### Comments for "Duration Risk Taking and Financial Stability"

David Scharfstein Harvard Business School

Financial Advisory Roundtable Federal Reserve Bank of New York November 22, 2013

# **Financial Stability Concerns**

- Two sorts of concerns
  - Excess volatility in markets in response to a rate increase
  - Adverse effect of a rate increase on leveraged financial institutions with considerable duration exposure (with possible implications for lending)
- What I'll touch on here:
  - Some amplification mechanisms that could give rise to excess volatility
  - Bank exposures to rate shocks
    - On the asset side of the balance sheet
    - On the liability side of the balance sheet

#### **Potential Amplification Mechanism 1: Reaching for Yield**

- In low interest rate environment, leveraged financial intermediaries may reach for yield by extending duration (Hanson and Stein, 2012)
- Effect of a rate increase amplified when these investors reduce their exposure to longterm bonds



*Source*: Based on data in Samuel G. Hanson and Jeremy C. Stein, "Monetary Policy and Long-Term Real Rates," Harvard Business School working paper, July 2012.

### **Potential Amplification Mechanism 2: Negative Convexity**

- Negative convexity of fixed rate mortgages: Mortgage rates increase → Expected future refinancing activity falls → Duration on MBS increases
- Since aggregate supply of duration rises, bond term premia rise to induce bond investors to bear this additional interest rate risk → Excess volatility of LT yields (Hanson, 2013)
- Negative convexity of MBS captures the strength of this amplification mechanism:
  - Negative convexity is low today because (i) refi behavior of many borrowers has become insensitive to rates (e.g., underwater and/or banks reluctant to lend) and (ii) other borrowers were able to lock in low rates with little risk of ever refinancing
  - As a result, this amplification mechanism will probably be weaker than in the past



*Source*: Based on data in Samuel G. Hanson "Mortgage Convexity," Harvard Business School working paper, November 2013. See this paper for further discussion of the amplification mechanism discussed above.

#### **Bank Exposures to Interest Rates on the Asset Side**

- Hard to know from public disclosures the precise magnitude of asset-side B/S exposures
- During 2013Q2 5-year Treasury yields rose about 60 bps, In aggregate, banks reported losses of about \$33.1B on available-for-sale securities of \$2,678B (1.2%)
- Chart below compares 2013Q2 losses to those in 2004-2006 period of rate increases. Only a partial picture given exposures elsewhere in bank portfolios, including interest rate swaps



### Bank Exposures to Interest Rates on the Liability Side

- Losses on the asset side of the balance sheet can be offset on the liability side if rate increases are not fully passed through in borrowing costs
- Pass-through will be attenuated to extent bank has more sticky low-cost deposits and savings accounts
- In last rising rate cycle (2004 2006) considerable variation across banks in rate pass through, as well as variation across products and locations (Solomon, Stockton, and Meleis, 2013).

# Cumulative Increase in Cost of Deposits for Top 50 U.S. Banking Companies 2004Q2 to 2006Q3

|                   |            | Change per 100 bp |
|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| Cost of Deposits* | COD Change | Fed Funds         |
| Highest           | +329 bp    | +78 bp            |
| Third Quartile    | +237 bp    | +56 bp            |
| Second Quartile   | +201 bp    | +48 bp            |
| Lowest            | +140 bp    | +33 bp            |
| Hi-Lo Difference  | 189 bp     | 45 bp             |

Fed Funds Rising from 1.00% to 5.25%

\*Interest expense on domestic deposits as a percent of average balances Analysis of data from Highline Financial by Novantas, Inc.

*Source*: Richard Solomon, Adam Stockton and Sherief Meleis, "Deposit Strategy: Preparing for Rising Rates" *Banking Strategies*, November 2013

# **Factors Affecting Deposit Repricing**

#### **More Repricing**

- Time deposit share much lower than average (~18% vs. ~35%) → shift into more costly time deposits when rates rise
- Growth of online banking and erosion of branch banking (greater scope for shopping/less scope for customer retention)
- Enhanced liquidity requirements could put a premium on core deposits and lead to more competition for these deposits



Data Source: FDIC Statistics on Depository Institutions

#### **Less Repricing**

 Loans/Deposits ratio is relatively low so there may be less competition for deposits

See Solomon, Stockton and Meleis (2013) for elaboration of some of these points.