



BANK FOR INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENTS

Central counterparty (CCP) resolution

The right move at the right time.

Umar Faruqui, Wenqian Huang and Takeshi Shirakami $_{\mbox{\scriptsize BIS}}$

15 November, 2018

Disclaimer: The views expressed here are those of the authors and not necessarily of the Bank for International Settlements

Motivation

CCPs are systemic nodes

Increasing proportion of central clearing



Data source: BIS

- CCP resilience, recovery and resolution are essential to financial stability
- Entering into CCP resolution is an irreversible decision under uncertainty
- Timing is important

Key trade-off and preliminary findings

This paper develops a real option model

- Optimal stopping problem to minimize expected losses
 - Too early
 - Lose the option value of waiting
 - ► Too Late
 - Losses could be extremely large and threaten financial stability

Preliminary findings

- Additional resources dedicated to CCP resolution
 - The probability of CCP recovery is higher
 - Conditional on resolution, expected losses are larger

Literature review

▶ CCP recovery and resolution

- [Elliott(2013)],[Duffie(2014)]
- [Raykov(2016)],[Singh and Turing(2018)]
- Central clearing
 - [Duffie and Zhu(2011)],[Cont and Kokholm(2014)], [Kubitza, Pelizzon, and Getmansky(2018)]
 - [Koeppl and Monnet(2013)], Biais, Heider and Hoerova (2012, 2016, 2018)

[Domanski, Gambacorta, and Picillo(2015)], [Cont(2017)]

Real option

- [McDonald and Siegel(1986)],[Dixit(1989)]
- [Pindyck(1990)], [Dixit and Pindyck(1994)]

Institutional background



Model setup - Agents

Buyers

expose to real economy risk

fully hedge with a (long-dated) derivatives contract

Sellers

- make market for the derivatives
- could default due to large price movements
- A CCP
 - sits between the buyers and the sellers
 - has one recovery tool following its rule book
- A resolution authority
 - minimizes expected losses from CCP recovery
 - decides when to resolve the CCP

Model setup - Default scenario



- LIBOR increases

- Buyers and sellers need to exchange VM
- Sellers default
- The CCP needs to cover the default losses

Model setup - Recovery starts



- The prefunded resources are exhausted
- The CCP needs to use recovery tools
- Recovery tools
 - Cash calls
 - VMGH
- Uncertainties
 - Market risk
 - Liquidity risk

Model setup - uncertainties

Liquidity events

$$dN_t = egin{cases} 0, & 1-\lambda_t dt \ 1, & \lambda_t dt \end{cases}$$

• Cash inflow
$$\tilde{R}_t dt$$

 $d\tilde{R}_t = -\varepsilon \tilde{R}_t dN_t$

Marked-to-market losses
 X_t dt

$$dX_t = \sigma_t X_t dz_t$$



Model setup - interlinked uncertainties

When X_t/R_t is large, the CCP is less likely to recover
 Derivatives market get more volatile ⇒ σ_t is large
 Participants are less willing to provide liquidity ⇒ λ_t is large

Model setup - Successful recovery





- Cash calls are honored
- Cash outflows decrease
- CCP is recovered successfully

Model setup - CCP resolution



Optimal stopping problem

The resolution authority solves the following stopping problem



Let ut denote the state variables: {R
 *˜*t, Xt}
 π(ut) = R
 *˜*t - Xt and Ω(ut) = e - I + R
 *˜*t - Xt
 Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation

$$F(u_t) = \max\{\underbrace{\pi(u_t)dt + F(u_t) + E[dF(u_t)]}_{\text{recovery/continuation}}, \underbrace{\Omega(u_t)}_{\text{resolution/stop}}\}$$

Optimal timing

- ▶ Optimal stopping regions are separated by threshold u^*
- Optimal timing of entry into resolution T

▶ The first time when u_t reaches u^*

• Successful recovery timing $\tau \ (\geq 1)$

▶ The first time when $\int_0^\tau \left(\tilde{R}_t - X_t \right) dt \ge 0$

▶ Resolve the CCP if $T < \tau$

State variables

- ▶ It is optimal to resolve the CCP when \tilde{R}_t is small or X_t is large
- One can reduce the number of state variables to one: $G_t = \frac{X_t}{\tilde{\rho}}$



Additional resources dedicated to resolution

Proposition. Comparative statics

With increasing additional resources dedicated to CCP resolution,

(i) the expected time to resolution increases,

- (ii) the likelihood of successful recovery increases,
- (iii) the losses conditional on resolution increases.

Additional resources dedicated to resolution

We establish a set of parameters for the base case

- $ln(X_t)$ has a variance of 1% per period ($\sigma = 0.1$)
- ▶ Liquidity event comes once per period $(\lambda = 1)$
- ▶ 10% of the surviving members suffer losses ($\varepsilon = 0.1$)
- Resolving the CCP leads to 1 unit of asset (e l = 1)
- Initial loss is 10 unit ($\tilde{R}_0 = X_0 = 10$)
- Additional resources of 1 unit ($\Delta e = 1$)



Limitations/Extensions

The current model assumes auctions fail

- With successful auctions, the uncertainty on the cash outflow is resolved σ_t = 0
- The option value of waiting will be smaller
- The same logic should carry through
- The model assumes away the buyers and sellers' incentives
 - Resolution by the authority may weaken the buyers and sellers' incentives to cooperate in the default management
 - Taking into account the dynamic incentives of the buyers and sellers, the current thresholds might be too lenient.
- ▶ The base case calibration is rudimentary
 - Liquidity/credit stress testing results from CFTC and ESMA
 - Any other suggestions?

Appendix

Uncertainties - VMGH

 Unlike cash calls, VMGH allows the CCP to directly reduce its liability

$$R_t dt = X_t dt$$

- ▶ $\frac{X_t}{R_t} = 1$, i.e., the optimal stopping problem is not affected by the interlinkage of the uncertainties
- \triangleright CCP's cash inflow R_t follows a geometric Brownian motion:

$$dR_t = \sigma R_t dz_t.$$

Optimal stopping problem - VMGH

The resolution authority solves the following stopping problem

$$\max_{T} E\left[\int_{0}^{T} \left(-C_{t}\right) dt + \left(e - I - C_{T}\right)\right] := V(C) \qquad (2)$$

▶ Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation

$$V(C_t) = \max\left[\underbrace{(-C_t dt + E[V(C_t) + dV(C_t)])}_{\text{Recovery}}, \underbrace{(e - I - C_T)}_{\text{Resolution}}\right]$$

State variables - VMGH



References I



Cont, Rama. 2017.

"Central clearing and risk transformation." .

Cont, Rama and Thomas Kokholm. 2014.
 "Central clearing of OTC derivatives: bilateral vs multilateral netting."
 Statistics & Risk Modeling 31 (1):3–22.

Dixit, Avinash. 1989.

"Entry and exit decisions under uncertainty." *Journal of political Economy* 97 (3):620–638.

Dixit, Avinash K and Robert S Pindyck. 1994.
 Investment under uncertainty.
 Princeton university press.

References II

Domanski, Dietrich, Leonardo Gambacorta, and Cristina Picillo. 2015.

"Central clearing: trends and current issues." .

Duffie, Darrell. 2014.

"Resolution of failing central counterparties." *Available at SSRN 2558226* .

Duffie, Darrell and Haoxiang Zhu. 2011.

"Does a central clearing counterparty reduce counterparty risk?"

The Review of Asset Pricing Studies 1 (1):74–95.

Elliott, David. 2013.

"Central counterparty loss-allocation rules." Bank of England Financial Stability Paper (20):16.

References III

Koeppl, Thorsten V and Cyril Monnet. 2013. "Central counterparty clearing and systemic risk insurance in OTC derivatives markets."

Revue dconomie financire 109.

Kubitza, Christian, Loriana Pelizzon, and Mila Getmansky. 2018.

"The pitfalls of central clearing in the presence of systematic risk." .

- McDonald, Robert and Daniel Siegel. 1986.
 "The value of waiting to invest." The quarterly journal of economics 101 (4):707–727.
- 📄 Pindyck, Robert S. 1990.

"Irreversibility, uncertainty, and investment." Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.

References IV



Raykov, Radoslav S. 2016.

"To share or not to share? Uncovered losses in a derivatives clearinghouse."

Tech. rep., Bank of Canada Staff Working Paper.

Singh, Manmohan and Dermot Turing. 2018. "CCP Resolution - An Unresolved Problem." .