Uncertainty Premia, Sovereign Default Risk, and State-Contingent Debt

Francisco Roch
IMF

Francisco Roldán
IMF

December 2022

Why do governments borrow noncontingent?

State-contingent debt instruments

- Decrease default risk
- Reduce cyclicality of fiscal policy
- Improve risk-sharing

Why aren't they used?

Why do governments borrow noncontingent?

State-contingent debt instruments

- Decrease default risk
- Reduce cyclicality of fiscal policy
- Improve risk-sharing

Why aren't they used?

Unfavorable prices of state-contingent instruments

- These instruments are heavily discounted by markets
  - Costa, Chamon, and Ricci (2008) compute wide spreads for Argentine GDP-warrants
    - $\sim$300-400bps from default risk of other securities
    - 600-1200bps residual: ‘novelty’ premium

This paper proposes a framework that

- Rationalizes pricing of SCI + welfare analysis
  - With ingredients from resolutions of the equity premium puzzle
  - Robustness (Hansen and Sargent, 2001; Pouzo and Presno, 2016)
- Links unfavorable prices to common ‘threshold’ structure
  - Example: Argentina’s GDP-warrants, also Ukraine, Greece. . . More

Unfavorable prices of state-contingent instruments

- These instruments are heavily discounted by markets
  - Costa, Chamon, and Ricci (2008) compute wide spreads for Argentine GDP-warrants
    - $\sim$300-400bps from default risk of other securities
    - 600-1200bps residual: 'novelty' premium

This paper proposes a framework that

- Rationalizes pricing of SCI + welfare analysis
  - With ingredients from resolutions of the equity premium puzzle
  - Robustness (Hansen and Sargent, 2001; Pouzo and Presno, 2016)
- Links unfavorable prices to common 'threshold' structure
  - Example: Argentina's GDP-warrants, also Ukraine, Greece. . . ▸ More

Main findings

1. Robust lenders dislike repayment structures with thresholds in good times
   - Heavy discounts for these bonds $\implies$ welfare losses
2. Explain most of the 'novelty premium' in Argentina's GDP warrants as ambiguity premia
   - Calibration of robustness from *noncontingent* debt only
3. Characterize the optimal design and how it changes with robustness
   - With high robustness, want to minimize ex-ante and ex-post contingency

Roadmap

- Stylized Model
- Probability Distortions
- Quantitative Implementation
- Concluding Remarks

Stylized Model

The model

We consider a simple two-period model, small open economy

- Uncertain endowment $y(z)$ in the second period
- The government has access to one asset which promises a return $R(z)$.
- A few benchmarks

Noncontingent debt	$R(z)$	$=$	1
Linear indexing	$R^{\alpha}(z)$	$=$	$1+\alpha(y(z)-1)$
Threshold debt	$R^{\tau}(z)$	$=$	$\mathbb{1}(z>\tau)$
Optimal design	$R^{\star}(z;\theta)$		chosen state-by-state

The model

We consider a simple two-period model, small open economy

- Uncertain endowment $y(z)$ in the second period
- The government has access to one asset which promises a return $R(z)$.
- A few benchmarks

Noncontingent debt	$R(z)$	$=$	1
Linear indexing	$R^{\alpha}(z)$	$=$	$1+\alpha(y(z)-1)$
Threshold debt	$R^{\tau}(z)$	$=$	$\mathbb{1}(z>\tau)$
Optimal design	$R^{\star}(z;\theta)$		chosen state-by-state

The government's problem

- The government takes as given the price schedule $q(b)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\max_b u(c_1^b) + \beta_b \mathbb{E}\left[u(c_2^b)\right] \\
\text{subject to } \; & c_1^b = y_1 + q(b)b \\
& c_2^b = y_2(z) - h(z,\Delta)d(b,z) - (1-d(b,z))R(z)b
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$h(z,\Delta) = y_2(z)^2\Delta$$

The lenders' problem

Foreign lenders are less standard and have multiplier preferences

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \max c_1^L - \frac{\beta}{\theta} \log \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\exp(-\theta v_2^L) \right] \right) \\
\text{subject to } \; & v_2^L = c_2^L \\
& c_2^L = w_2 + (1 - d(b, z)) R(z) b \\
& c_1^L = w_1 - q_1 b
\end{aligned}
$$

Lenders provide us with an Euler equation to price the debt

$$
\begin{aligned}
q(b; R) &= \beta \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\exp(-\theta v_2^L)}{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-\theta v_2^L)\right]} (1 - d(b, z)) R(z) \right] \\
&= \underbrace{\beta \mathbb{E}\left[(1-d)R\right]}_{= q_{RE}} + \underbrace{(1 - \mathbb{P}(d)) \operatorname{cov}(M, R)}_{= q_\theta^{\text{cont}}} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[R\right] \operatorname{cov}(M, d)}_{= -q_\theta^{\text{def}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

The lenders' problem

Foreign lenders are less standard and have multiplier preferences

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \max c_1^L - \frac{\beta}{\theta} \log\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-\theta v_2^L)\right]\right) \\
\text{subject to } \quad & v_2^L = c_2^L \\
& c_2^L = w_2 + (1 - d(b,z))R(z)b \\
& c_1^L = w_1 - q_1 b
\end{aligned}
$$

Lenders provide us with an Euler equation to price the debt

$$
\begin{aligned}
q(b;R) &= \beta \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\exp(-\theta v_2^L)}{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-\theta v_2^L)\right]}(1 - d(b,z))R(z)\right] \\
&= \underbrace{\beta \mathbb{E}\left[(1-d)R\right]}_{= q_{RE}} + \underbrace{(1 - \mathbb{P}(d))\operatorname{cov}(M,R)}_{= q_\theta^{\text{cont}}} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[R\right]\operatorname{cov}(M,d)}_{= -q_\theta^{\text{def}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

The lenders' problem

Foreign lenders are less standard and have multiplier preferences

$$\max c_1^L - \frac{\beta}{\theta} \log\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-\theta v_2^L)\right]\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{subject to } \; v_2^L &= c_2^L \\ c_2^L &= w_2 + (1 - d(b,z))R(z)b \\ c_1^L &= w_1 - q_1 b \end{aligned}$$

Lenders provide us with an Euler equation to price the debt

$$q(b;R) = \beta\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\exp(-\theta v_2^L)}{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-\theta v_2^L)\right]}(1 - d(b,z))R(z)\right]$$

$$= \underbrace{\beta\mathbb{E}\left[(1-d)R\right]}_{=q_{RE}} + \underbrace{(1 - \mathbb{P}(d))\,\mathrm{cov}(M, R)}_{=q_\theta^{\mathrm{cont}}} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[R\right]\mathrm{cov}(M, d)}_{=-q_\theta^{\mathrm{def}}}$$

The lenders' problem

Foreign lenders are less standard and have multiplier preferences

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max c_1^L - \frac{\beta}{\theta} \log\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-\theta v_2^L)\right]\right) \\
\text{subject to}\quad & v_2^L = c_2^L \\
& c_2^L = w_2 + (1 - d(b,z))R(z)b \\
& c_1^L = w_1 - q_1 b
\end{aligned}$$

Lenders provide us with an Euler equation to price the debt

$$\begin{aligned}
q(b;R) &= \beta\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\exp(-\theta v_2^L)}{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-\theta v_2^L)\right]}(1-d(b,z))R(z)\right] \\
&= \underbrace{\beta\mathbb{E}\left[(1-d)R\right]}_{=q_{RE}} + \underbrace{(1-\mathbb{P}(d))\,\mathrm{cov}(M,R)}_{=q_\theta^{\text{cont}}} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[R\right]\mathrm{cov}(M,d)}_{=-q_\theta^{\text{def}}}
\end{aligned}$$

Probability Distortions

Distorted probabilities – noncontingent debt

Reoptimizing



Distorted probabilities – threshold debt



Design of debt



Quantitative Implementation

Quantitative Model

- Infinite horizon, small-open economy
- Robust lenders as before
- Long-term debt, debt issued at t pays coupon at $t+s$

$$\max\left\{0, (1-\delta)^{s-1}(1+\alpha(y_s-1))\mathbb{1}(y_s>\tau)\right\}$$

  - Noncontingent debt: $\alpha = 0, \tau = -\infty$
- Default triggers exclusion + output costs for a random amount of periods $\sim Geo(\psi)$

Robustness in the quantitative model

	Rational Expectations			$\theta = 2.15$ (benchmark)		
Statistic	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$
Spread (bps)	893	318	742	842	1636	746
o/w Spread RE	893	318	742	432	2.6	343
Std Spread	439	133	301	376	238	282
Debt-to-GDP (%)	18.3	32.8	17.8	16.7	18.3	17.5
Std(c)/Std(y)	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.3	0.84	1.3
Default Prob (%)	6.0	1.7	5.6	3.2	0.01	2.7
Welfare Gains	-	0.94%	0.22%	-	-1.1%	0.15%
DEP	-	-	-	40.1%	31.4%	39%

Robustness in the quantitative model

	Rational Expectations			$\theta = 2.15$ (benchmark)		
Statistic	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$
Spread (bps)	893	318	742	842	1636	746
o/w Spread RE	893	318	742	432	2.6	343
Std Spread	439	133	301	376	238	282
Debt-to-GDP (%)	18.3	32.8	17.8	16.7	18.3	17.5
Std(c)/Std(y)	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.3	0.84	1.3
Default Prob (%)	6.0	1.7	5.6	3.2	0.01	2.7
Welfare Gains	-	0.94%	0.22%	-	-1.1%	0.15%
DEP	-	-	-	40.1%	31.4%	39%

Robustness in the quantitative model

	Rational Expectations			$\theta = 2.15$ (benchmark)		
Statistic	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$
Spread (bps)	893	318	742	842	1636	746
o/w Spread RE	893	318	742	432	2.6	343
Std Spread	439	133	301	376	238	282
Debt-to-GDP (%)	18.3	32.8	17.8	16.7	18.3	17.5
Std(c)/Std(y)	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.3	0.84	1.3
Default Prob (%)	6.0	1.7	5.6	3.2	0.01	2.7
Welfare Gains	-	0.94%	0.22%	-	-1.1%	0.15%
DEP	-	-	-	40.1%	31.4%	39%

Robustness in the quantitative model

	Rational Expectations			$\theta = 2.15$ (benchmark)		
Statistic	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$
Spread (bps)	893	318	742	842	1636	746
o/w Spread RE	893	318	742	432	2.6	343
Std Spread	439	133	301	376	238	282
Debt-to-GDP (%)	18.3	32.8	17.8	16.7	18.3	17.5
Std(c)/Std(y)	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.3	0.84	1.3
Default Prob (%)	6.0	1.7	5.6	3.2	0.01	2.7
Welfare Gains	-	0.94%	0.22%	-	-1.1%	0.15%
DEP	-	-	-	40.1%	31.4%	39%

Robustness in the quantitative model

	Rational Expectations			$\theta = 2.15$ (benchmark)		
Statistic	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$
Spread (bps)	893	318	742	842	1636	746
o/w Spread RE	893	318	742	432	2.6	343
Std Spread	439	133	301	376	238	282
Debt-to-GDP (%)	18.3	32.8	17.8	16.7	18.3	17.5
Std(c)/Std(y)	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.3	0.84	1.3
Default Prob (%)	6.0	1.7	5.6	3.2	0.01	2.7
Welfare Gains	-	0.94%	0.22%	-	-1.1%	0.15%
DEP	-	-	-	40.1%	31.4%	39%

Robustness in the quantitative model

	Rational Expectations			$\theta = 2.15$ (benchmark)		
Statistic	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$
Spread (bps)	893	318	742	842	1636	746
o/w Spread RE	893	318	742	432	2.6	343
Std Spread	439	133	301	376	238	282
Debt-to-GDP (%)	18.3	32.8	17.8	16.7	18.3	17.5
Std(c)/Std(y)	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.3	0.84	1.3
Default Prob (%)	6.0	1.7	5.6	3.2	0.01	2.7
Welfare Gains	-	0.94%	0.22%	-	-1.1%	0.15%
DEP	-	-	-	40.1%	31.4%	39%

Robustness in the quantitative model

	Rational Expectations			$\theta = 2.15$ (benchmark)		
Statistic	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$	Noncontingent	Threshold	$\alpha = 1$
Spread (bps)	893	318	742	842	1636	746
o/w Spread RE	893	318	742	432	2.6	343
Std Spread	439	133	301	376	238	282
Debt-to-GDP (%)	18.3	32.8	17.8	16.7	18.3	17.5
Std(c)/Std(y)	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.3	0.84	1.3
Default Prob (%)	6.0	1.7	5.6	3.2	0.01	2.7
Welfare Gains	-	0.94%	0.22%	-	-1.1%	0.15%
DEP	-	-	-	40.1%	31.4%	39%

Optimal design of state-contingent debt

Design

	Rational Expectations		Benchmark ($\theta = 2.15$)	
Statistic	**Noncontingent**	$\alpha = 5.5, \tau = 0.904$	**Noncontingent**	$\alpha = 2.5, \tau = 0.879$
Spread (bps)	893	298	842	590
o/w Spread RE	893	298	432	205
Std Spread	439	69	376	119
Debt-to-GDP (%)	18.3	23.3	16.7	19.8
Std(c)/Std(y)	1.4	0.84	1.3	1.1
Default Prob (%)	6.0	2.5	3.2	1.9
Welfare Gains	-	1.6%	-	0.47%

Optimal design of state-contingent debt

Design

	Rational Expectations		Benchmark ($\theta = 2.15$)	
Statistic	**Noncontingent**	$\alpha = 5.5, \tau = 0.904$	**Noncontingent**	$\alpha = 2.5, \tau = 0.879$
Spread (bps)	893	298	842	590
o/w Spread RE	893	298	432	205
Std Spread	439	69	376	119
Debt-to-GDP (%)	18.3	23.3	16.7	19.8
Std(c)/Std(y)	1.4	0.84	1.3	1.1
Default Prob (%)	6.0	2.5	3.2	1.9
Welfare Gains	-	1.6%	-	0.47%

Optimal design of state-contingent debt

Design

	Rational Expectations		Benchmark ($\theta = 2.15$)	
Statistic	Noncontingent	$\alpha = 5.5, \tau = 0.904$	Noncontingent	$\alpha = 2.5, \tau = 0.879$
Spread (bps)	893	298	842	590
o/w Spread RE	893	298	432	205
Std Spread	439	69	376	119
Debt-to-GDP (%)	18.3	23.3	16.7	19.8
Std(c)/Std(y)	1.4	0.84	1.3	1.1
Default Prob (%)	6.0	2.5	3.2	1.9
Welfare Gains	-	1.6%	-	0.47%

Optimal design of state-contingent debt

▸ Design

	Rational Expectations		Benchmark ($\theta = 2.15$)	
Statistic	**Noncontingent**	$\alpha = 5.5, \tau = 0.904$	**Noncontingent**	$\alpha = 2.5, \tau = 0.879$
Spread (bps)	893	298	842	590
o/w Spread RE	893	298	432	205
Std Spread	439	69	376	119
Debt-to-GDP (%)	18.3	23.3	16.7	19.8
Std(c)/Std(y)	1.4	0.84	1.3	1.1
Default Prob (%)	6.0	2.5	3.2	1.9
Welfare Gains	-	1.6%	-	0.47%

Price of marginal issuances

In reality issuances of state-contingent bonds are small

- Solve the model with noncontingent debt
- Take the lenders' SDF from that equilibrium
- Use it to price another bond

	Noncontingent bond	Linear bond	Threshold bond	Optimal bond
Benchmark	842	845	947	829
Rational Expectations	893	849	367	634

Price of marginal issuances

In reality issuances of state-contingent bonds are small

- Solve the model with noncontingent debt
- Take the lenders' SDF from that equilibrium
- Use it to price another bond

	Noncontingent bond	Linear bond	Threshold bond	Optimal bond
Benchmark	842	845	947	829
Rational Expectations	893	849	367	634

Concluding Remarks

Concluding Remarks

- Standard sovereign debt model augmented with robust lenders
  1. Accounts for spreads on typical threshold SCDIs
  2. Rationalizes part of the ‘novelty’ premium as a premium for ambiguity
  3. Links unfavorable prices to common *threshold* structure
  4. Welfare gains of SCDI decreasing in robustness
     - Both for given instrument and for optimally-designed debt

- Optimal design
  - With realistic robustness, lower thresholds and flatter indexation than RE
  - With extreme robustness, eliminate contingency ex-ante (*stipulated*) and ex-post (*default*)
  - In general, tradeoff between contingency and risk-sharing

Distorted probabilities – threshold+linear debt

◂ Back



CARA

Back

Euler equations of a rational-expectations agent with CARA preferences and access to a risk-free bond

$$q = \beta\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{u'(c_2)}{u'(c_1)}R\right] = \beta\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\exp(-\gamma c_2)}{\exp(-\gamma c_1)}R\right]$$

$$\frac{1}{1+r} = \beta\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{u'(c_2)}{u'(c_1)}\right]$$

hence

$$q = \beta\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\exp(-\gamma c_2)}{\beta(1+r)\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-\gamma c_2)\right]}R\right]$$

Same as robustness in two periods, in general the robust sdf is

$$q = \beta\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\exp(-\theta v')}{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-\theta v')\right]}R\right]$$

Multiplier preferences

In general,

$$\min_{\tilde{p}} \max_{c} u(c) + \beta \int v(a')dp + \frac{1}{\theta}\text{ent}(p, \tilde{p})$$

turns into

$$\max_{c} u(c) - \frac{\beta}{\theta} \log\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(-\theta v(a'))\right]\right)$$

Distorted probabilities – noncontingent debt

◂ Back



Distorted probabilities – linearly indexed debt

Back



Distorted probabilities – threshold debt

Back



Parametrization

Back

We represent this bond with threshold debt, one period = five years, and

Parameter	Target	Value
β_b	Borrower's discount rate	6% ann.
β	Risk-free rate	3% ann.
γ	Borrower's risk aversion	2
Δ	Output cost of default	20%
g	Expected growth rate	8% ann.
k	Threshold for repayment	50%

Optimal bond design

◂ Back



Decomposition of spreads

Back



Figure 1: GDP-linked security premia.

The figure shows the estimated spread decomposition in Igan and Kim (2021) for the GDP-warrants issued by Argentina (left), Greece (middle) and Ukraine (right).