

# Relationship lending in the interbank market and the price of liquidity

Falk Brauning and Falko Fecht

Discussion by Viktors Stebunovs

The views expressed should not be interpreted as the views  
of the Federal Reserve System

November 19, 2012

# Questions

- What the paper is about?
  - Relationship lending in a money market and access to and pricing of overnight loans
  - Changes in the relationship lending in early stages of the financial crisis
- Why these issues are important?
  - Academics/policy makers: existence and significance of relationship lending in money markets (private info, mutual insurance, liquidity reallocation)
  - If relationship lending is important then a bankruptcy of a large lender might set a domino chain in motion
  - Need to know if there was a change in relationship lending in early stages of the crisis, what was its nature

# Methods and findings

- Use German payments system data to
  - Identify overnight loans in one of the German money markets from March 2006 to November 2007
  - Identify lending relationships over time
  - Run probit models to explain access to overnight loans
  - Run linear models to explain overnight loan pricing
- Find that
  - Past lending increases the probability of getting a loan again both before and in early stages of the crisis
  - Relationships result in higher loan prices (relative to that for arms length loans) before the crisis, but lower prices in early stages of the crisis
- “Relationship lenders have anticipated the financial crisis by charging higher interest rates in the run-up to the crisis”

# The story is not complete?

- Why borrowers before the crisis stayed with their relationship lenders and paid higher prices?
  - Why borrowers would not seek other potential relationship lenders?
  - Was that investment into future access to loans? Why this implicit contract was time consistent?
  - Was that the price for a stable source of desired volumes of liquidity? Doesn't explain the crisis period
- Does the mutual insurance story hold? Higher correlation leads to higher loan probability and lower rates
- Left out: foreign banks and banks with U.S. exposures?

# Identification of loans/relations

- “Traditional” Furfine’s algorithm identifies loans only
  - It relies on the actual distribution of federal funds rates for brokered transactions)
  - Its identification precision has been occasionally tested by the Federal Reserve
- Is it too much to ask a modified Furfine’s algorithm to identify both prices and volumes?
- Has the precision of this modified algorithm been tested on actual transaction data? Is it possible to use bank specific submissions for EONIA to identify loans?
- Identified relationships are not stable by construction? Switching relationship lenders is not really a problem?

# Empirical models

- Probit models to explain access to overnight loans
  - A loan is observed if the transaction actually happens because an unobserved condition is met: observe a loan if a latent variable  $> 0$
  - What is this latent variable? Is it utility from the match? Is it a spread between an opportunity cost and ask price? The definition of a latent variable likely matters for the choice of observables
- Linear models to explain overnight loan pricing
  - Why the RHS is the spread between a loan rate and the target rate, rather than EONIA?

# Empirical models (continued)

- Shouldn't a benchmark model take into account the selection bias while explaining loan pricing?
  - Late in the paper the authors show that it does not actually make a difference whether the bias is modeled or not
- Shouldn't a benchmark model have fixed effects?
- The data set is rich—more interesting things to look at