International Lender of Last Resort and Debt Restructuring



Eduardo Fernández-Arias (personal views)

Preventing and Managing Debt Crises to Promote Sustainability Santiago, November 2011



Outline

- 1. The Financial Safety Net System
- 2. Debt Restructuring Facility
- 3. Preventing Debt Crises



1. The Financial Safety Net System Where we are and where we need to be

- Increasing need for International Lending of Last Resort (ILLR) to deal with country financial crises (market not willing or able to lend) as financial globalization deepens and spreads
- The international financial safety net to protect against liquidity and solvency crises has holes
- However, after a very slow progress, there are at last some successful new facilities to build on and new multilateral momentum to ride on!



Confusions of ILLR

- We know what to do in a liquidity crisis (pour liquidity) but we don't know how to distinguish it from a solvency crisis and are afraid of moral hazard
- We are not sure how to structure adjustment lending for countries to regain solvency and are afraid countries will not agree and follow through
- We don't know what to do if debt restructuring is needed (no multilateral framework for resolution)
- And situations evolve, morphing liquidity crises into solvency crises needing adjustment...or restructuring

The financial safety net we need

- We need a system of ILLR ready to address liquidity and solvency crises in a robust and coherent fashion across a wide array of countries
- The following ideas exemplify such system. More details in International Lending of Last Resort and Sovereign Debt Restructuring (WB book Sovereign Debt and the Financial Crisis: Will This Time Be Different?)
- Here I emphasize Debt Restructuring Facility and expand to Prevention

A modest proposal: Supporting and building on IMF New Facilities

- Principle: Adapt domestic institutions (liquidity back up, bankruptcy process)
- Objective: Best and widest protection tailored to financial need and country capacity
- Specialized facilities structured to address specific shocks with up-front support
- Prior country eligibility in a tiered structure catering to countries' capacities
- Looks complex, but one-size-fits-all facilities are bound to be too selective or too weak

The design of a feasible ILLR is very constrained

- For effectiveness needs to achieve a lot:
 - Power: critical mass to restore/keep confidence
 - Speed: automatic delivery (avoid Humpty Dumpty fall)
 - Certainty: No fine print or last-minute activation clause
- But it lacks traditional instruments of LLR:
 - No marketable collateral: Financial safeguards
 - No enforceable regulation to limit risk taking: Prudential conditions for eligibility
 - No bankruptcy court to enforce workout: Carrots and sticks to enforce conditions on stakeholders

Basic design principles of a feasible ILLR facility

- Prior country selection based on preset eligibility conditions of financial safety and economic health with facility-specific, simple objective standards on:
 - Soundness of Fundamentals
 - Quality and stability of Policy Framework
- Country prequalification with no commitment fee to avoid stigma and adverse selection
- Ex-post conditionality on adjustment/reform and debt restructuring only as needed to restore solvency
- **Tiers:** Calibrate eligibility standards and extent of conditionality to countries' capacities

Example A: Systemic Liquidity Facility

As in Global Financial Safety Nets (EFA & ELY, forthcoming in International Finance)

- •Triggered by widespread liquidity crunch as in widespread financial contagion in EMBI
- •Automatic up-front access to liquidity from global issuers (instead of international reserves)
- •Wide Basic Tier (e.g. good standing in Article IV); Top Tier (e.g. solid macro) gets more access because has lower risk of solvency concerns



Example B: Country Liquidity Facility

- Available on demand (at steep rate) to offset a country-specific liquidity crunch
- Automatic up-front access to a degree of liquidity insurance dependent on:
 - Country Tier (fundamentals)
 - Marketable Assets (sovereign wealth fund)
 - Type of Shock (e.g. exogenous shocks presume lower risk of solvency concerns)
- Monitoring to seamlessly switch to Adjustment Facility if temporary liquidity does not do it (err on the side of caution)

Example C: A family of FCLs to deal with Liquidity cum Adjustment

- Calibrate automatic up-front access and expost conditionality program according to tiers:
- Senior FCL (e.g. excellent macro, such as in FCL): full access, no conditionality
- Junior FCL or PCL (including disqualified Senior FCL) get some automatic access and then transition to adjustment with ex-post conditionality
- Monitoring to transition to Debt Restructuring Facility if needed



The Phantom of Moral Hazard

- Undue moral hazard concerns blocks the FSN
- Useful lending with financial safeguards (prima facie solvent cases) does not distort incentives (as opposed to insurance)
- Leads to more risk taking...efficiently, not constrained by lack of FSN
- May exacerbate private moral hazard if regulation faulty, but as much as domestic financial safety net: opportunistic argument?



2. Debt Restructuring Facility

- There is no multilateral system for sovereign debt restructuring
- Current non-system based on breach of contract or threat of breach and chaos; lawyers' paradise
- DRF needs to redefine solvency and bankruptcy for the case of sovereigns based on economic rationality to achieve debt sustainability...
- ...and incorporate debt restructuring under the umbrella of FSN and ILLR



Debt Restructuring Facility associated with the ILLR function

- If and when debt restructuring is needed to regain solvency (there is debt overhang)
- Multilateral debt workout plan includes:
 - Certification (or not) of "excusable" default
 - Arrangements for automatic ILLR interim financing
 - Adjustment and reform conditionality
 - Guidelines for appropriate private sector involvement in debt restructuring
- But carrots and sticks may be insufficient



Lack of coordination is not the main problem: announcing a plan is not enough

- Bond debt has been renegotiated despite coordination difficulties, with or without CACs
- But perfectly coordinated private lenders will find it optimal to minimize haircuts betting for good luck (or else costly repeated restructuring)...
- ... and governments will find it optimal to delay restructuring betting for good luck



KEY REFORM: Sovereign Debt Restructuring with Bankruptcy Court (instead of carrots and sticks)

- ILLR can enforce adjustment/debt restructuring plan with lenders (contractually-based or by accord)
- Standstill on payments and stay on litigation
 - Avoids system based on contract breaching and litigation, costly to countries' reputations
 - Gives ILLR time to device "optimal" reorganization plan and teeth to enforce it with standstill in hand.
- Senior priority to interim financing, allowing for private sector involvement (akin to country insurance thru dilution); less ILLR resources needed.

Would it make restructuring "too easy" for Dooley?

- DRF reduces illiquidity and uncertainty at the root of domestic cost of default; would that lead to smaller sustainable debt and be counterproductive?
- Confusion 1: With uncertainty, smaller default cost (and debt) may be good (too much of a good thing...)
- Confusion 2: With certification of standard for excusable default, DRF can offer insurance (always good) and government need not delay to prove it
- DRF can optimally shape costs of default, increasing cost of opportunism



How is DRF triggered? Who calls the DRF?

- Country Call. DRF as bankruptcy protection. The problem is that political economy leads to delay
- Multilateral Call. Technocratically better and natural extension of failed adjustment programs, but sovereigns may see it as a damaging overreach
- Automatic Call when preset and agreed sustainability criteria cease to be complied with. Criteria may have originated in country, with multilateral enforcing.

3. Preventing Debt Crises

- So far focus on ex-post safety net. Nevertheless, proposed architecture provides good incentives exante (with moral hazard under control):
- Prior country selection to ILLR benefits incentivize countries' effort to reach eligibility standards
- Precautionary incentives magnified by:
 - No commitment fee to maximize benefit and use
 - Proactive country prequalification (all in play)
 - Tiered structure provides marginal incentive to elicit countries' effort at all levels; unattainable conditionality is useless

The Role of Prudential Conditionality embedded in eligibility criteria

- The FSN ought to impose conditionality concerning international prosperity beyond national prosperity
- Conditionality to enhance credibility and enforcement of national policies (e.g. concerning domestic financial regulation)
- Conditionality to offset domestic governance distortions? E.g. concerning international insurance seen as too expensive because of discounting

Monitoring is key for the system

- The cost of suboptimal policies accrue to the country if there is clarity about them and transparency on outcomes; otherwise market diffuses it to others
- Therefore monitoring and information are legitimate interests of conditionality...
- ...and may actually be an additional tool for countries: let the sovereign express its intentions to comply with certain policy framework/eligibility criteria and monitor compliance (affords signal value)



Principles for Responsible Borrowing?

- The ideal is to mimic optimal implicit contract of Grossman and Van Huyck:
 - Debt restructuring produces contingent debt
 - Borrowing (and fiscal policy) is optimal
- Excusable default is linked to responsible borrowing, to be taken into account by DRF
- Crisis prevention squarely depends on responsible borrowing, as in sustainable fiscal rules
- Therefore use principles of responsible borrowing for eligibility criteria in FSN and for conditionality as appropriate



Inter-American Development Bank / www.iadb.org