

# Discussion of "The Paradox of Liquid Loans" by Nada Mora and Rhiannon Sowerbutts

Martin Summer  
Oesterreichische Nationalbank

Conference on risk transfer mechanisms and financial stability,  
Basel May 29-30.



# The major contribution of the paper

- ▶ Paper looks at empirical evidence for the relation of lead bank credit exposure in a loan syndicate and the long run performance of borrowers.



# The major contribution of the paper

- ▶ Paper looks at empirical evidence for the relation of lead bank credit exposure in a loan syndicate and the long run performance of borrowers.
- ▶ While this is an investigation of loan syndicates it empirically addresses a question of wider relevance: What are the monitoring incentive implications of credit risk sharing?



# A further contribution of the paper

- ▶ The paper begins with a theory part to frame the discussion in the empirical part and to support the focus on specific incentive problems in the loan syndication procedure.



# A further contribution of the paper

- ▶ The paper begins with a theory part to frame the discussion in the empirical part and to support the focus on specific incentive problems in the loan syndication procedure.
- ▶ The theory part is however only weakly related to the empirical part. The empirical part could indeed stand alone without losing too much of overall substance of the paper.

# The core equation

$$\text{Prob}(\text{Default}_{ij}) = f(\alpha + \beta(\text{exposure of syndicate lead bank}_i) + \gamma X_i + \theta Y_{ij} + D + \epsilon_i)$$



# The main results

- ▶ There is evidence that a larger share of the syndicated loan held by the lead bank is associated with a lower default probability of the borrower.



# The main results

- ▶ There is evidence that a larger share of the syndicated loan held by the lead bank is associated with a lower default probability of the borrower.
- ▶ The borrowers of syndicate lead banks that hold a larger share of the syndicated loan perform better according to various measures of performance.





# The main results

- ▶ There is evidence that a larger share of the syndicated loan held by the lead bank is associated with a lower default probability of the borrower.
- ▶ The borrowers of syndicate lead banks that hold a larger share of the syndicated loan perform better according to various measures of performance.
- ▶ If the lead bank holds a larger share of the syndicated loan this is reflected in equity prices at the time a syndication is announced.



# Three questions raised by the empirical results

- ▶ In which way does the evidence allow to conclude that the effects that show up in the data are connected with monitoring effort?



# Three questions raised by the empirical results

- ▶ In which way does the evidence allow to conclude that the effects that show up in the data are connected with monitoring effort?
- ▶ How relevant are the facts about loan syndicates for credit risk transfer in general?



# Three questions raised by the empirical results

- ▶ In which way does the evidence allow to conclude that the effects that show up in the data are connected with monitoring effort?
- ▶ How relevant are the facts about loan syndicates for credit risk transfer in general?
- ▶ Are there any insights to be gained about the optimal loan share a lead bank in a syndicate should retain?



# Comments on the theoretical framework

- ▶ The theory part suggests that there is one theoretical framework with two limiting cases. In fact the limiting cases are two different models that are not limiting cases of a unified framework.



# Comments on the theoretical framework

- ▶ The theory part suggests that there is one theoretical framework with two limiting cases. In fact the limiting cases are two different models that are not limiting cases of a unified framework.
- ▶ The discussion of efficiency in the free riding theory of monitoring as well as the discussion of the equilibrium are misleading.



# Comments on the theoretical framework

- ▶ The theory part suggests that there is one theoretical framework with two limiting cases. In fact the limiting cases are two different models that are not limiting cases of a unified framework.
- ▶ The discussion of efficiency in the free riding theory of monitoring as well as the discussion of the equilibrium are misleading.
- ▶ In the setup there seems to be no incentive to lend through a syndicate in the first place: Assume for instance  $K = \frac{pR}{4}$ . Then lending by a syndicate has a strictly smaller total profit than lending through a single bank.



# Comments on the theoretical framework

- ▶ The theory part suggests that there is one theoretical framework with two limiting cases. In fact the limiting cases are two different models that are not limiting cases of a unified framework.
- ▶ The discussion of efficiency in the free riding theory of monitoring as well as the discussion of the equilibrium are misleading.
- ▶ In the setup there seems to be no incentive to lend through a syndicate in the first place: Assume for instance  $K = \frac{pR}{4}$ . Then lending by a syndicate has a strictly smaller total profit than lending through a single bank.
- ▶ I found it difficult to relate the theory part of the paper to the empirical part.

