



10TH JACQUES POLAK ANNUAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE
NOVEMBER 5-6, 2009

Do Global Banks Spread Global Imbalances? The Case of Asset-Backed Commercial Paper During the Financial Crisis of 2007–09

Viral Acharya
New York University, NBER, and CEPR

Philipp Schnabl
New York University

Paper presented at the 10th Jacques Polak Annual Research Conference
Hosted by the International Monetary Fund
Washington, DC—November 5–6, 2009

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) only, and the presence of them, or of links to them, on the IMF website does not imply that the IMF, its Executive Board, or its management endorses or shares the views expressed in the paper.

Do Global Banks Spread Global Imbalances?
The Case of Asset-Backed Commercial Paper During the
Financial Crisis of 2007-09

Viral V. Acharya¹ and Philipp Schnabl²

First draft: September 2009³

This draft: October 15, 2009

Abstract

The global imbalance explanation of the financial crisis of 2007-09 argues that the demand for riskless assets from countries with current account surpluses created fragility in the US financial sector. We examine this explanation by analyzing the geography of asset-backed commercial paper conduits set up by large commercial banks. We show that both banks located in surplus countries and banks located in deficit countries manufactured riskless assets of \$1.2 trillion by selling short-term asset-backed commercial paper to risk-averse investors, predominantly US money market funds, and investing the proceeds primarily in long term US assets. As negative information about US assets became apparent in August 2007, banks in both surplus and deficit countries experienced difficulties rolling over asset-backed commercial paper and as a result suffered significant losses. We conclude that it was global banking flows, and not just global imbalances, that determined the geography of the financial crisis.

¹ Viral V Acharya, Department of Finance, Stern School of Business, New York University, 44 West 4th Street, Room 9-84, New York, NY-10012, US. Tel: +1 212 998 0354, Fax: +1 212 995 4256, e-mail: vacharya@stern.nyu.edu. Acharya is also Academic Director of the Coller Institute of Private Equity, a Research Affiliate of the Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) and Research Associate in Corporate Finance at the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER).

² Philipp Schnabl, Department of Finance, Stern School of Business, New York University, 44 West 4th Street, Room 9-76, New York, NY-10012, US. Tel: +1 212 998 0356, Fax: +1 212 995 4256, e-mail: schnabl@stern.nyu.edu

³ Authors are grateful to Dave Backus, Pierre-Olivier Gourinchas, Ayhan Kose, Gustavo Suarez and faculty members at Stern School of Business, New York University for discussions on the topic and to research staff at Moody's and Fitch Ratings for detailed answers to our queries.

1. Introduction

Bernanke (2005) argued in his famous speech that the “savings glut” in Asia, most notably in China, and several European countries with current account surpluses, had created severe and persistent global imbalances. These imbalances have by and large found their way through capital flows into the US economy (Caballero et al, 2008). Importantly, unlike capital flows to emerging markets, a large share of these flows have been invested in effectively risk-free assets, such as US treasuries, US agency debt, and money market fund shares. Some observers (for example, Caballero and Krishnamurthy, 2009) have argued that the demand for risk-free assets coming from surplus countries left the US economy fragile by concentrating the real risks in its financial sector. Together, these observations constitute the global imbalance explanation of the financial crisis of 2007. Bernanke (2009) and Portes (2009) argue respectively that it is impossible to understand the financial crisis fully without appealing to global imbalances and that they are the underlying cause of the crisis.⁴

We argue in this paper that while global imbalances are clearly central to understanding the capital flows to the US economy, they fall short of explaining why the financial crisis took such a global form right from its inception. To understand the global spread, we analyze how financial sectors around the world became exposed to the crisis. We show that large commercial banks in both current account surplus and current account deficit countries manufactured risk-free assets by setting up asset-backed commercial paper (ABCP) conduits. Conduits are a form of securitization in which

⁴ Jagannathan, Kapoor and Schaumburg (2009) also advance the hypothesis that the financial crisis is a symptom rather than the disease. They focus on one important aspect of global imbalances, namely the large increase in the developed world’s labor supply, and the inability of existing institutions in the US and the rest of the world to cope with this shock.

banks use off-balance sheet vehicles to purchase long-term and medium-term assets financed with short-term debt. However, contrary to other forms of securitization, such as mortgage-backed securities or collateralized debt obligations, banks effectively keep the credit risk associated with the conduit assets. Hence, as long as banks are solvent, conduits are risk-free for outside investors but can generate significant risks for banks. In exchange for bearing these risks, banks have access to low-cost funding via the asset-backed commercial paper market.

We document that prior to the financial crisis, most asset-backed commercial paper was issued in US dollars and sold to risk-averse investors such as money market funds. Most of the proceeds were used to invest in long-term financial assets of current account deficit countries, such as the United States and the United Kingdom. However, the sponsoring commercial banks were based both in current account surplus countries (e.g., Germany, Japan, and Netherlands) and current account deficit countries (e.g., United States, United Kingdom). The magnitude of this enterprise was economically significant with more than \$1.2 trillion of short-term asset-backed commercial paper outstanding in June 2007. Analyzing the geography of asset-backed commercial paper conduits, we find that the country-wide level of asset-backed commercial paper outstanding, our proxy for the scale of production of risk-free assets, was effectively unrelated with a country's current account balance.

Hence, when information about the deteriorating quality of US sub-prime assets traveled across the financial markets in the summer of 2007, it was not just the banks in the US that got hit. In fact, the first banks to collapse and be bailed out by their government were IKB Deutsche Industriebank and Sachsen Landesbank based in

Germany (Acharya and Schnabl, 2009). These banks had provided credit guarantees more than three times their equity capital in order to issue asset-backed commercial paper of the risk-free variety. On August 7, 2007, the French Bank BNP Paribas halted withdrawals from three funds invested in mortgage-backed securities and suspended calculation of net asset values⁵, following which the risk-averse investors withdrew from the ABCP market. As shown in Figure 1, the rise in ABCP came to an abrupt end in August 2007, and as shown in Figure 2, the cost of issuing overnight ABCP relative to the US Fed Funds rate increased from 10 basis points to 150 basis points within one day of the announcement. The German banks were thus unable to roll over their ABCP liabilities in August 2007 and rendered insolvent.

Other large banks in both Europe and the United States, such as ABN Amro (eventually Royal Bank of Scotland) and Citibank, survived the freeze in the ABCP market but suffered significant losses because their credit guarantees to outside investors required them to pay off maturing ABCP independently of underlying asset values (the so-called “securitization without risk transfer”, a term employed by Acharya, Schnabl and Suarez, 2009, to describe ABCP). As a measure of the cost of ABCP exposure, we find that a one-standard deviation increase in ABCP exposure, measured as the ratio of ABCP outstanding to bank equity as of January 2007, reduces stock returns in August 2007 by 1.5 percent. Countries with current account surpluses such as Germany, Japan and the Netherlands did as worse in terms of bank stock returns as deficit countries like the United States and the United Kingdom, with Germany in fact doing the worst. We

⁵ See “BNP Paribas Freezes Funds as Loan Losses Roil Markets”, Bloomberg.com, August 9, 2008.

interpret these findings as the direct impact of off-balance sheet conduits on the value of bank equity.

We also document that the inability to roll-over ABCP lead to “dollar shortages” among European banks that had sponsored conduits (Baba, McCauley and Ramaswamy, 2009, and McGuire and von Peter, 2009). As a result, US subsidiaries of European banks increased their borrowing from the Federal Reserve in the United States, which eventually prompted the Federal Reserve to set up dollar-swap facilities with a large number of central banks in other countries, especially in Europe.

Overall, our results suggest that the geography of the financial crisis depends on the incentives of global banks to manufacture riskless assets rather than the direction of capital flows. According to the pure global-imbalance view (see, for instance, Mendoza, Quadrini and Rios-Rull, 2008), the financial sectors of current account surplus countries should have been shielded from the financial crisis. Instead we observe that banks in surplus countries are at least as affected as banks in deficit countries. Thus, in a world with global banking, the financial sectors of surplus countries are themselves at substantial risk from capital flows into deficit countries.

Based on descriptive evidence of the regulation of ABCP conduits across countries, we conjecture that global imbalances spread to all financial sectors that were “weakly” regulated in the sense of allowing banks to hold assets in conduits with little capital relative to the required capital for assets on bank balance sheets. We describe the capital regulation for ABCP conduits in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, and Canada and how it affected the likelihood of banks in the respective countries to sponsor conduits.

Besides the global imbalances literature cited above, a few other contributions relate to our main findings. Obstfeld and Rogoff (2009) argue that both global imbalances and the financial crisis are rooted in common causes linked to economic policies followed in several countries such as the low-interest rate environment in the United States and the undervaluation of its currency by China. We point out that lax financial sector regulation in a world with global banking also contributed in spreading the destabilizing effects of global imbalances. Obstfeld and Rogoff (2001, 2005, 2007) also note the systemic risk imposed to the global economy due to untested developments in financial markets during 2000s.

Rose and Spiegel (2009a, b) document in a series of recent papers that the crisis does not seem to have spread through contagion from the US. They document that countries that had disproportionately high amounts of trade with the US in either financial or real markets did not experience more intense crises. Our paper employs a nuanced version of financial exposure to the US –the extent of ABCP conduit activity undertaken by banks in different countries – and shows that it explains performance of country-level and bank-level stock returns in the early phase of the crisis. However, we too do not view this as a “transmission” from the US; instead as a direct financial exposure to the US, that is uncorrelated with trade exposure to the US.

In terms of related work on ABCP conduits and securitization, Gorton and Souleles (2005), Gorton (2008) and Brunnermeier (2009) provide descriptions of the shadow banking sector consisting of off-balance sheet vehicles. Ashcraft and Shuermann (2008) present detailed description of the process of securitization of sub-prime mortgages, of which conduits were one component. Nadauld and Sherland (2008) study

the securitization by investment banks of AAA-rated tranches – “economic catastrophe bonds” as explained by Coval, Jurek, and Stafford (2008) – and argue that the change in the SEC ruling regarding the capital requirements for investment banks spurred them to engage in excessive securitization. In contrast, Shin (2009), Acharya and Richardson (2009) and Acharya and Schnabl (2009) argue that banks were securitizing without transferring risks to end investor and, in particular, ABCP and AAA-rated tranche production were a way of taking on tail-natured systemic risk of the underlying pool of credit risks.

In an analysis focused on the economic causes of the increasing propensity of the financial sector to take such risks (in one class of conduits – the “credit arbitrage” vehicles), Arteta et al (2008) provide evidence consistent with government-induced distortions and problems of corporate governance. Arteta et al. (2008) also present an overview of the location of credit arbitrage conduits, but do not relate it to global imbalances, the focus of our paper. Acharya, Schnabl and Suarez (2009) document that ABCP was indeed risk-free in that only 4% loss was borne by the ABCP investors due to downgrades and defaults on underlying assets of conduits. They also illustrate the important role played by bank guarantees in enabling conduits to issue ABCP by showing that rollovers of ABCP that had weaker guarantees (“extendible notes” and “SIVs”) were more difficult during the crisis than that of ABCP with stronger guarantees (“credit guarantees” and “liquidity guarantees”). Finally, Covitz, Liang, and Suarez (2009) document the “run” in the shadow banking sector and link it to the deterioration of asset quality in conduits.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the structure of ABCP conduits, describes the data sources, and presents summary statistics. Section 3 analyzes the geography of ABCP in terms of their sponsor, their investment strategy, and their outside investors. The section also examines the role of country-specific financial regulation in enabling risk taking through ABCP conduits. Section 4 shows how the financial crisis erupted in August 2007 in different parts of the world and links bank's exposure to ABCP conduits. Section 5 provides a discussion of economic incentives behind ABCP issuance and related activities aimed at producing risk-free assets. Section 6 concludes.

2. Institutional background

2.1. Conduit structure

Figure 3 depicts the typical structure of an asset-backed commercial conduit and its relation to its sponsoring financial institution, asset sellers, and outside investors. We describe this structure using the conduit *Ormond Quay* as an example. *Ormond Quay* is a conduit set up in May 2004 and managed by Sachsen Landesbank, a large regional bank in Germany. Sachsen Landesbank's management responsibilities consist of selecting the assets to be purchased by *Ormond Quay* and issuing short-term asset-backed commercial paper in order to finance the assets. Sachsen Landesbank sells the asset-backed commercial paper to outside investors, such as money market funds, and rolls over the asset-backed commercial paper at regular intervals.

Panel A of Table 1 shows the composition of *Ormond Quay*'s investments by asset type as of July 2007. *Ormond Quay* invests almost exclusively in asset-backed

securities with a total value of \$11.4bn. The majority of the securities are backed by residential mortgages (55.5%) and commercial mortgages (23.8%). The remainder is split between corporate loans (4.1%), consumer loans (4.1%), collateralized debt obligations (2.7%), and a mix of equipment lease receivables, car loans and leases, student loans, credit card receivables, and other asset types. As shown in Panel B of Table 1, the majority of *Ormond Quay's* assets are originated in the United States (37.7%) and the United Kingdom (22.1%). The remainder is split between unspecified countries in Europe (11.2%), Italy (9.3%), Spain (8.4%), Netherlands (3.9 %), and other European and Asian countries. All assets have the highest "AAA" rating from at least one certified rating agency.

On the liabilities side, *Ormond Quay* finances the assets almost exclusively by issuing short-term asset-backed commercial paper. As of July 2007, total asset-backed commercial paper outstanding is \$12.1 billion of which 32% were issued in US dollars and 68% were issued in Euro.⁶ We estimate that *Ormond Quay* only has a sliver of equity, around \$36 million, or 30 basis points of its asset value. There are no other liabilities. We have no information on *Ormond Quay's* hedging strategy but, like most conduits, *Ormond Quay's* is likely to have hedged its currency risk and interest rate risk.

Ormond Quay benefits from a credit guarantee provided by Sachsen Landesbank which guarantees that Sachsen Landesbank pays off maturing asset-backed commercial paper if *Ormond Quay* is unable to do so. Hence, as long as Sachsen Landesbank is

⁶ We do not have information on the maturity of *Ormond Quay's* asset-backed commercial paper but, according to the Federal Reserve Board, most conduits have asset-backed commercial paper outstanding with a maturity of 30 days or less. The majority of issuance is with a maturity of 1 to 4 days. Regarding outside investors, we have no information of their identity but according to the Federal Reserve's Flow of Funds, the main investors in asset-backed commercial paper are US money market funds.

solvent, outside investors are expected to be repaid. This structure is different from traditional commercial paper which is considered safe because of its seniority in the capital structure due to its short-term maturity (Kacperczyk and Schnabl, 2009). Instead, asset-backed commercial paper is considered safe because it is backed jointly by conduit assets and a bank guarantee.

As a result of the bank guarantee, Moody's awarded the conduit the highest possible short-term rating "P-1". Moody's also explicitly mentions in its report that the guarantees provided by Sachsen Landesbank are required for the "P-1" rating and further notes that the guarantees are considered sufficient because Sachsen Landesbank benefits of a grandfathered state guarantee. The rating is important for the sale of asset-backed commercial paper because many outside investors, such as US money market funds, have regulatory constraints which require them to buy only highly-rated securities (Kacperczyk and Schnabl, 2009).

The structure of *Ormand Quay* is typical for asset-backed commercial paper conduits. Most conduits, with the exception of Structured Investment Vehicles, are financed almost exclusively with asset-backed commercial paper. Also, most conduits benefit from a credit guarantee provided by a large commercial bank which guarantees them Moody's highest short-term rating (Acharya, Schnabl, and Suarez, 2009). Unlike Sachsen Landesbank, most sponsors do not have an explicit state guarantee, but they are typically large enough such that they are considered very unlikely to fail. Also, many sponsors may benefit from implicit too-big-to fail guarantees by their respective governments.

Like *Ormand Quay*, most conduits invest in “AAA”-rated securitized assets, unsecuritized assets of similar quality, or a combination of both. *Ormand Quay* is a credit arbitrage conduit, which is a type of conduit that invests almost exclusively in securitized assets. Other types of conduits are multi-seller conduits or single-seller conduits that usually invest in unsecuritized assets. In the case of multi-seller conduits and single-seller conduits (sometimes also called loan conduits), a large share of the assets are bought from customers of the sponsoring financial institution.

Regarding asset types, many conduits invest in mortgages but not all conduits do. Other common asset types are trade receivables, credit card receivables, student loans, auto loans, home equity loans, corporate loans, and consumer loans. Most conduits are diversified across several asset classes. Regarding investment strategies, credit arbitrage conduits tend to invest more in long-term assets such as mortgages, whereas multi-seller conduits and single seller conduits tend to invest more in medium term assets such as trade receivables.

Overall, conduits are similar to regular banks in the sense that they hold long-term and medium-term risky assets and finance themselves via issuing short-term debt. The main difference is that a private entity, namely the sponsoring financial institution, effectively insures the short-term debt sold to outside investors. The main difference between financing assets via a conduit and financing assets on a bank’s balance sheet is the regulatory treatment of the assets. If the credit guarantees are properly structured (in particular, as liquidity enhancement with less than one year to maturity), then asset in conduits draw 90% lower regulatory capital charges than asset financed on the balance sheet.

2.2 Data

We use several data sources for the empirical analysis in this paper. The primary data sources are conduit ratings reports from Moody's Investor Service covering the period from January 2001 to March 2009. The rating reports are typically three to five pages and contain information on conduit sponsor, conduit type, conduit assets, credit guarantees, and a general description of the conduit. Moody's Investor Service publishes the first report when it first issues a rating and subsequently updates the reports at regular intervals. For some conduits, Moody's Investor Service publishes monthly monitoring reports. Monthly reports are typically one page and comprise information on conduit size, credit guarantees, and conduit assets. In addition, Moody's Investor Service publishes a quarterly spreadsheet that summarizes basic information on all active conduits.

To construct our data set, we start with the universe of conduits collected by Moody's Investor Service. We merge conduits that have more than one funding operation (79 out of 9536 observations). We drop South African conduits because they are rated on a different scale (72 out of 9536 observations). We drop ABCP issued by collateralized debt obligations because the credit guarantees to collateralized debt obligations are different from the credit guarantees provided to conduits (292 out of 9536 observations).

For each conduit, we identify the sponsor and match the sponsor to the consolidated financial company (e.g., we match Deutsche Bank New York to Deutsche Bank in Germany). We use several data sources such as Bankscope and Osiris to identify

sponsors. Once we identify a potential match, we verify the information using the company website.

We match sponsors to sponsor characteristics using the Bankscope database. We use the ISIN identifier to match Bankscope data to stock data from Datastream. If a bank does not have an ISIN identifier, we verify with the company website that the bank is not listed on a stock exchange. We use the headquarters of the consolidated financial company to identify the location of the sponsor.

2.3. Summary statistics

Table 2 provides summary statistics for all conduits authorized to issues ABCP as of January 1, 2007. Panel A shows that there are 296 conduits with total ABCP outstanding of \$1.235 trillion. The average conduit size is \$4.2 billion with a standard deviation of \$5.2 billion. The largest conduit type is multiseller conduits with \$548 billion in ABCP. Multiseller conduits purchase assets from more than one seller. The assets are often not securitized and the sellers are usually clients of the conduit sponsor. The main asset types held by multiseller conduits are trade receivables (15%), securities (12%), auto loans (11%), credit card receivables (10%), and commercial loans (9%).

The second-largest type is credit arbitrage conduits with \$213 billion in ABCP. Credit arbitrage conduits usually purchase securitized assets from many sellers. The main asset types held by credit arbitrage conduits are residential mortgage loans (26%), collateralized loan obligations and collateralized bond obligations (21%), commercial mortgage loans (12%), and commercial loans (11%). The third-largest type is single-

seller conduits with \$173 billion in ABCP. Single-seller conduits are often used by mortgage originators to warehouse assets before they are securitized.

Table 3 presents summary statistics per sponsor. We define a sponsor as a single consolidated financial company and we aggregate ABCP at the holding level. In total, there are 126 sponsors and average ABCP outstanding is \$9.8 billion. The largest sponsor type is commercial banks. Commercial banks sponsor \$903 billion, or 73%, of ABCP. The second largest group is structured finance groups with \$181 billion in ABCP. Other sponsors are mortgage lenders (\$71 billion), insurance companies and monoline insurers (\$14 billion), and investment banks (\$11 billion).

3. The geography of asset-backed commercial paper conduits

3.1. Location of sponsor, investors, and asset originators

To analyze the location of sponsors, we restrict the sample to commercial banks. The reason is that sponsors other than commercial banks, usually do not have the financial strength to support conduits. To get a sense of the potential selection bias from this restriction, consider the example of the Dutch Bank ABN Amro. In January 2007, ABN Amro directly sponsored conduits with ABCP of \$68.6 billion outstanding. At the same time, the rating agency Fitch reports that ABN Amro provided total credit guarantees of \$107.5 billion to conduits. Hence, the difference of \$38.9 billion is credit guarantees provided by ABN Amro to conduits other than its own. Typically these credit guarantees are for conduits sponsored by structured investment groups. Conduits of structured investment groups account for about 14% of ABCP outstanding as of January 2007. To the best of our knowledge, conduits managed by structured investment groups

are similar in terms of asset composition to credit arbitrage conduits sponsored by large commercial banks.

We identify the location of a sponsor as the location of the headquarters of the sponsoring bank. For example, if the sponsor is Deutsche Bank New York, then we aggregate the ABCP at the level of the holding company of Deutsche Bank in Germany. The reason for this classification is that subsidiaries usually do not have the financial strength to sponsor a conduit. Hence, credit guarantees provided by subsidiaries are usually backed, either explicitly or implicitly, by the holding company.

Figure 4 shows the time-series of asset-backed commercial paper outstanding per country for the seven largest countries by ABCP outstanding. We find that the majority of sponsors are located in the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, France, Japan, and Belgium. In all countries, ABCP outstanding increased significantly until August 2007 and dropped steeply afterwards.

Independent of the sponsor location, however, we find a common strategy regarding the funding source. We use Moody's reports to identify the funding currency as of January 2007. If a conduit issues in more than one currency, we separately account for each currency. Table 4 reports total asset-backed commercial paper outstanding by the location of the sponsor and the funding currency as of January 2007. For example, German banks sponsored \$204 billion in ABCP of which \$139 billion was issued in US dollars, \$63 billion in Euro, and \$2.5 billion in other currencies. In total, \$714 billion out of \$969 billion, or 74%, was issued in US dollars. We note that most European banks financed their conduits by issuing asset-backed commercial paper in US dollars rather than Euro.

Next, we examine the country of origin of assets held by conduits. Unfortunately there is no comprehensive data on conduits assets' country of origin. However, Moody's publishes monthly reports for some larger conduits, in particular for credit arbitrage reports, which often contain information on assets' country of origin. Table 5 lists the ten largest conduits by ABCP outstanding for which information on assets' country of origin is available. For each conduit, the table reports the sponsor location and the allocation of assets across countries. We find that all conduits have a significant share of assets invested in US assets independent of whether the sponsor is located in the United States or elsewhere. For almost all conduits, investments in the United States represent the largest share for a single country. We also note that most conduits invest most of their portfolio in assets with the highest "AAA" ratings. These results suggest that conduits invest primarily in highly quality assets of current account deficit countries, in particular the United States and the United Kingdom.⁷ However, we note that this analysis relies on credit arbitrage conduits only and that we have little data on assets' country of origin for loan conduits.

Finally, we examine the identity of investors in asset-backed commercial paper. We identify the broad investor classes using the Federal Reserve's Flow of Funds. The Flow of Funds aggregates asset-backed commercial paper and regular commercial paper which have a total value of \$2.2 billion in early 2007. Assuming investors hold

⁷ To validate these findings, we also consult a market-level report issued by Moody's Investor Service (Moody's Investor Service, 2007). The report provides summary statistics on assets held by credit arbitrage conduits in March 2007. Based on conduits with assets outstanding of \$196 billion, Moody's find that 53% of assets measured by outstanding principal amount are originated in the United States and that 99% of rated assets are rated "Aa" or higher. These results support the findings based on conduit-level data.

both types of commercial paper in constant proportions, the Flow of Funds provides information of the relative importance of different investor classes.

Panel A of Table 6 shows that the largest investor class is money market funds and mutual funds which account for \$722 billion (32.6%) of the market. Other important investors are funding corporations (26.4%), foreign investors (10.2%), and state governments (8.4%). Relative to their size, households and non-financial corporations hold little commercial paper directly but they are large investors via money market funds.

We use holdings data from iMoney Net to examine the importance of asset-backed commercial paper to money market funds. Panel B of Table 6 lists the 20 largest prime funds with non-zero holdings of asset-backed commercial paper. The share of the portfolio invested in asset-backed commercial paper varies between 1% and 49% with most funds investing between 10% and 30% of their portfolio in asset-backed commercial paper. Overall, we interpret this finding as evidence that ABCP is an important asset class for risk-averse investors, such as money market funds.

3.2. ABCP activity and global imbalances

The previous section shows that conduits finance themselves primarily in US dollars and purchase financial assets in current account deficit countries such as the United States and the United Kingdom. However, the main risks associated with ABCP conduits remain with the sponsors, which are located in both Europe and the United States. To put ABCP activity in the context of global imbalances, we examine the relation between ABCP activity and global imbalances using both country-level and bank-level data.

We measure global balances as the current account balance in 2006. We restrict the sample to banks located in countries in the Eurozone (as of 2006), Denmark, Japan, Sweden, United Kingdom, and the United States (excluding countries with populations smaller than 1 million). We choose this sample because most large banks are based in these countries. Among countries with banks that sponsor conduits, we exclude Australia, Canada, and South Africa because credit guarantees to conduits in these markets are not comparable to credit guarantees in the United States and Europe. Among countries with large banks, we exclude China because Chinese banks do not sponsor conduits.

Figure 5 shows the current account surplus in 2006 and the natural logarithm of GDP in 2006. The two largest deficit countries in our dataset are the United States and the United Kingdom and the two largest surplus countries are Japan and Germany. There is significant variation in the data ranging from a current account deficit of -11.1% (Greece) to a current account surplus of 17.3% (Norway).

Figure 6 presents total ABCP as of January 2007 relative to the current account balance. The figure shows that ABCP is unrelated to a country's current account balance. Thus, the fragility of a country's banking sector, as measured by its exposure to ABCP conduits, is unrelated to the direction of the global imbalances. Both banks in surplus countries and banks in deficit countries sponsor ABCP conduits. To correct for the relative size of countries, Figure 7 shows the correlation of ABCP activity, measured as ABCP outstanding relative to total bank equity, and the current account balance. Again, we find that ABCP activity is unrelated to the current account balance.

In order to control for bank observables in the geography of asset-backed commercial paper conduits, we examine the decision to sponsor using the bank-level. We define an indicator variable “sponsor” equal to one if a bank sponsors ABCP conduits worth 10% or more of its equity and zero otherwise. We estimate the regression

$$Sponsor_i = \alpha + \beta X_i + \gamma I_c + \varepsilon_{ic}$$

where X_i are bank-level observables such as the share of deposits, the share of short-term debt, the capital ratio, the natural logarithm of bank assets, and the natural logarithm of equity. The variables I_c are country-level fixed effects for the five countries with the largest ABCP exposure. We restrict the sample to banks with total assets of at least \$10 billion.

Table 7 presents the results. Column (1) shows that the country indicator variables are statistically significant at the 1% level for all countries with the exception of France. Column (2) adds bank size measured as the natural logarithm of bank assets. The coefficient on bank size is statistically significant, which suggests that larger banks are more likely to sponsor conduits, but does not affect the country fixed effects. Columns (3) to (6) add further control variables such as the natural logarithm of equity, the capital ratio, profitability, and the share of short financed with deposits. Importantly, the coefficients on the country indicator variables remain statistically significant and the economic magnitude of the coefficient even increases. Column (7) restricts the sample to banks with at least \$100 billion of assets and finds similar results.

Overall, these results suggest that both banks located in surplus countries and banks located in deficit countries manufacture riskless assets by issuing asset-backed

commercial paper. These results are robust to controlling for bank-level observable characteristics.

3.3. The role of financial sector regulation

There is considerable variation across countries in their regulatory treatment of ABCP conduits. One important component of regulation in all countries is the distinction between credit enhancement and liquidity enhancement. In the context of conduits, credit enhancement is an *unconditional* guarantee by the sponsoring bank to pay off maturing commercial paper if the conduit is unable to do so. In almost all countries, credit enhancement is considered equivalent to on-balance sheet financing and therefore requires the same amount of regulatory capital.

However, there is important variation across countries in the regulatory treatment of liquidity enhancement. In the context of conduits, liquidity enhancement is a *conditional* guarantee by the sponsoring bank to pay off maturing commercial paper if the conduit is unable to do so. The condition is that the assets in the conduits are deemed performing when the sponsor is called upon to provide liquidity. In practice, conduits usually stipulate assets as performing if the delinquency rate is below a pre-specified level (unsecuritized assets) or if the assets are rated as investment grade (securitized assets).

This structure of liquidity enhancement ensures that liquidity enhancement is effectively providing the same level of insurance to outside investor as credit enhancement. The reason is that most assets in conduits are considered high quality, which ensures that there is a considerable time lag between the first signs of a decline in

asset quality and the date at which assets are deemed non-performing. Since commercial paper is short-term, this means that the commercial paper almost always expires before assets are deemed non-performing. Consistent with this interpretation, Acharya, Schnabl, and Suarez (2009) find that there is not a single bank-sponsored conduit with full liquidity enhancement in which liquidity enhancement expired before asset-backed commercial paper investors were repaid.

We therefore focus on bank regulation regarding liquidity enhancement. We summarize the relevant regulation regarding liquidity enhancement for the countries which are the main three sponsors of conduits: United States, United Kingdom, and Germany. We also describe the regulations for Canada and Spain, which differ in their treatment of liquidity enhancement. Finally, we summarize regulation for other countries.

3.3.1. United States

Before 2001, bank regulators in the United States made a strict distinction between credit enhancement and liquidity enhancement. Credit enhancement was considered equivalent to on-balance sheet financing, resulting in an eight percent capital charge for assets covered by credit enhancement. Liquidity enhancement was considered off-balance sheet financing, resulting in a zero percent capital charge for assets covered by liquidity enhancement. Most conduits primarily used liquidity enhancement to provide insurance to outside investors against non-repayment of maturing ABCP, which resulted in low capital charges for assets in conduits relative to assets on balance sheets.

In 2001, the energy company Enron declared bankruptcy due to fraud and regulators uncovered the role of Enron's off-balance sheet vehicles in hiding Enron's financial liabilities. As a result, regulators decided to re-examine the regulatory treatment of ABCP conduits because conduits shared many structural features of Enron's off-balance sheet vehicles.

In January 2003, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) issued final accounting guidance on variable interest entities (FASB Interpretation No. 46 or FIN 46), which would have required the consolidation of conduits on bank balance sheet under US GAAP. Industry publications around that time discuss the likely possibility that new regulation would require the same capital charges for assets in conduits as for assets on balance sheets. Consistent with this interpretation, Figure 1 shows that there is no growth in ABCP outstanding during the period from 2001 to 2004.

In October 2003, US bank regulators - the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Office of Thrift Supervision (together, the "Agencies") - issued an interim ruling that permit banks that sponsor ABCP conduits to remove the consolidated conduit assets from their assets for the purpose of calculating risk-weighted assets. In July 2004, the Agencies issued a final ruling which required banks to hold capital against eligible liquidity enhancement at a 10% conversion factor. In practice, this ruling implied that assets in conduits required 90% less capital than assets on balance sheets. This new regulation thus continued to mandate much lower capital for assets in conduits relative to conduits on balance sheets. As shown in Figure 1, there was a large increase in ABCP outstanding after the Agencies issued this ruling.

3.3.2. United Kingdom

Before 2004, the United Kingdom had the same capital regulation as the United States. Assets in conduits covered by liquidity enhancement were exempted from capital charges. Contrary to the United States, the United Kingdom did not revise this regulation before the financial crisis. However, there are two important developments that are different from the United States.

First, in the early 2000s several UK banks started adopting new accounting standards based on International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). IFRS does not recognize the transfer of assets to a conduit as a true sale in the accounting sense, which means that UK banks using IFRS accounting rules were required to consolidate conduits on its balance sheet for the purposes of financial reporting. As noted in a report by Price Waterhouse on the “Great Accounting Debate: Conduits off or on balance sheet under IFRS”, IFRS does not recognize the usual structure employed by US banks to circumvent consolidation under FIN 46. However, the UK bank regulator did not update the rules for computing capital requirement following the consolidation under IFRS. Hence, for the purpose of computing regulatory capital, conduits continued to be treated as off-balance sheet even though for financial reporting purposes they were on the balance sheet.

Second, in 2007 most UK banks started adopting the new regulatory framework based on Basel 2. Under the standardized approach, Basel 2 mandates a 20% capital charge against liquidity enhancement covering assets in conduits. Hence, the standardized approach still maintained an 80% lower capital charge for assets in conduits relative to assets on the balance sheet. However, if a conduit was holding highly rated assets, the absolute reduction in required capital was lower, because highly rated assets

had lower risk weights under Basel 2 than under Basel 1. Under the internal ratings based approach, the difference in regulatory capital between off-balance sheet and on-balance sheet financing is lower, because this approach is based on modeling assumptions which make less distinction between credit and liquidity enhancement. In 2007, however, the regulatory treatment of ABCP conduits under Basel 2 was still under discussion.

3.3.3. Germany

The history of the regulatory framework in Germany is similar to the United Kingdom. German banks were not required to hold capital against liquidity enhancement. In the early 2000s, some large German banks started adopting IFRS but, similar to UK banks, conduits continued to be off-balance sheet for regulatory purposes even though they were on the balance sheet for financial reporting purposes. Also, starting in 2006 and 2007 German banks adopted Basel 2 which reduced the difference in regulatory treatment of assets on the balance sheet relative to assets in conduits.

Contrary to other countries, Germany has large number of regional banks called Landesbanken, which are owned by state governments. Importantly, before 2005, German Landesbanken operated with guarantees by their respective state government, which significantly lowered their funding costs. In 2001, the European Union decided that such guarantees violated EU competition law and required state governments to abandon state guarantees by 2005. However, all debt issued prior to 2005 would still benefit from grandfathered state guarantees until 2015. As a result, many Landesbanken issued debt before 2005 in order to raise financing at low funding costs.

Apparently, a large number of banks choose to invest these funds into conduits. As discussed above, the grandfathered state guarantees were of critical importance in the ratings agencies' assessments whether Landesbanken could support such conduits. Due to the guarantees, Landesbank were able to take on significantly more conduits assets relative to their size, which resulted in significantly higher exposure to conduits. This was the reason why German banks were among the first banks to be bailed out by their government.

3.3.4. Spain

The regulation in Spain with respect to IFRS and Basel 2 was similar to the UK and Germany. Contrary to the other countries, however, in the early 2000s, the Spanish banks regulator decided to require an 8% capital charge against assets in conduits. Reportedly, the regulator was worried about a domestic housing boom and wanted to prevent Spanish banks from taking on additional exposure via conduits. As a result, in Spain there was effectively no difference in capital requirements for assets on balance sheet and assets off balance sheet.

Interestingly, we do not find a single Spanish bank that is sponsoring conduits directly. This observation is consistent with lower benefits from conduits in Spain due to this regulation. However, we observe that one Spanish bank, Santander, has exposure to conduits via its wholly-owned UK subsidiary Abbey National plc. It is not possible to determine whether the Spanish regulator required capital against conduits sponsored by Abbey National but, if not, this may be another example of the limitation of national regulation in dealing with global banks.

3.3.5. Canada

Before 2004, bank regulation in Canada was similar to the United States. If support to conduits was structured via liquidity enhancements, the bank was not required to hold any capital against the conduit. In 2004, the Canadian bank regulator, the Office of the Superintendent, introduced capital charges for banks that had used standard liquidity enhancement. However, the Office of the Superintendent suggested that financial institutions can structure liquidity enhancement such that it is only paid out if there is a general market disruption. This “Canadian-style” liquidity enhancement did not require a capital charge.

As a result, most Canadian conduits adopted the new Canadian-style liquidity enhancement. In response, the international rating agencies Moody’s and S&P decided to leave the Canadian market (i.e., not rate any Canadian ABCP) because the Canadian-style liquidity enhancement were insufficient to safeguard outside investors. However, the local rating agency Dominion Bond Rating Services continued to rate Canadian issuances.

At the start of the financial crisis in 2007, many Canadian conduits experienced difficulties issuing ABCP. Some Canadian banks decided to provide liquidity, either because they determined that they were legally required to do so or because they wanted to protect the franchise value of their conduits. However, many international banks did not provide liquidity with the argument that the crisis did not qualify as a general market disruption. Hence, there were two groups of conduits. The first group defaulted on their ABCP, which triggered significant losses for outside investors, such as Canadian money

market funds. The second group of conduits restructured their liquidity enhancement according to US rules and managed to remain in the market.

3.3.6. Other countries

To the best of our knowledge, most other countries had similar regulations as the United Kingdom and United States. Under Basel 1, liquidity enhancement was considered off balance sheet and bank regulators required no capital charge against the liquidity enhancement. Under the standardized approach of Basel 2, which was only implemented in parts of Europe, there was an 80% lower capital charge for assets in conduits relative to assets on the balance sheet. According to industry publications, the only exception to this regulation apart from Spain was Portugal, which may have been following Spain's lead. Consistent with this regulation, we do not find any Portuguese bank sponsoring conduits.

4. Conduit Exposure and the Financial Crisis

Our hypothesis is that banks with large conduit exposure would be more adversely affected by the crisis in the ABCP Market which took hold on August 9th, 2007, and regardless of their geographic location. The difficulty in testing this hypothesis is that the financial crisis has many different aspects and ABCP is only one of these aspects. Hence, if we observe that banks with conduit exposure have lower returns during the financial crisis, then this result may be driven by other bank activities that negatively affect stock prices and are correlated with conduit exposure. For example, starting October 2007, banks started taking write-downs also on their exposure to AAA-

tranches of sub-prime assets. As shown in Figures 1 and 2, on August 9, 2007, ABCP investors reduced purchases of newly issued ABCP and spreads jumped from 10 bps to 150 bps. Hence, we focus only on the month of August 2007 to test for the impact of conduit exposure on banks to get cleaner identification of effects of the ABCP freeze.

We restrict our sample to the 300 largest financial institutions because only those institutions had the financial strength to support conduits. We restrict our analysis to commercial banks based in Europe and the United States because these were the main sponsors of conduits. We restrict the sample to banks with share price data (107 observations). We measure conduit exposure as ABCP outstanding relative to equity capital as of January 1, 2007.

4.1 Country-level Response

First, we illustrate that the effect of the ABCP freeze was felt globally wherever ABCP exposure was high. This can be seen in Figure 8 where we employ as the independent variable the average stock return performance from August 1, 2007 to August 31, 2007 of all banks in a given country and as the dependent variable the average ABCP to equity exposure of that country's banks. Countries that have non-trivial exposures are the US, the UK and the France (deficit countries) and Belgium, Netherlands and Germany (surplus countries). Most other countries are close to zero in terms of ABCP exposure. Nevertheless, there is a reasonably negative relationship between country-level stock price reaction and ABCP exposure. Even if this relationship were treated as being virtually flat, it is clear that banks of countries with high ABCP exposure suffered when ABCP Market froze, regardless of whether these were surplus or

deficit countries. This underscores our main thesis of the paper that the financial crisis materialized at the very onset – in August 2007 – also in many of the surplus countries, and that it was not just the US (and the UK) that got affected by the production of risk-free ABCP to meet the inflow of global imbalances into the US money market funds.

4.2 Bank-level response

To verify that the stock price responses in August 2007 were indeed due to ABCP exposure, we examine the bank-level stock price response and its relationship to bank-level exposure. Our baseline specification is

$$R_i = \alpha + \beta \text{ConduitExp}_i + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i$$

where R_i is the cumulative stock return of bank i computed over the month of August 2007, ConduitExp_i is bank i 's ABCP conduit exposure relative to equity, X_i are banks i 's observable characteristics (measured as of January 1, 2007) and ε_i is an error term.

We estimate the specification using robust standard errors to allow for correlation across error terms.

Table 8 presents the results. Column (1) shows that a one-unit increase in conduit exposure reduces the cumulative stock return by 3.4 percentage points. To fix ideas, a one-unit increase is approximately two standard deviations in the exposure variable or about the difference between the exposure of Citibank (high exposure) and Wells Fargo (no exposure). Column (2) controls for banks size with the natural logarithm of assets and the natural logarithm of equity. The coefficient of interest decreases to 2.3% but remains statistically significant. Column (3) adds controls for the equity ratio and the coefficient remains unchanged. Columns (4) and (5) add control variables for funding

sources such as deposit funding and short-term debt funding and the results are unaffected. To test if exposure explains *within-country* variation in stock price reactions, Columns (6) adds indicator variables for the country of bank headquarters. Again, the coefficient of interest is unaffected and remains statistically significant. We interpret these results as evidence that banks with higher conduit exposure were more negatively affected by the ABCP market freeze. The coefficient may in fact constitute a lower bound of the realized impact because investors may have underestimated the severity of the downturn or may not have been fully aware of the (relatively opaque) credit guarantees provided to conduits.

Figures 9 and 10 capture this relationship between bank-level conduit exposure and stock-price reaction. Figure 10 corroborates the regression evidence of a negative relationship after the ABCP market freeze, whereas Figure 9 highlights that such relationship was non-existent during 2007 prior to August 2007. The latter finding helps rule out that the negative relationship unearthed in August 2007 is not due to an omitted variable bias, for example, some other form of bank heterogeneity that correlates in opposite ways with conduit exposure and stock returns.

4.3 Dollar shortages

As discussed above, most conduits financed themselves in US dollars but many sponsoring banks were located in European countries. To the best of our knowledge, conduits usually hedge their currency exposure. For example, if a conduit owns long-term assets in US dollars and finances the assets by issuing short-term asset-backed commercial paper in US dollars, the conduit is considered hedged from a currency

perspective. However, this structure exposes the sponsoring bank to the risk that the commercial paper cannot be rolled over and that the bank has to provide liquidity in US dollars. Consistent with this interpretation, the Belgium bank Fortis, a large sponsor of asset-backed commercial paper, states in its 2006 annual report that “the Fortis policy for banking activities is to hedge via short-term funding in the corresponding currency where possible”.

As a result, we expect a large demand for US dollar funding by European banks around the start of the financial crisis in 2007. In particular, if assets held by conduits are illiquid or can only be sold at fire-sale prices, banks need to secure US dollar funding from sources other than the asset-backed commercial paper market. In fact, McGuire and von Peter (2009) document a significant “US dollar shortage” during the financial crisis. One way to measure the extent of the US dollar shortage is as the total borrowing in US dollars by European banks’ US offices.

Figure 11 shows total borrowing by European banks’ US offices, measured as total liabilities in US dollars minus total assets in US dollars. The figure shows that total borrowing increased significantly at the start of the financial crisis in August 2007. McGuire and von Peter (2009) argue that at least some of the increase in borrowing of European banks’ US offices was borrowing from Federal Reserve facilities to which several European institutions had access to in their capacity as primary dealers. This evidence suggests that European banks substituted financing from the asset-backed commercial paper with financing from the Federal Reserve. As discussed by McGuire and von Peter (2009), such dollar shortages became particularly severe after the Lehman

bankruptcy, which prompted the Federal Reserve to establish swap lines with other central banks, in particular in European countries.

5. Discussion: Bank Incentives to Concentrate Risks through Securitization

We have presented evidence that the geography of the financial crisis of 2007-09 had more to do with banking flows rather than with global imbalances. Hence, we avoid reiterating the question asked elsewhere – which is what has caused the global imbalances and how to fix them. Instead, we ask – what incentives did large, global banks have to concentrate risks while deploying securitization methods such as ABCP Conduits to absorb the capital inflows? We discuss a few possibilities including the changing nature of banking business, erosion of margins in traditional lending activity due to competition and securitization, risk-taking incentives induced by such erosion of bank franchise values, weak enforcement of capital requirements, bank size and government guarantees, and finally, globalization of banking. More empirical work is needed in order to tease between these different possible explanations.

To understand the surge in setting up of conduits in the period preceding July 2007, it is useful to start with the traditional banking model. In traditional banking, banks held on to the loans they originated while performing the role of delegated monitoring and screening on behalf of depositors (Diamond, 1984). In modern banking, there was a fundamental change in that banks originated loans and then distributed them to outside investors. In particular, banks began transferring financial assets, such as mortgages, trade receivables, consumer loans, corporate loans, and consumer loans off their balance sheets into separate legal entities called structured purpose vehicles (SPVs), of which

ABCP conduits are one example. SPVs own the financial assets and issue asset-backed securities structured using several layers of tranches with higher tranches having priority over lower tranches in case of default of the underlying assets. This process of securitization was deemed to improve the safety of the financial system by allocating the financial risks to investors best able to hold those risks (Duffie, 2007).

Financial system regulators have long recognized the benefits of securitization and provided incentives for financial institutions to shed risk and securitize assets. In practice, these incentives take the form of lower capital requirements if assets are securitized. This is beneficial from the bank's perspective, because issuing equity is generally costly relative to issuing debt. The downside of securitization is that it reduces bank incentives to properly monitor and screen borrowers relative to the traditional banking model (see, for instance, Stiglitz, 1992). Indeed, Berndt and Gupta (2008), Dell'Ariccia et al (2008), Keys et al (2008) and Mian and Sufi (2008) provide evidence that securitization and credit risk transfer weakened bank monitoring incentives in the run-up to the financial crisis of 2007-09.⁸

However, this explanation cannot fully explain the large losses on securitized assets realized *within* the banking sector in the ongoing financial crisis. Krishnamurthy (2008) shows that 39% of securitized mortgages were held on bank balance sheets as of June 2008. In fact, many banks securitized assets but effectively were exposed to significant risk of assets after securitization (as with ABCP conduits in our paper) or

⁸ For example, Keys et al (2008) show that loans eligible for securitization had higher default rates relative to comparable loans not eligible for securitization. If outside investors are unable to assess loan quality properly and instead rely on information provided by banks or rating agencies, banks have an incentive to originate low quality loans and sell them at inflated prices.

explicitly continued to hold the risks after securitization (as with holdings of AAA tranches of sub-prime mortgages).⁹ This suggests that reduced monitoring incentives only provide a partial explanation for why banks decided to originate *and* hold securitized assets.

We conjecture that while securitization freed up costly equity capital that banks could deploy elsewhere, at the same time, banks no longer collected revenues from holding and managing risk, thus operating at weaker margins in their traditional business. As a result, banks started to explore how to reduce capital requirements while still earning compensation for holding risk. For example, in the case of ABCP conduits, banks sold credit and liquidity guarantees so that short-term debt investors in the conduits' assets had effectively close to full, contingent recourse to bank balance-sheets but banks benefited from lower capital requirements in the short run. In particular, if asset quality deteriorated in future, then end investors in securitization vehicles would not roll over debt, a form of a “run” in the shadow banking sector, and the asset risks would be brought back by banks on their balance-sheets (Covitz, Liang, and Suarez, 2009).

This most modern banking model – which Acharya, Schnabl and Suarez (2009) call as “securitization without risk transfer” - evidently violates the defining characteristic of securitization, namely, the transfer of credit risk to outside investors. It is however consistent with banks wanting to risk shift (Jensen and Meckling, 1976) or pay out private profits at the expense of transferring hidden debt risks on to others (for example, on to taxpayers, as argued by Akerlof and Romer, 1993). Such incentives in turn might have arisen because of heightened competition and cross-border banking leading to a

⁹ E.g., a report commissioned by the Swiss Banking Regulator documents that UBS, one of the world largest banks by assets in 2006, actively sought to keep and purchase assets they had previously securitized.

thinning of margins in traditional banking business (Keeley, 1990, Gorton, 2009),¹⁰ short-termism on part of bank management and risk-takers (Gorton and Rosen, 1995), and the presence of government guarantees such as deposit insurance and the too-big-to-fail doctrine (Arteta et al, 2008).

Also, as stressed earlier in the paper, banks found ABCP conduits especially attractive as risk-free assets were created with very little capital on balance-sheet by providing guarantees to conduits in the form of “liquidity enhancement” (essentially, short-term revolvers being rolled over to synthesize a long-term credit guarantee). While this practice was legal, it was clearly an exploitation of loophole in capital requirements since the accordance of such guarantees did not constitute a complete credit risk transfer and capital treatment of conduits should thus have been identical to on balance-sheet assets. Indeed, Spain and Portugal adopted national capital standards to rule out any preferential treatment of conduits, and had little conduit activity, whereas other regulators chose to allow the “regulatory arbitrage”.

Viewed through this lens – that of global banks and bankers wanting to take excessive risks to transfer value away from creditors and taxpayers – global imbalances could in fact be considered as a catalyst or amplifier of the financial crisis of 2007-09 rather than the root cause.

¹⁰ Stiroh (2002) shows, for example, that the component of revenues earned through interest payments by commercial banks in the United States has been dwindling steadily, and it has been replaced by fee-based income and trading revenues. While interest and fee income is relatively stable over the business cycle, trading revenues are highly volatile and in fact much lower in Sharpe ratios. This can be considered evidence supportive of a gradual trend in banking to engage increasingly in short-term, speculative activities, a phenomenon only further facilitated by the repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act (separating commercial and investment banking activities) and enactment of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act in 1999 (allowing commercial, investment and insurance activities within a single bank).

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we provided evidence that while global imbalances help explain the capital flows from surplus to deficit countries, they fail to explain the geography of the financial crisis of 2007-09, in particular, why surplus countries such as Germany and their banks were as heavily involved as the US banks in the business of creating risk-free securities and concentrating risks in the process. We examined the asset-backed commercial paper conduits – one production technology for risk-free assets to meet the needs of US money market funds – as a way of illustrating this point. We conclude that while it is useful for future reforms to take head on the issue of reducing global imbalances, they are no panacea for ruling out global financial crises that seem more attributable to global banking flows and an increasing propensity of the global banking sector to manufacture tail risks (or “carry trade” style payoffs). Maturity mismatch of the ABCP conduits and their effective recourse to sponsor bank balance sheets can be considered a canonical example of such propensity. Addressing this propensity might reduce incidence of global financial crises even in a world where global imbalances persist. While many reforms to the financial sector are being proposed, one seems most important to us: the quality of enforcement of capital requirements (and not just their level). Not allowing global imbalances to find their way into the poorly-capitalized shadow banking world of ABCP conduits might have simply reversed or at least blocked the pattern of capital flows, and enabled financial regulators worldwide to effect a (relatively) market-based correction to the global imbalances.

It is sometimes easier to guard against a disease than to eradicate it. Global imbalances may be a case in point.

References

- Acharya, Viral V., Douglas Gale and Tanju Yorulmazer, 2008. "Rollover Risk and Market Freezes", Working Paper, New York University Stern School of Business.
- Acharya, Viral V. and Matthew Richardson, 2009. "Causes of the Financial Crisis", *Critical Review*, 21(2-3), 195-210.
- Acharya, Viral V. and Philipp Schnabl, 2009. "How Banks Played the Leverage 'Game'", Chapter 2 in Acharya, Viral V. and Matthew Richardson (editors), 2009. "Restoring Financial Stability: How to Repair a Failed System", New York University Stern School of Business, John Wiley & Sons.
- Acharya, Viral V., Philipp Schnabl and Gustavo Suarez, 2009. "Securitization without risk transfer", Working Paper, New York University Stern School of Business.
- Akerlof, George A. and Paul M. Romer, 1993. "Looting: The Economic Underworld of Bankruptcy for Profit," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, Economic Studies Program, The Brookings Institution, vol. 24(2), pages 1-74.
- Arteta, Carlos, Mark Carey, Ricardo Correa, and Jason Kotter, 2008, "Revenge of the Steamroller: ABCP as a Window on Risk Choices", Working Paper, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve.
- Ashcraft, Adam and Til Schuermann, 2008, "Understanding the Securitization of the Subprime Mortgage Credit", Federal Reserve Bank of New York staff reports.
- Baba, Naohiko, Robert N McCauley and Srichander Ramaswamy, 2009, "US dollar money market funds and non-US banks", Bank for International Settlements (BIS) Quarterly Review, March, 65-81.
- Bernanke, Ben, 2005, "The Global Saving Glut and the U.S. Current Account Deficit," speech delivered for the Sandridge Lecture at the Virginia Association of Economists, Richmond, March 10, www.federalreserve.gov/boarddocs/speeches/2005/200503102/default.htm.
- Bernanke, Ben S. (2009). "Financial Reform to Address Systemic Risk." Speech at the Council on Foreign Relations, Washington, D.C. (March 10). URL: <http://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/bernanke20090310a.htm>
- Berndt, Antje and Anurag Gupta, 2008. "Moral Hazard and Adverse Selection in the Originate-to-Distribute Model of Bank Credit", Working paper, Carnegie Mellon University.

Brunnermeier, Markus, 2009. "Deciphering the Liquidity and Credit Crunch of 2007-08", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 23(1), 77-100.

Caballero, R.J, E. Farhi, and P.O. Gourinchas, "An Equilibrium Model of Global Imbalances and Low Interest Rates," *American Economic Review*, March 2008.

Caballero, R.J. and A. Krishnamurthy, 2009, "Global Imbalances and Financial Fragility," *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, 99(2), 584-88.

Calomiris, Charles, 2009, "Financial Innovation, Regulation and Reform", forthcoming, the *Cato Journal*.

Calomiris, Charles and Joseph Mason, 2004, "Credit Card Securitization and Regulatory Arbitrage", *Journal of Financial Services Research* 26(1), 5-27

Coval, Joshua, Jakub Jurek and Erik Stafford, 2009, "Economic Catastrophe Bonds," forthcoming *American Economic Review*.

Covitz, Daniel, Nellie Liang and Gustavo Suarez, 2009, "The Anatomy of a Financial Crisis: The Evolution of Panic-Driven Runs in the Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Market," Working Paper, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve.

Dell'Ariccia, Giovanni, Deniz Igan and Luc Laeven, 2008. "Credit Booms and Lending Standards: Evidence from the Subprime Mortgage Market", Working paper, International Monetary Fund.

Diamond, Douglas, 1984. "Financial Intermediation and Delegated Monitoring", *Review of Economic Studies*, 51, 393-414.

Gorton, Gary, 2008, "The Panic of 2007", Yale University working paper.

Gorton, Gary, 2009, "Slapped in the Face by the Invisible Hand: Banking and the Panic of 2007", Working Paper, Yale University working paper.

Gorton, Gary and Richard Rosen, 1995, "Corporate Control, Portfolio Choice, and the Decline of Banking," *Journal of Finance*, 50(5), pp. 1377-420.

Gorton, Gary and Nicholas S. Souleles, 2005, Special purpose vehicles and securitization, NBER Working Paper No. 11190.

Jagannathan, Ravi, Mudit Kapoor and Ernst Schaumburg, 2009, "Why are we in a recession? The Financial Crisis is the Symptom not the Disease!", Working Paper, Northwestern University.

Jensen, Michael C., William H. Meckling, 1976, Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs and Ownership Structure, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305-360.

Kacperczyk, Marcin and Philipp Schnabl, 2009, “When Safe Proved Risky: Commercial Paper during the Financial Crisis of 2007-2009”, Working Paper, New York University.

Keeley, Michael, 1990, “Deposit Insurance, Risk, and Market Power in Banking”, *American Economic Review*, 80(5), 1183-1200.

Keys, Benjamin, Tanmoy Mukherjee, Amit Seru and Vikrant Vig, 2008. “Did Securitization Lead to Lax Screening? Evidence from Subprime Loans?” Working paper, London Business School.

Krishnamurthy, Arvind, 2008, “The Financial Meltdown: Data and Diagnoses”, Northwestern University working paper.

Lee, Gilham, 2005, “Accounting Consolidation versus Capital Calculation: The Conflict Over Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Programs”, North Carolina Banking Institute Journal, Volume 9

McGuire, Patrick and Goetz von Peter, 2009, The US dollar shortage in global banking and the international policy response, Working Paper, Bank for International Settlements.

Mendoza, Enrique G., Vincenzo Quadrini, and José Víctor Ríos-Rull, 2007. “Financial Integration, Financial Deepness, and Global Imbalances.” NBER Working Paper 12909

Mian, Atif, and Amir Sufi, 2008. “The consequences of mortgage credit expansion: Evidence from the 2007 Mortgage Default Crisis”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, forthcoming.

Moody’s Investor Service, 2007, “ABCP Market at a Glance: ABCP Credit Arbitrage Snapshot (March 2007)”, Special Report

Nadauld, Taylor D. and Shane M. Sherlund, 2008. “The Role of the Securitization Process in the Expansion of Subprime Credit”, Working Paper, Ohio State University.

Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth Rogoff (2001). “Perspectives on OECD Capital Market Integration: Implications for U.S. Current Account Adjustment.” In *Global Economic Integration: Opportunities and Challenges*. Kansas City, MO: Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City.

Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth Rogoff (2005). “Global Current Account Imbalances and Exchange Rate Adjustments.” *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 1: 67-146.

Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth Rogoff (2007). "The Unsustainable U.S. Current Account Position Revisited." In Richard H. Clarida, editor, *G7 Current Account Imbalances: Sustainability and Adjustment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth Rogoff, 2009. "Global Imbalances and the Financial Crisis: Products of Common Causes", Working Paper, Harvard University.

Portes, Richard (2009). "Global Imbalances." In Mathias Dewatripont, Xavier Freixas, and Richard Portes, editors, *Macroeconomic Stability and Financial Regulation: Key Issues for the G20*. London: Centre for Economic Policy Research.

Rose, Andrew K. and Mark M. Spiegel, 2009a. "Cross-Country Causes and Consequences of the 2008 Crisis: Early Warning", CEPR Discussion Paper 7354.

Rose, Andrew K. and Mark M. Spiegel, 2009b. "Cross-Country Causes and Consequences of the 2008 Crisis: International Linkages and American Exposure", CEPR Discussion Paper 7476.

Shin, Hyun Song, 2009, "Securitization and Financial Stability" paper presented as the Economic Journal Lecture at the Royal Economic Society meeting, Warwick, March 2008.

Stiglitz, Joseph, 1992, "Banks versus Markets as Mechanisms for Allocating and Coordinating Investment," in J. Roumasset and S. Barr (ed.) *The Economics of Cooperation*. Boulder: Westview Press, Inc.

Stiroh, Kevin, 2002, "Diversification in Banking: Is Non Interest Income the Answer?" Working Paper, Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Figure 1: Rise and Collapse of ABCP Commercial Paper

This figure shows total asset-backed commercial paper outstanding in the period from January 2001 to February 2009. The figure is based on aggregate data provided by the Federal Reserve Board. The figure indicates the date of the Enron Bankruptcy (November 2001), the announcement of new accounting rules for liquidity enhancement provided to conduits (April 2004), and the start of the subprime crisis (August 2007).




Figure 2: Yield on overnight ABCP over Federal Funds Rate

This figure shows the yield on overnight asset-backed commercial paper over the fed funds rate from 8/1/2007 to 8/31/2008. The figure is based on yields data provided by the Federal Reserve Board. We note the large increase in the yield on 9 August 2007.




Figure 3: ABCP Structure

This figure illustrates the flow of funds to and from conduits. The sponsoring bank is usually a large commercial bank that provides management services to the conduit and receives a fee in return. The sponsoring banks usually also provides a credit guarantee to outside conduit investors. Asset originators sell both securitized and securitized assets to the conduits. Most assets purchased by conduits are originated in the United States and the United Kingdom. Conduits finance themselves by selling asset-backed commercial paper to outside investors. The main outside investors are money market funds. The names and values in brackets refer to the conduit Ormond Quay, which is described above.




Figure 4: Growth in bank-sponsored ABCP by country

This figure shows the growth in ABCP by country based reports provided by Moody's Investor Service. The data is restricted to the seven largest countries. The data is restricted to ABCP sponsored by commercial banks and mortgage lenders.




Figure 5: Global imbalances

This figure shows the correlation between global imbalances, measured as the current account balance in 2006, and the natural logarithm of gross domestic product in 2006. The current account deficit data is from the OECD Economic Outlook database. The GDP country data is from the OECD Statistical database measured at current prices and exchange rates.




Figure 6: ABCP and global imbalances, unweighted

This figure shows the correlation between global imbalances, measured as the Current Account Deficit in 2006, and off-balance sheet activity, measured as ABCP as of 1/1/2007. The current account deficit data is from the OECD Economic Outlook database. The GDP country data is from the OECD Statistical Database measured at current prices and exchange rates. The ABCP data is based on Moody's data and is restricted to ABCP sponsored by commercial banks and mortgage lenders.




Figure 7: ABCP and global imbalances, weighted by bank equity

This figure shows the correlation between global imbalances, measured as the current account deficit in 2006, and off-balance sheet activity, measured as ABCP as of 1/1/2007 relative to total bank equity in 2006. The current account deficit data is from the OECD Economic Outlook. The GDP country data is from the OECD Statistical Database measured at current prices and exchange rates. The ABCP data is based on Moody's data and is restricted to ABCP sponsored by commercial banks and mortgage lenders.




Figure 8: Stock Returns and ABCP in from July 2007 to July 2008, by country

This figure shows average stock returns for the period from July 2007 to July 2008 and ABCP exposure, measured as ABCP outstanding relative to bank size, per country. Stock returns and ABCP exposure are weighted by bank assets. The stock return index data is from Datastream, the ABCP data is from Moody's Investor Service, and the bank data is from Bankscope.




Figure 9: Stock Returns and ABCP from January 2004 to July 2007, bank-level

This figure shows the stock return and ABCP exposure, measured as the ratio of ABCP as of 1/1/2007 relative to bank equity, in the period from January 2004 to July 2007. The data is restricted to all commercial banks that are sponsoring ABCP as of 1/1/2007 and that are listed on a stock exchange. The stock return data is based on the total return index from Datastream.




Figure 10: Stock Returns and ABCP from July 2007 to July 2008, bank-level

This figure shows the stock return and ABCP exposure, measured as the ratio of ABCP as of 1/1/2007 relative to bank equity, in the period from July 2007 to July 2008. The data is restricted to all commercial banks that are sponsoring ABCP as of 1/1/2007, that are listed on a stock exchange. The graph omits two outliers with ABCP/Equity ratios of more than 100%. The stock return data is based on the total return index from Datastream.




Figure 11: Net borrowing of European banks' US offices in US dollars

This figure shows total liabilities in US dollars minus total assets in US dollars of European banks' US offices. The data is based on data collected by the Bank of International Settlements. The figure is based on the left hand panel of Figure 6 in McGuire and von Peter (2009).




Table 1: Ormond Quay's Asset Composition

This table documents the asset composition of the asset-backed commercial paper conduit Ormond Quay as of July 2007. Panel A shows the break-down by asset type and Panel B shows the breakdown by assets' country of origin. All assets held by Ormond Quay are asset-backed securities (with the exception of corporate, municipal and sovereign bonds). The information is based on Moody's July 2007 rating report of Ormond Quay.

Panel A: Asset Type		
Asset Type	Amount	%
Residential Mortgages	6,298,165,721	55.5%
Commercial Mortgages	2,698,617,285	23.8%
Consumer Loans	462,789,971	4.1%
Commercial Loans	461,329,631	4.1%
Other Asset-Backed Securities	407,388,697	3.6%
CDO/CLO	307,397,692	2.7%
Student Loans	268,042,174	2.4%
Equipment Lease Receivables	137,092,590	1.2%
Car Loans & Leases	136,437,223	1.2%
Credit Card Receivables	104,220,899	0.9%
Bonds (Corporate/Municipal/Sovereign)	70,291,219	0.6%
Total	11,351,773,102	

Panel B: Asset Origin		
Country	Amount	%
United States	4,276,996,597	37.7%
United Kingdom	2,509,790,101	22.1%
Europe	1,276,916,849	11.2%
Italy	1,059,705,514	9.3%
Spain	956,051,638	8.4%
Netherlands	442,511,775	3.9%
Germany	425,913,091	3.8%
Australia	121,468,457	1.1%
Portugal	69,875,241	0.6%
Singapore	69,345,153	0.6%
France	68,009,652	0.6%
Ireland	41,221,246	0.4%
Korea	19,926,998	0.2%
Sweden	14,040,792	0.1%
Total	11,351,773,104	

Table 2: Conduit Characteristics

This table includes all conduits that were rated by Moody's and authorized to issue Commercial Paper on 1/1/2007. We do not include conduits in South Africa (6 conduits) and CDOs authorized to issue Commercial Paper (35 CDOs). '# Programs' denotes the number of conduits. 'Size' denotes total outstanding ABCP in million USD. 'Mean' denotes the average size by program, 'Std' the standard deviation, 'Min' the minimum size, and 'Max' the maximum size. Conduits classified as full liquidity have liquidity enhancement covering all outstanding ABCP. Conduits classified as full credit have credit enhancement covering all outstanding ABCP.

	Market Total		Per Conduit (\$mn)			
	# Conduits	Size (\$mn)	Mean	Std.	Min	Max
All Conduits	296	1,235,281	4,173	5,129	0	37,872
Type						
Multiseller	135	547,970	4,059	4,380	0	21,415
Singe-Seller	63	173,549	2,755	3,964	0	18,931
Arbitrage	35	213,823	6,109	8,397	0	37,872
Hybrid	27	148,380	5,496	5,631	302	22,596
SIV	28	92,645	3,309	3,351	0	12,279
Other	8	58,914	7,364	6,323	2,373	20,337
Currency						
USD	234	972,977	4,158	4,627	0	22,596
EURO	33	219,959	6,665	8,424	0	37,872
YEN	16	22,941	1,434	2,014	0	5,976
AUD	12	19,253	1,604	1,302	142	3,944
NZD	1	151	151	0	151	151

Table 3: Sponsor Characteristics

Panel A shows the characteristics of ABCP sponsors. The analysis is based on Moody's rating reports as of 1/1/2007. Panel B shows ABCP by the location of the. Panel B is restricted to banks-sponsored ABCP.

Sponsor Characteristics				
	Total		Average	
	# Sponsors	Size (\$mn)	Mean	Std.
All Programs	126	1,235,281	9,804	14,764
Sponsor Type				
Commercial Banks	64	903,291	14,114	17,853
Structured Finance	27	181,739	6,731	11,725
Mortgage Lender	16	71,120	4,445	6,131
Insurance & Monoline	3	14,118	4,706	3,914
Investment Banks	4	11,039	2,760	2,257
Country of Origin				
United States	68	488,535	7,184	14,608
Germany	15	204,103	13,607	11,593
United Kingdom	10	195,678	19,568	17,045
Japan	5	40,820	8,164	10,606
Other	28	306,180	10,935	5,096

Table 4: Sponsor Location and Funding Currency

This table shows ABCP outstanding by the location of the sponsor and the funding currency. The analysis is based on Moody's rating reports as of 1/1/2007.

Sponsor Location	Funding Currency				Total
	USD	Euro	Yen	Other	
Belgium	30,473	4,729	0	0	35,202
Denmark	1,796	0	0	0	1,796
France	51,237	23,670	228	557	75,692
Germany	139,068	62,885	0	2,566	204,519
Italy	1,365	0	0	0	1,365
Japan	18,107	0	22,713	0	40,820
Netherlands	56,790	65,859	0	3,116	125,765
Sweden	1,719	0	0	0	1,719
Switzerland	13,082	0	0	0	13,082
United Kingdom	92,842	62,298	0	3,209	158,349
United Staes	302,054	0	0	2,996	305,050
Total	714,871	219,441	22,941	12,444	969,697

Table 5: Asset Allocation by Country of Origin

This table shows the asset allocation and ratings for the nine largest conduits as of 1/1/2007 for which this information is available. The share of “AAA”-rated assets is reported if this information is available. The information is collected from Moody’s ratings reports.

Conduit	Sponsor (Location)	Asset Allocation		
		Size	Country	Rating
Grampian	HBOS (UK)	37.0	US (70.4%), others (29.6%)	Aaa (99%)
Amstel	ABN Amro (Netherlands)	20.4	Netherlands	Aaa(99.1%)
Scaldis	Fortis (Belgium)	18.4	US (51.1%), Global (14.9%), UK (10.1%), Spain (6.3%), Various (17.5%),	Aaa (99.8%)
Atalantis One	Rabobank (Netherlands)	15.7	US (40.5%), Netherlands (27.1%), Australia (9.1%), Great Britain (5.4%), Switzerland (2.9%), New Zealand (2.6%), Others (12.4%)	
Thames Asset No1	Royal Bank of Scotland (UK)	17.9	UK (57.8%), US (35.8%) Global (3.5%), Germany (2.5%), Spain (0.4%)	
Solitaire Funding	HSBC (UK)	15.4	US (68.9%), UK (24.9%), Germany (3.3%), Europe (0.9%), Netherlands (0.7%), Australia (0.5%), Global (0.5%), Portugal (0.2%)	Aaa (100%)
Stanfield Victoria	Stanfield and Deutsche Bank (UK/Germany)	21.9	US (96%), UK (2%), Netherlands (1%), Others (1%)	
Cancara Asset Securitisation	Lloyds (UK)	15.3	USA (76%), UK (19%), Netherlands (5%)	
Cullinan Finance Limited	HSBC (UK)	13.4	US (62%), UK (23%), Japan (3%), Germany (3%), Others (9%)	
Ormond Quay	Sachsen Landesbank (Germany)	12.1	US (38%), UK (22%), Europe (11%), Italy (9%), Spain (8%)	

Table 6: Investor Characteristics

Panel A shows commercial paper holdings by investor class. Commercial paper holdings include both ABCP and other commercial paper. The analysis is based on the Flow of Funds data provided by the Federal Reserve Board. Panel B shows holdings of Asset-Backed Commercial paper by the 20 largest prime funds with non-zero ABCP holdings. The analysis is based on iMoneyNet holdings data.

Panel A: Commercial Paper Holdings by Investor Class			
Investor	Holdings	%	
Money Market Funds	608.4	27.5%	
Mutual Funds	114.1	5.1%	
Funding Corporations	584.3	26.4%	
Household Sector	187.7	8.5%	
Non-financial Corporate	122.6	5.5%	
State Government	186.2	8.4%	
Foreign Investors	226.5	10.2%	
Other Investors	186.1	8.4%	
Total	2215.9		

Panel B: Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Holdings by 20 Largest Prime Funds			
Fund	Assets	ABCP	%
Fidelity Cash Reserves	89,088	12,472	14.0%
Columbia Cash Reserves/Class A	62,519	3,751	6.0%
Schwab Value Adv MF/Instit Prime	43,498	13,919	32.0%
Bear Stearns TempFund/PremierChoice	37,273	13,418	36.0%
Fidelity Instit MMF II	27,736	5,270	19.0%
Goldman Sachs FS Prime Oblig/Adm	27,113	13,285	49.0%
Morgan Stanley Inst Liq/Prime/Part	26,261	12,080	46.0%
Reserve Primary Fund/Inv II	25,622	512	2.0%
Dreyfus Instit Cash Adv/Adm	25,482	5,606	22.0%
Centennial Money Market Trust	25,106	8,285	33.0%
Columbia MM Reserves/Trust	22,923	2,522	11.0%
Federated/Prime Oblig Fund/Inst Svc	21,985	5,276	24.0%
Schwab Money Market Fund	21,634	6,058	28.0%
AIM STIT Liquid Assets/Reserve	21,460	4,507	21.0%
DWS MM Series/Premium/CI S	19,447	194	1.0%
Citi Cash Reserves	18,891	189	1.0%
Northern Instit Divsfd Assets/CI C	17,302	5,364	31.0%
First Amer Prime Oblig/CI I	16,695	1,503	9.0%
Fidelity Prime Fund/Cap Reserves	16,690	3,338	20.0%
Schwab Cash Reserves	16,642	5,325	32.0%

Table 7: The effect of bank observables on exposure to ABCP conduits

This table analyzes the decision to sponsor asset-backed commercial paper conduits. The dependent variable is an indicator variable equal to one if ABCP relative to bank equity is larger than 10% or zero otherwise. The sample is restricted consolidated banks with total assets of at least \$10 billion in 2006. The country variables are indicator variable equal to one if bank is headquartered in that country and zero otherwise. The control variables are the natural logarithm of assets, the natural logarithm of equity, the ratio of equity to assets, the ratio of pretax profits to equity, and the ratio of deposits to assets. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%.

	Dependent Variable: Indicator Variable (ABCP/Equity>10%)						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Assets (\$bn)	>10	>10	>10	>10	>10	>10	>100
US Bank	0.226 (0.083)**	0.288 (0.071)**	0.279 (0.078)**	0.280 (0.078)**	0.262 (0.080)**	0.272 (0.080)**	0.394 (0.129)**
UK Bank	0.440 (0.126)**	0.282 (0.109)*	0.282 (0.112)*	0.287 (0.113)*	0.282 (0.113)*	0.276 (0.113)*	0.379 (0.143)**
German Bank	0.501 (0.097)**	0.427 (0.084)**	0.431 (0.093)**	0.441 (0.095)**	0.464 (0.096)**	0.460 (0.096)**	0.544 (0.118)**
Dutch Bank	0.501 (0.194)*	0.296 (0.167)	0.296 (0.169)	0.300 (0.170)	0.320 (0.170)	0.333 (0.171)	0.342 (0.189)
French Bank	0.187 (0.122)	-0.026 (0.108)	-0.027 (0.110)	-0.022 (0.110)	-0.029 (0.110)	-0.029 (0.110)	0.020 (0.123)
Log(Assets)		0.196 (0.025)**	0.186 (0.059)**	0.155 (0.082)	0.152 (0.082)	0.185 (0.086)*	0.006 (0.193)
Log (Equity)			0.012 (0.059)	0.042 (0.080)	0.041 (0.080)	0.015 (0.083)	0.24 (0.181)
Capital Ratio				-0.372 (0.691)	-0.225 (0.701)	0.057 (0.742)	-4.769 (3.430)
Profitability					0.436	0.454	0.248

					(0.373)	(0.373)	(0.519)
Share Deposits						0.178	0.07
						(0.153)	(0.243)
	0.099	-0.895	-0.865	-0.752	-0.823	-1.052	-0.34
	(0.050)*	(0.133)**	(0.198)**	(0.288)**	(0.294)**	(0.354)**	(0.871)
	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Observations	132	132	132	132	132	132	92
R-squared	0.138	0.386	0.386	0.387	0.394	0.395	0.412

Table 8: Impact of ABCP on Stock Returns at the start of the financial crisis

This table shows the effect of conduit exposure on stock return in the month of August. We restrict the sample to commercial banks that (i) are among the 300 largest financial institutions (ii) are located in the Europe or the United States, and (iii) have stock price data available. The dependent variable is the total stock return over the period from August 1th to August 31th 2007. We measure ‘Conduit Exposure’ as bank-sponsored ABCP outstanding relative to equity. Columns (2) to (6) include control variables for the ratio of short-term assets to debt, the ratio of equity to assets, log(Assets) and log(Equity). All control variables are measures on 1/1/2007. Column (6) includes fixed effects for Germany, Great Britain, and the United States. Robust standard errors are in parentheses below coefficients. * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

	Dependent Variable: Stock Return					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Exposure	-0.034 (0.007)**	-0.023 (0.005)**	-0.020 (0.006)**	-0.022 (0.008)**	-0.022 (0.008)**	-0.029 (0.009)**
Log(Assets)		-0.008 (0.009)	-0.027 (0.015)	-0.029 (0.017)	-0.029 (0.017)	-0.006 (0.025)
Log(Equity)		-0.002 (0.011)	0.018 (0.017)	0.019 (0.018)	0.019 (0.018)	-0.002 (0.026)
Capital Ratio			-0.123 (0.055)*	-0.122 (0.072)	-0.122 (0.072)	-0.058 (0.115)
Share Short Term Debt				0.084 (0.087)	0.084 (0.087)	0.029 (0.106)
Share Deposits				0.005 (0.037)	0.005 (0.037)	0.008 (0.052)
Constant	0.018 (0.007)*	0.051 (0.023)*	0.109 (0.044)*	0.107 (0.060)	0.107 (0.060)	0.009 (0.068)
Country FE	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Observations	107	107	107	107	107	107
R-squared	0.062	0.15	0.159	0.166	0.166	0.258