

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LIQUIDITY DURING CRISES TIMES: EVIDENCE FROM GREEK BANKS

Antonis Kotidis
Dimitris Malliaropulos
Elias Papaioannou

Discussant: Sergio Mayordomo

8th workshop of the MPC Task Force on Banking Analysis for Monetary Policy
Bank of Greece

**These views are the authors' ones and do not represent those of
Banco de España or the Eurosystem**



1. Effects of ELA program on

- Interbank Market: The banks contracted lending in the interbank market in response to ECB policy swing
- Provision of ELA: Importance of the ELA as a lender of last resort.

2. Firm level dimension effects

- Lending: Banks with higher exposure to the shock reduced their lending
- Exports: Among single-lender firms (those with credit losses), firms more exposed are more likely to terminate an export flow.
- **In sum: ELA was successful in subsidizing the banking system but banks responded to ELA's higher cost and conditionality cutting interbank and corporate lending**

- **Firm level dimension effects**
 - Effects of corporate lending
 - Trade effects
- **Extensions to enhance the contribution to the understanding of the ELA functioning and effects**
 - How did ELA affect the access to financing?
 - Portfolio reallocation

- **Firm level dimension effects**
 - Effects of corporate lending
 - Trade effects
- **Extensions to enhance the contribution to the understanding of the ELA functioning and effects**
 - How did ELA affect the access to financing?
 - Portfolio reallocation

- **This analysis has to be implemented with the four systemic banks that report exposures exceeding 1 million euros to individual firms.**
- **Firms in this analysis represent 1% of firms in Greece but they account for 40% of lending (very large corporations!)**
- **Additional information for a proper understanding of the results**
 - Dispersion in the variable of interest (total exposure to the ECB shock) across banks
 - Are banks “similar” ex-ante in terms of the other bank controls (banks’ exposure to the repo or deposit run)?
 - *No other bank controls.*

- **Aggregate effect (1% of firms)**
 - 1% of firms with very specific characteristics
 - *Access to financial markets...*
 - Aggregate credit at the industry, size or industry-size level
 - *More difficult to deal with demand*
 - *It enables you to use the seven banks of the first part of the paper.*
- **Demand**
 - Firm fixed-effects but the rest of the banks are not considered (demand similar across the banks considered and those do not considered).

- **Relationship lending**

- Defined based on four banks
- No significant effect on the interaction between multi-lender firm and the proxy for the bank exposure to ELA
- Suggestion to deal with the limitations of RL: Restrict the sample to firms that “only” borrow from these large 4 banks (balance-sheet vs credit register)

- **Result: Among single-lender firms, firms more exposed are more likely to terminate an export flow after the shock.**
 - Same issue as with relationship lending
 - There is no differential effect on export volumes and values
 - What type of export flows are terminated? Small clients,
 - Is the effect due to demand or supply?
 - *Role of trade credit (delay in payments) in the other countries (i.e., domestic markets).*
- **What about extending this analysis to other firm outcomes: profitability, employment, investment...**

- **Firm level dimension effects**
 - Effects of corporate lending
 - Trade effects
- **Extensions to enhance the contribution to the understanding of the ELA functioning and effects**
 - How did ELA affect the access to financing?
 - Portfolio reallocation

- **Some evidence on long-term financing**
 - Quantify stigma in financial markets (bond markets?)
- **Financing in the interbank market**
 - Characteristics of lenders (now all vs Greek banks), types of collateral used, cost of borrowing
 - *Does collateral mitigate the stigma effect?*

1. Regulatory compliance (zero risk-weights)

- Similar rebalancing to other sovereigns with zero risk-weight

2. Search for yield (general strategy: Banks compensate higher funding costs taking more risk)

- No rebalancing to other sovereigns with zero risk-weight
- More risk-taking in lending (split firms according to their risk)

3. Government support

- More purchases in months when the government needed to roll over a relatively large amount of maturing debt
- Political connections
- 2 + 3: New channel of risk taking that offers zero risk weights
- Final effect on bank profitability?

- **Dealing with ELA conditionalities**
- **Result: Banks that were close to the cutoff reduced lending to a higher extent**
 - Criteria: (i) CET1 > 4.5% & (ii) Tier1 > 6% & (iii) total capital > 8% (?)
 - ELA eligibility defined based on ex-ante distance from these thresholds
 - Are all banks eligible based on your ex-ante measures and the information available when the ELA facility was introduced?
 - *If they are, how can we disentangle what is due to banks solvency and to the ELA conditionalities?*

- **Result:** A bank's direct exposure to the ECB waiver shock is positively associated with its borrowing from ELA (importance of the ELA as a lender of last resort).
 - Control by bank characteristics that evolve over time (stock prices)
 - Interact the two bank controls (banks' exposure to the repo and deposit run) with "*Post Waiver*"
 - Are banks "similar" ex-ante in terms of the other two bank controls?

Thanks for your attention!

