{array} $
CCAR 2011	$-4.874^{***} \ (-4.029)$	$-4.163^{***} \ (-2.809)$	-3.372^{**} (-2.111)	$-4.392 \ (-1.556)$
CCAR 2012	$-0.880 \ (-0.741)$	$-0.609 \ (-0.439)$	$-0.192 \ (-0.145)$	$-3.319 \ (-1.217)$
CCAR 2013	$-1.230^{st} (-1.819)$	$-0.576 \ (-0.531)$	$1.115 \\ (0.704)$	$-2.951 \ (-0.713)$
CCAR 2014	$-0.095 \ (-0.094)$	$0.748 \\ (0.509)$	$1.370 \\ (1.541)$	$-3.940 \ (-0.753)$
Growth in house prices	0.278^{*} (1.692)	$0.239 \\ (1.261)$	$0.162 \\ (1.300)$	$0.123 \\ (0.574)$
Unemployment rate	$-1.186 \ (-1.316)$	$-1.221 \ (-1.369)$	$-1.530^{**} \ (-2.449)$	$-2.027^{**} \ (-2.506)$
Growth in per capita GSP	$-0.093 \ (-0.367)$	0.017 (0.065)	$0.143 \\ (0.669)$	$-0.050 \ (-0.190)$
Num. of observations R-squared	$\begin{array}{c} 1200 \\ 0.78 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1200 \\ 0.79 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1200 \\ 0.79 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1200 \\ 0.78 \end{array}$

Table 4: State-level regressions of CCAR banks' jumbo loan origination shares on stress test episodes

Part I: stress tests (6)

- Some, inconclusive effects in other years
 - For instance: reversed sign in 2012
 - Could reflect extent of balance sheet cleaning
 - Note that effect between groups could be masked by averaging positives and negatives.
- Final comment

London

Business

School

v Is it really the goal to curb lending?

London Business Part II: Leveraged loans (1)

- Share of leveraged in bank syndicated loan portfolio
 - Went down after FAQ (looks permanent)

School

Went up after IGLL (but only for 1 quarter) ٧

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	1 quarter	2 quarters	3 quarters	4 quarters
$Bank \times IGLL$	22.981^{***}	3.015	-9.116	-6.921
	(3.566)	(0.364)	(-1.516)	(-1.162)
Nonbank \times IGLL	2.971	3.587	7.392	13.557^{*}
	(0.759)	(0.910)	(1.052)	(2.052)
$\mathrm{Bank} imes\mathrm{FAQ}$	-15.476^{***}	-21.049^{***}	-19.528^{***}	-36.543^{***}
	(-3.305)	(-3.668)	(-2.869)	(-4.335)
Nonbank \times FAQ	3.236	3.427	2.968	-0.500
	(0.813)	(0.686)	(0.926)	(-0.085)

Table 12: Regressions of speculative-grade syndicated loan originations for most active lenders

Part II: Leveraged Ioans (2)

- Plausible interpretation
 - Y FAQ caused a decreasing for banks
 - Don't want to upset the regulator
 - Need to clarify difference between US and foreign
 - v (In my view): IGLL triggered a correction
 - Identification

London

Business

- What determines the portfolio share?
- Relationship lending versus OTD
- Macro-prudential considerations
 - v What is the goal?
 - v Pipeline risk: 2015 Q4, the market dries up



- Very interesting paper
- Identification is tricky
- Recent theory advances may be useful in framing the tests and interpreting the results



Thank you very much