Costs of Sovereign Defaults: Restructuring Strategies, Bank Distress and the Credit-Investment Channel

Tamon Asonuma, Marcos Chamon, Aitor Erce and Akira Sasahara

Discussed by Johannes Fleck, EUI

- Fiscal Risk and Public Sector Balance Sheets -July 6-7, 2017

### Research question

#### How do different ways to restructure sovereign debt affect GDP?

- Restructuring strategies considered
  - 1. strictly pre-emptive
  - 2. weakly pre-emptive
  - 3. post-default
- The paper estimates their effects on cumulative GDP loss and investigates the roles of several transmission channels
  - investment
  - private credit, net capital inflows, lending rates
  - probability of banking crises

# Sovereign defaults: Known unknowns

- What is the 'true' cost of defaulting?
  - Literature estimates: 0% 20% of cumulative GDP loss
- How to model sovereign default costs?
  - restricted borrowing
  - productivity or exports affected
  - disruption to financial intermediation
- What are the motivations of defaulting governments?
  - Self-fulfilling debt run
  - Stochastic GDP and external assistance
  - Cost of repayment very large for low GDP realizations
  - $\rightarrow$  All three determine optimal design of assistance programs
    - prevent default by loans with low rates and long maturities?
    - allow default and give transfers to stabilize economy?

## This paper speaks to the unknowns

- Large dataset: Many countries over a long time horizon
  - Episodes of restructuring strategies: Asonuma and Trebesch (2016)
  - Banking crises: Laeven and Valencia (2013)
  - Target and control variables: various databases
- Methodology:
  - GDP impulse responses for distinct restructuring strategies LP: Local Projection (Jorda 2005)
  - Combine LP with endogenous strategy choice AIPW: Augmented Inv. Probability Weighting (Jorda and Taylor 2016)
- Findings:
  - 1. Cumulative GDP and investment losses increase in strategy number
  - 2. Same for risk of credit crunch and banking crisis
    - strategies differ in cost due to distinct effects on transmission channels
  - 3. Ex-ante conditions of strategies differ substantially

## Comments and suggestions (1/2)

- The paper is contributing to a specific but crowded literature To make it stand out, focus more on its innovative feature
- Address endogeneity due to distinct strategy choices further
  - First stage of AIPW: estimate propensity score using probit

$$Pr(S_j)_{i,t} = \Phi(Z_{i,t-1}, X_{i,t-1}, \gamma^{S_j})$$
 for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ 

- ▶ Identification assumption  $u \perp S_j | Pr(\cdot)$  "selection on observables"
- ► To address remaining sources of endogeneity add controls for → simultaneous crises (banking, bop, currency, political) → availability and conditions of assistance programs
- ► Zoom into episodes of different restructuring strategies → increase data frequency to account for timing (if/where possible) → look more closely at countries which pursued several strategies

# Comments and suggestions (2/2)

2. What is the 'complete' motivation to pursue a specific strategy?

Quote from the paper:

"Restructuring decisions (...) are optimal choices by the sovereign debtors"

- Data show largest number of choices for strategy with highest cost
- But size of interest payments missed is non-increasing in costs
- Are there other benefits associated with strategies 1 to 3?
- Any strategy offers insurance...

but the insurance values might depend on

- types of ex-ante GDP shocks (size, persistence) to be smoothed
- welfare costs of raising public revenue
- Two suggestions for next steps of the paper
  - $\rightarrow$  selection on observables assumption problematic in current form
  - $\rightarrow$  consider welfare measures to fully endogenize strategies

# My concluding thoughts

This paper is a great read

- It is very well written and structured
- Its topic is interesting and thought provoking
- It applies state of the art methods in this field
- It investigates essential questions related to sovereign default