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Background: ongoing international regulatory reform

- Supplement the microprudential regulation with a macroprudential overlay

- Systemic risk perspective
  - “… additional capital, liquidity or other supervisory measures to reduce the externalities created by systemically important institutions” (BCBS Proposal, December 2009)
The contribution of this paper:

- This paper proposes a practical approach to imposing capital surcharges on SIFIs
  - A measure on each bank’s incremental contribution to systemic risk: CoVaR approach
  - Which determines the level of capital surcharge on individual banks
Comment 1

- The idea of linking capital charges to systemic risk contribution was not absent in Basel II
- Theoretic underpinning of Basel II: ASRF model
  - Granularity assumption: each loan (portfolio/bank) is infinitely small in a portfolio (banking system)
  - A single common factor
- Portfolio invariant property under these two assumptions

\[ k = \sum_{i} k_i = \sum_{i} F(PD_i, \rho_i, LGD_i) \]

- Systemic risk contribution is additive and is portfolio(system)-independent
- i.e. macroprudential and microprudential are consistent
Macroprudential overlay is important and necessary if either of the two assumptions is violated

- Bank level: concentration risk adjustment under Pillar 2 (BCBS WP no 15, 2006)
- System level: capital surcharge for systemically important banks
  - Externality: too-big-to-fail, too-connected-to-fail
Comment 2

- How to measure systemic importance of each bank?
  - Size
  - Substitutability
  - Interconnectedness
Recently proposed market-based measures

- Spillover effect: failure of one bank → impact on the system
  - CoVaR (Adrian and Brunnermeier)

- Risk allocation: system in distress → losses from each bank
  - Marginal expected shortfall (MES) (Acharya)
  - Sharply value approach (Tarashev, Borio and Tsatsaronis)
  - Distress Insurance Premium (DIP) (Huang, Zhou and Zhu)

- These measures can have very different results!
End-2008 results for major US banks
Compared with SCAP results
• It is dangerous to impose capital surcharges based on one particular measure

• Take CoVaR for example
  • Focus too much on interconnectedness
  • Mediobanca faces the highest capital surcharge (as a % of assets) – how comfortable is the result?
  • Not additive
Minor comment

- Definition
  - Incremental contribution = VaR (when J defaults) – VAR (unconditional rather than when J survives)
  - The two-bank example
    - VaR(B) = VaR(A) = 5 million
    - VaR(B|A defaults) = 6 million
    - VaR(B|A survives) ≠ 5 million
Overall

- A very nice, well-written paper: topical issue, practical proposal and thought-provoking

- Recommend to read!