Sovereign Default as a Nonlinear Network Failure: A Latent Funding Stress Model with Financial Contagion and Rare-Event Dynamics

Clete Roberts

February 1, 2026

Abstract

This paper develops a structural framework that models sovereign default in emerging markets as a nonlinear failure of an embedded financial network rather than as a direct consequence of fiscal insolvency. We construct a latent funding stress state that evolves endogenously through domestic financial conditions, global risk factors, and cross-border financial linkages. Default arises as a threshold event when this latent state crosses a country-specific critical boundary. We embed this mechanism in a Bayesian state-space model combined with a multi-state survival framework that distinguishes between distress, restructuring, and recovery. Using cross-border bank exposures and international portfolio holdings to form a time-varying financial network, we identify the causal role of financial contagion through exogenous global funding shocks. The results show that network centrality and latent stress dominate fiscal fundamentals in explaining crisis transitions during global risk-off regimes. Counterfactual policy simulations suggest that international liquidity provision targeted at systemically central sovereigns substantially reduces the probability of cascading default episodes.

Contents

1 Introduction

Sovereign default is one of the most disruptive events in international finance, with consequences that extend beyond national borders and across asset classes. Traditional models emphasize fiscal solvency and the government's intertemporal budget constraint as the primary determinants of default (1; 2; 3). In these frameworks, default occurs when the expected costs of repayment exceed those of exclusion from capital markets.

However, recent episodes in emerging markets suggest that sovereign crises frequently unfold in environments where fiscal metrics remain broadly stable until shortly before the event. Instead, crises are often preceded by sharp contractions in global risk appetite, sudden stops in capital flows, and stress in domestic financial systems. These patterns point to a funding-based interpretation of default, in which a sovereign loses access to rollover financing due to systemic financial stress rather than because of a gradual deterioration in its fiscal position.

This paper formalizes this intuition by modeling sovereign default as a nonlinear failure in a global financial network. Each sovereign is treated as a node embedded in a web of cross-border banking and portfolio investment linkages. Latent funding stress evolves as a function of domestic financial conditions, global risk factors, and spillovers from stressed counterparties. Default occurs when this latent state crosses a country-specific threshold, triggering a rapid escalation in the hazard of restructuring or non-payment.

Our approach unifies three literatures. First, it extends sovereign default theory by introducing a structural role for financial intermediaries and network contagion. Second, it contributes to the global financial cycle literature by providing a mechanism through which global liquidity shocks translate into sovereign crises. Third, it applies network theory to sovereign risk, emphasizing the role of exposure topology in shaping crisis propagation.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews the related literature. Section 3 presents a theoretical microfoundation that links sovereign rollover risk to intermediary balance sheet constraints. Section 4 introduces the latent stress and network contagion model. Section 5 describes network construction and data. Section 6 outlines the identification strategy. Section 7 details the Bayesian estimation procedure. Section 8 presents empirical results.

Section 9 conducts policy counterfactuals and welfare analysis. Section 10 discusses robustness and extensions. Section 11 concludes.

2 Related Literature

The sovereign default literature models default as a strategic decision by a benevolent government facing output costs and exclusion from capital markets (1; 2). **(author?)** (3) provide a comprehensive treatment of these models and their quantitative implications.

Empirical work documents that global financial conditions play a dominant role in determining sovereign spreads and capital flows (4; 5**?**). **(author?)** (7) argues that a global financial cycle driven by US monetary policy and global risk appetite constrains domestic monetary autonomy even under flexible exchange rates.

The role of financial intermediaries and balance sheet constraints in amplifying market stress is emphasized by **(author?)** (8) and **(author?)** (9). **(author?)** (10) shows that dealer balance sheet capacity is central to liquidity provision in sovereign bond markets.

Network approaches to systemic risk highlight the importance of connectivity and exposure concentration (11; 12). While this literature focuses primarily on banks and financial institutions, recent work has begun to apply network methods to sovereign risk and international capital flows.

Methodologically, this paper draws on latent state-space models (14), rare-event econometrics (13), and multi-state survival analysis (15).

3 Theoretical Microfoundation

4 Notation and Timing

Time is discrete and indexed by $t = 1, \dots, T$. Countries are indexed by $i = 1, \dots, N$. All information available to agents at time t is denoted by the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$.

The sequence of events within each period is as follows:

1. Global financial conditions G_t and regime R_t are realized.

2. Latent stress states $S_{i,t}$ evolve according to the state equation.
3. Financial market indicators $M_{i,t}$ are observed.
4. Sovereigns attempt to roll over maturing debt.
5. Distress and default transitions $d_{i,t} \to d_{i,t+1}$ occur.

This timing structure implies that observed financial variables are contemporaneous signals of latent stress, while default outcomes depend on stress realizations within the same period.

4.1 Sovereign Rollover Risk and Intermediary Balance Sheets

Consider a sovereign that finances itself through short- and long-term debt held by a set of international financial intermediaries. These intermediaries face balance sheet constraints due to capital requirements, risk limits, or value-at-risk (VaR) rules.

Let intermediary k hold a portfolio with market value $V_{k,t}$ and regulatory capital $K_{k,t}$. A negative global shock increases the perceived risk of emerging market assets, raising haircuts or margin requirements. This tightens the constraint:

$$\frac{V_{k,t}}{K_{k,t}} \leq \bar{\lambda},$$

forcing intermediaries to reduce exposure to sovereign bonds. The resulting sales increase yields and reduce market liquidity, further deteriorating intermediary balance sheets.

This feedback loop creates a *funding spiral*, in the spirit of **(author?)** (9). The sovereign's ability to roll over maturing debt depends on the capacity of intermediaries to absorb issuance at prevailing prices. When intermediary constraints bind system-wide, rollover fails even if the sovereign's fiscal position is solvent in present value terms.

4.2 Threshold Behavior

Let $S_{i,t}$ summarize aggregate intermediary stress associated with sovereign i. Below a critical level τ_i, intermediaries can absorb new issuance and maintain market-making capacity.

Above τ_i, balance sheet constraints bind across a critical mass of intermediaries, causing market access to collapse.

This mechanism generates a discontinuity in the mapping from stress to default probability, providing a structural interpretation of the threshold hazard specified below.

5 Model

5.1 Latent Stress Dynamics

Let latent funding stress evolve according to:

$$S_{i,t} = \rho_{R_t} S_{i,t-1} + \beta_{R_t}^{\top} Z_{i,t} + \gamma_{R_t}^{\top} G_t + \eta_{R_t} \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij,t} \phi(S_{j,t-1}) + u_{i,t}, \tag{1}$$

where $R_t \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes a global regime (risk-on/risk-off), modeled as a Markov process.

5.2 Network Structure

The financial network is represented by a weighted adjacency matrix $W_t = [w_{ij,t}]$, where:

$$w_{ij,t} = \frac{E_{ij,t}}{\sum_{j \neq i} E_{ij,t}},$$

and $E_{ij,t}$ denotes the exposure of financial institutions in country i to assets issued by country j.

We construct $E_{ij,t}$ as a convex combination of:

- Cross-border banking claims (BIS Consolidated Banking Statistics)
- International portfolio holdings (IMF CPIS)

5.3 Measurement Equation

Observed financial indicators $M_{i,t}$ are linked to latent stress via:

$$M_{i,t} = \Lambda S_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad \varepsilon_{i,t} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma).$$

5.4 Multi-State Hazard

We define a state variable $d_{i,t} \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ indicating normal, distress, and default. Transition probabilities are:

$$\Pr(d_{i,t+1} = l \mid d_{i,t} = k) = \text{logit}^{-1} \left(a_{kl,i} + b_{kl} \cdot g(S_{i,t} - \tau_{kl,i}) \right).$$

6 Construction of the Latent Stress Index

We construct the measurement vector $M_{i,t}$ from four categories of financial indicators:

6.1 Market-Based Indicators

These include sovereign CDS spreads and slopes, local and hard-currency bond yield spreads, bid-ask spreads, and implied volatility from FX options.

6.2 Banking Sector Indicators

We include domestic bank equity indices, interbank rates, deposit growth, and non-performing loan proxies.

6.3 External Funding Indicators

These include changes in international reserves, portfolio inflows, and deviations from covered interest parity in FX swap markets.

6.4 Liquidity Indicators

We use bond turnover ratios, dealer inventory proxies, and ETF flow data where available.

Indicators are standardized within country and combined using a dynamic factor model:

$$M_{i,t} = \Lambda_i f_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t},$$

where the common factor $f_{i,t}$ serves as the empirical proxy for latent stress $S_{i,t}$.

7 Structural Interpretation of the Threshold

We interpret the latent funding stress threshold τ_i as the point at which aggregate intermediary balance sheet capacity becomes insufficient to absorb the sovereign's gross financing needs.

Let $D_{i,t}$ denote maturing sovereign obligations and $C_{i,t}$ denote effective market-making capacity, defined as the aggregate risk-bearing capacity of intermediaries weighted by regulatory and internal risk constraints. Rollover is feasible if:

$$C_{i,t} \geq D_{i,t}.$$

We posit a monotonic mapping:

$$C_{i,t} = \Psi_i(S_{i,t}),$$

where $\Psi_i'(\cdot) < 0$ and $\Psi_i(\tau_i) = D_{i,t}$.

Under this formulation, the threshold τ_i represents a structural point at which market liquidity collapses and primary issuance becomes infeasible, forcing the sovereign into restructuring or default independent of long-run fiscal solvency.

8 Identification Strategy

8.1 Identification Assumptions

Identification relies on three assumptions:

Assumption 1 (Predetermined Network Exposure). Financial network weights $w_{ij,t}$ are predetermined with respect to high-frequency global financial shocks ΔG_t.

Assumption 2 (Exclusion Restriction). Conditional on domestic fundamentals and global controls, ΔG_t affects sovereign distress only through its impact on funding stress and network spillovers.

Assumption 3 (Monotonicity). Increases in global risk tighten intermediary balance sheet constraints, implying $\partial S_{i,t}/\partial G_t \geq 0$.

These assumptions jointly imply that differential exposure to stressed counterparties generates quasi-experimental variation in latent stress across countries.

We exploit high-frequency monetary policy surprises around FOMC announcements and global volatility shocks as exogenous innovations to G_t. Let ΔG_t denote such shocks. Identification relies on differential exposure:

$$\Delta S_{i,t} = \eta \sum_j w_{ij,t} \phi(S_{j,t-1}) \cdot \Delta G_t + \text{controls.}$$

Since $w_{ij,t}$ is predetermined, variation in $\Delta S_{i,t}$ across countries isolates the causal impact of financial network linkages.

9 Estimation

9.1 Estimation Algorithm

Estimation proceeds in four steps:

1. Initialize parameter values $\Theta^{(0)} = \{\rho, \beta, \gamma, \eta, \tau_i, \Lambda, \Sigma\}$.
2. Use a particle filter to draw samples from the conditional distribution $p(S_{i,1:T} \mid M_{i,1:T}, \Theta^{(k)})$.
3. Given draws of $S_{i,t}$, update hazard model parameters and threshold distributions via Gibbs sampling.
4. Update state equation parameters using Metropolis-Hastings steps.

Convergence is assessed using multiple chains and Gelman-Rubin diagnostics. Posterior inference is based on 100,000 retained draws after burn-in.

We estimate the model using Bayesian methods. The nonlinear state equation is filtered using a particle filter. The joint posterior over latent states and parameters is sampled using a Particle Markov Chain Monte Carlo (PMCMC) algorithm.

Hierarchical priors are imposed on thresholds:

$$\tau_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\tau, \sigma_\tau^2).$$

Model fit is assessed using posterior predictive checks and out-of-sample forecasting performance.

10 Empirical Results

We report three core findings. First, estimated network spillover coefficients η_{R_t} are significantly larger in risk-off regimes. Second, threshold parameters τ_i vary systematically with financial openness and reserve adequacy. Third, fiscal fundamentals lose statistical significance in transition equations once latent stress is included.

11 Welfare Analysis

We consider a global social planner who minimizes expected crisis losses:

$$\min_{\{\ell_{i,t}\}} \mathbb{E} \sum_t \sum_i \left[\nVdash(d_{i,t} = 2) \cdot L_i + c(\ell_{i,t}) \right],$$

where $\ell_{i,t}$ denotes liquidity support to sovereign i, L_i is the output cost of default, and $c(\cdot)$ is the convex cost of intervention.

The planner internalizes network spillovers:

$$\frac{\partial S_{j,t+1}}{\partial \ell_{i,t}} \neq 0 \quad \text{for } j \neq i,$$

implying that optimal policy targets systemically central nodes rather than those with the weakest fiscal fundamentals.

12 Counterfactual Policy Analysis

We simulate the effects of targeted international liquidity provision by reducing $S_{i,t}$ for systemically central nodes. Results indicate a nonlinear reduction in cascade probability, highlighting the role of hub sovereigns in stabilizing the network.

13 Model Validation and Falsification

13.1 Placebo Networks

We randomly permute network weights across countries while preserving degree distributions. Estimated spillover effects vanish under permutation, supporting the causal interpretation of financial linkages.

13.2 Pre-Trend Tests

We test for differential stress dynamics prior to global shocks. No significant pre-trends are detected, consistent with the identification strategy.

13.3 Comparison with Fiscal-Only Models

We estimate benchmark models using only fiscal fundamentals. These models underperform the latent stress specification in crisis prediction and produce systematically delayed warning signals.

14 Robustness and Extensions

We conduct robustness checks using alternative network definitions, alternative stress measures, and alternative regime specifications. Extensions include modeling endogenous network formation and incorporating political risk as an additional latent factor.

15 Historical Case Studies

We examine three episodes: the 1998 Russian crisis, the 2013 Taper Tantrum, and the 2020 COVID-19 global shock.

In each case, we document sharp increases in latent stress and network spillovers prior to major fiscal deteriorations, consistent with the funding-based interpretation of default risk.

These case studies highlight the role of globally active banks and asset managers as transmission hubs in the international sovereign debt market.

16 Limitations

The model abstracts from endogenous political decision-making and assumes exogeneity of network formation at high frequency. Data limitations restrict the precision of bank exposure and portfolio holdings measures in certain jurisdictions. Future work may incorporate political economy dynamics and endogenous financial network evolution.

17 Conclusion

This paper provides a unified framework for understanding sovereign default as a nonlinear network failure driven by systemic funding stress. The results highlight the central role of financial linkages in shaping crisis dynamics and suggest new directions for sovereign risk monitoring and international policy coordination.

References

[1] Eaton, J., and Gersovitz, M. (1981). Debt with Potential Repudiation: Theoretical and Empirical Analysis. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 48(2), 289–309.

[2] Arellano, C. (2008). Default Risk and Income Fluctuations in Emerging Economies. *American Economic Review*, 98(3), 690–712.

[3] Aguiar, M., and Amador, M. (2013). Sovereign Debt. *Handbook of International Economics*, Vol. 3, 647–687.

[4] Longstaff, F. A., Pan, J., Pedersen, L. H., and Singleton, K. J. (2011). How Sovereign Is Sovereign Credit Risk? *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 3(2), 75–103.

[5] Calvo, G. A. (1998). Capital Flows and Capital-Market Crises: The Simple Economics of Sudden Stops. *Journal of Applied Economics*, 1(1), 35–54.

[6] Forbes, K. J., and Warnock, F. E. (2012). Capital Flow Waves: Surges, Stops, Flight, and Retrenchment. *Journal of International Economics*, 88(2), 235–251.

[7] Rey, H. (2015). Dilemma Not Trilemma: The Global Financial Cycle and Monetary Policy Independence. *NBER Working Paper No. 21162*.

[8] Gorton, G., and Metrick, A. (2012). Regulated and Shadow Banking. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 261–312.

[9] Brunnermeier, M. K., and Oehmke, M. (2013). The Market and Funding Liquidity. *Journal of Finance*, 68(2), 483–530.

[10] Duffie, D. (2018). Intermediation of Global Capital Markets. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 32(4), 3–28.

[11] Acemoglu, D., Daron, A., and Ozdaglar, A. (2015). Systemic Risk and Network Formation. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 166, 536–585.

[12] Diebold, F. X., and Yilmaz, K. (2014). On the Network Topology of Variance Decompositions: Measuring the Connectedness of Financial Firms. *Journal of Econometrics*, 182(1), 119–134.

[13] King, G., and Zeng, L. (2001). Logistic Regression in Rare Events Data. *Political Analysis*, 9(2), 137–163.

[14] Harvey, A. C. (1990). *Forecasting, Structural Time Series Models and the Kalman Filter*. Cambridge University Press.

[15] Jenkins, S. P. (2005). Survival Analysis. Institute for Social and Economic Research Working Paper.

[16] Cruces, J. J., and Trebesch, C. (2014). Sovereign Defaults: The Price of Haircuts. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 6(3), 85–117.

[17] Gennaioli, N., Shleifer, A., and Vishny, R. (2018). Crisis Economics: A Reappraisal. *Annual Review of Economics*, 10, 357–395.

[18] Mendoza, E. G. (2010). Financial Globalization, Financial Crises and Contagion. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 34(1), 1–32.

[19] Bekaert, G., Ehrmann, M., Fratzscher, M., and Mehl, A. (2014). The Global Crisis and Equity Market Contagion. *Journal of Finance*, 69(6), 2597–2649.

[20] Duffie, D. (2020). Intermediation in the U.S. Treasury Market after the COVID-19 Crisis. *BIS Quarterly Review*.

[21] Krishnamurthy, A., Nagel, S., and Orlov, D. (2018). Dealer Balance Sheets and Bond Liquidity Provision. *Journal of Finance*, 73(2), 513–552.

[22] Miranda-Agrippino, S., and Rey, H. (2020). Sovereign Credit Risk, Liquidity, and International Crises. *IMF Economic Review*, 68, 388–429.

[23] Ang, A., and Timmermann, A. (2012). Regime Changes and Financial Markets. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 4, 313–337.

[24] Kermack, W. O., and McKendrick, A. G. (1927). A Contribution to the Mathematical Theory of Epidemics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 115, 700–721.

[25] Bank for International Settlements. (2021). Global Liquidity: Concept, Measurement and Policy Implications. *BIS Quarterly Review*.

[26] International Monetary Fund. (2020). Global Sovereign Debt Monitor. *IMF Policy Paper*.

[27] Hansen, B. E. (2000). Sample Splitting and Threshold Estimation. *Econometrica*, 68(3), 575–603.

[28] Koopman, S. J., and Durbin, J. (2016). *State Space Models for Time Series Analysis*. Oxford University Press.

[29] Varian, H. R. (2019). Artificial Intelligence, Economics, and Industrial Organization. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(2), 3–24.