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Background on network analysis at the ECB

Essential Components of Networks
  Linkages (bars) in Networks
  Units (nodes) embodying agents
  Transmission of shocks at the units

How networks have been studied at the ECB

Challenges going forward
Euro area is an ideal framework

- Natural network of countries with strong cross-border activities
- Network has both “natural” and “political” underlying factors
- Longer history on network stemming from infrastructures
- Recent application to financial flows and fragility interconnections

Unique hub of interaction makes it ideal for central bank applications - subject to networks’ characteristics and ability to address policy questions.
Financial connections across units

Interesting linkages include all forms of financial aspects underlying one financial unit’s fortune to that of another

- **Positions**: Holdings of or arrangements on securities and overall strategy
- **Activities**: Financing of and shifting positions in line with strategy
- **Role**: Function in infrastructure of payments, settlements, etc.
- **Legal**: Ownership, including network on stance and operation
- **Subsidiarity**: Sensitivity to common shocks, including market participants’ perceptions
Choice of connection for analysis

Economic aspect of interest determines desired network, determining its preferred structure . . .

- Identifying central knots: concept of systemic importance
- Identifying fragility of networks linking the system
- Develop a dynamic mechanism of exposure and/or contagion

. . . clearly on the basis of information availability
Type of interaction

Analysis has an ideal unit for desired interaction . . .

- **Natural**: Existing partition (country, regulation, etc.)
- **Sectoral**: Function-based groups (natural linkage)
- **Institutional**: Granular partition, but critically depends on information availability

. . . and selected unit restricts the choice of linkage and/or transmission mechanism

- **Countries** cap linkage and transmission mechanism
- **Sectors** determine linkage and restrict transmission mechanism
- **Institutions** have widest choice of linkages and transmission (complication)
At the moment interest centres on institutions

- Systemic fragility is largely about firm’s interconnections . . .
- ...with strong implications to national boundaries and supervisory definitions . . .
- ...but lacks supporting information and common analysis framework
Type of transmission

The mechanism transmitting shocks across units is often denoted the **behaviour** of the node (or agent)

**Mechanic** Transmission stems from fixed requirements, such as a static balance sheet identity or pricing, together with static rules, such as maturity requirements

**Strategic** Optimisation leads node (typically an institution) to measure reactions to and transmission of shocks

Transmission assumption is central to pinning down fragility or the systemic importance captured. For financial institutions the constraints imposed by the balance sheets is central
Networks in the analysis of financial infrastructures

- Traditionally the oldest and most established
- Origin on the need summarise large amount of granular information on payment and settlement flows
- Institutionally based with well defined links and no behavioural aspects
- Core element in the characterisation of substitutability aspect in systemic importance
Networks for identifying financial fragilities

- Recent work motivated by financial instrument holdings (linkages) at sectoral level (unit)
- Provides link of financial sector and real sectors analysing central role of the financial sector
- Uses mechanic mark-to-market accounting practices in the balance sheet to study propagation mechanism in the network
- Alternative model uses relationship between sectoral (unit) measures of credit risk (linkages) to depict sentiment (transmission) effect on covariation
- Directly derives a notion of **losses** stemming from shocks in the system and can provide useful tool in stress testing sectors
Networks underlying ownership structures

- Most recent motivation stemming from the need to depict concentration of eurosystem liquidity among counterparties (nodes in a centred network)
- Also supports the depiction of holdings of securities among counterparties from their the collateral pool
- Aims at identifying the fragilities in the provision of liquidity
- Provides a concrete measure of the systemic importance of institutions central to Eurosystem operations
What network is relevant?

- Network of networks (unfortunately)
- Units are less well defined than directives would lead us to believe
- Reactions at the nodes are anything but deterministic - what is the relevant behavioural assumption?
- How to prioritise the seemingly endless need for more granular data
Systemic importance is about losses

- Ultimately the measure of network’s criticality is system loss
- ... and loss critically relies on
  - agents’ reactions assumed in reacting to shock ...
  - ... and the (unmodelled) interaction between various levels of the network or networks
- ... suggesting a lower bound in terms of criticality depicted by current analysis, and substantial room for supervisory discretion
Remarks on networks being about entire systems

- Networks tell us about intricate relationships needed for macroprudential analysis
- Networks are increasingly less about national boundaries, but rather on economic and financial functions
- Global scope is the silent addressee - need of international body to carry out network analysis is evident
- Key role of international organisations in this regard
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