

# The Perils of Bilateral Sovereign Debt

---

Francisco Roldán  
IMF

César Sosa-Padilla  
Notre Dame & NBER

DebtCon 8  
Washington DC, October 2025

The views expressed herein are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the IMF, its Executive Board, or its management.

# Official Sovereign Debt

- A large share of sovereign borrowing takes the form of **official** debt  
... Multilaterals, development banks, other governments
- Emergence of new bilateral creditors **outside** the Paris Club  
... with claims to **seniority** and sometimes **opaque** terms

► IDS data

## Questions

- How does the presence of a large senior lender affect sovereign debt markets?
- What are its welfare implications for borrowing governments?

# Official Sovereign Debt

- A large share of sovereign borrowing takes the form of **official** debt  
... Multilaterals, development banks, other governments
- Emergence of new bilateral creditors **outside** the Paris Club  
... with claims to **seniority** and sometimes **opaque** terms

► IDS data


## Questions

- How does the presence of a large senior lender affect sovereign debt markets?
- What are its welfare implications for borrowing governments?

# Evaluating Senior Official Creditors

Quantitative sovereign debt model with


- Competitive creditors in private **markets**
- Large **bilateral** lender
  1. Superior enforcement  
[de-facto seniority]
  2. Bargained terms  
[price and quantity]
  3. Short-maturity loans
- Prime example: Central Bank **swap** lines  
(Horn et al., 2021)
- Focus on the **interaction** between both funding sources



# Evaluating Senior Official Creditors

Quantitative sovereign debt model with


- Competitive creditors in private **markets**
- Large **bilateral** lender
  1. Superior enforcement  
[de-facto seniority]
  2. Bargained terms  
[price and quantity]
  3. Short-maturity loans
- Prime example: Central Bank **swap** lines  
(Horn et al., 2021)
- Focus on the **interaction** between both funding sources



# Evaluating Senior Official Creditors

Quantitative sovereign debt model with

- Competitive creditors in private **markets**
- Large **bilateral** lender
  1. Superior enforcement  
[de-facto seniority]
  2. Bargained terms  
[price and quantity]
  3. Short-maturity loans
- Prime example: Central Bank **swap** lines  
(Horn et al., 2021)
- Focus on the **interaction** between both funding sources



# Relational Overborrowing

## Main findings

- Bilateral loans have significant effects on equilibrium outcomes
  - ... provide funding when other sources dry up (e.g. because of default risk) ▲
  - ... can also incentivize more **risk-taking** ▼
- If the rate on bilateral loans is decreasing in *market* debt [cross-elasticity]
  - ... government issues debt more quickly, delevers more slowly
  - ... spends longer in the risky region
  - ... defaults more frequently
- Cross-elasticity can emerge endogenously from **bargaining** ☞
  - ... at plausible values for bargaining weights
  - ... increased frequency of defaults dominates extra liquidity
  - ... **welfare losses** for the government



# Relational Overborrowing

## Main findings

- Bilateral loans have significant effects on equilibrium outcomes
  - ... provide funding when other sources dry up (e.g. because of default risk) ▲
  - ... can also incentivize more **risk-taking** ▼
- If the rate on bilateral loans is decreasing in *market* debt [cross-elasticity]
  - ... government issues debt more quickly, delevers more slowly
  - ... spends longer in the risky region
  - ... defaults more frequently
- Cross-elasticity can emerge endogenously from **bargaining** ☞
  - ... at plausible values for bargaining weights
  - ... increased frequency of defaults dominates extra liquidity
  - ... **welfare losses** for the government





# Relational Overborrowing

## Main findings

- Bilateral loans have significant effects on equilibrium outcomes
  - ... provide funding when other sources dry up (e.g. because of default risk) ▲
  - ... can also incentivize more **risk-taking** ▼
- If the rate on bilateral loans is decreasing in *market* debt [cross-elasticity]
  - ... government issues debt more quickly, delevers more slowly
  - ... spends longer in the risky region
  - ... defaults more frequently
- Cross-elasticity can emerge endogenously from **bargaining** ☞
  - ... at plausible values for bargaining weights
  - ... increased frequency of defaults dominates extra liquidity
  - ... **welfare losses** for the government




## Model

---


# Timeline of Events

- Enter period  $t$  owing  $b$  to bondholders,  $m$  to monopolist, income  $y(z)$



# Timeline of Events


- Choose to **repay** or **default** the *market* debt subject to convex output costs



$$v(b, m, z) = \max \{ v_R(b, m, z) + \epsilon_R, v_D(m, z) + \epsilon_D \}$$

# Timeline of Events


- If repaid, issue new debt  $b'$  in markets at price  $q$



$$q(b', b, m, z) = \beta_L \mathbb{E} [(1 - 1_{\mathcal{D}}(b', m', z')) (\kappa + (1 - \delta)q(b'', b', m', z')) | z]$$


# Timeline of Events

- Meet with senior lender, decide any transfers  $x$  and new/remaining balance  $m'$



# Timeline of Events

- Consume **output** plus **revenues from debt issuance** plus **transfers** minus **debt service**



$$c_R = y(z) + q(b', b, m, z)(b' - (1 - \delta)b) + x_R(b', b, m, z) - \kappa b$$

## Exogenous Bilateral Terms

---



# Programming the Large Lender: Possible Rules

- Explore interest rate rules of the form

$$r(b', m') = \max\{r^*, \alpha_0 + \alpha_b b' + \alpha_m m'\}$$

- Two versions

Size-dependent

$$\alpha_0 > 0, \alpha_b = 0, \alpha_m > 0$$

Risk-inducing

$$\alpha_0 > 0, \alpha_b < 0, \alpha_m = 0$$

# Programming the Large Lender: Possible Rules

- Explore interest rate rules of the form

$$r(b', m') = \max\{r^*, \alpha_0 + \alpha_b b' + \alpha_m m'\}$$

- Two versions

**Size-dependent**

$$\alpha_0 > 0, \alpha_b = 0, \alpha_m > 0$$

**Risk-inducing**

$$\alpha_0 > 0, \alpha_b < 0, \alpha_m = 0$$

## Equilibrium with Exogenous Rules

- ‘Only market’ standard calibration to Argentina 1993-2001

	Only market	Size dependent $r$	Risk inducing $r$
Avg spread (bps)	714	623	921
Std spread (bps)	399	315	552
$\sigma(c)/\sigma(y)$ (%)	113	115	115
Debt to GDP (%)	22.5	23.5	22.8
Loan to GDP (%)	0	0.71	0.972
Loan spread (bps)	–	682	1,264
Corr. loan & spreads (%)	–	62.5	48.1
Default frequency (%)	5.72	5.13	6.92
Welfare gains (rep)	–	0.21%	-0.079%

## Equilibrium with Exogenous Rules

- Default rates:  with size dependent  with risk-inducing

	Only market	Size dependent $r$	Risk inducing $r$
Avg spread (bps)	714	623	921
Std spread (bps)	399	315	552
$\sigma(c)/\sigma(y)$ (%)	113	115	115
Debt to GDP (%)	22.5	23.5	22.8
Loan to GDP (%)	0	0.71	0.972
Loan spread (bps)	–	682	1,264
Corr. loan & spreads (%)	–	62.5	48.1
Default frequency (%)	5.72	5.13	6.92
Welfare gains (rep)	–	0.21%	-0.079%

# Equilibrium with Exogenous Rules

- Spreads:  with size dependent  with risk-inducing

	Only market	Size dependent $r$	Risk inducing $r$
Avg spread (bps)	714	623	921
Std spread (bps)	399	315	552
$\sigma(c)/\sigma(y)$ (%)	113	115	115
Debt to GDP (%)	22.5	23.5	22.8
Loan to GDP (%)	0	0.71	0.972
Loan spread (bps)	–	682	1,264
Corr. loan & spreads (%)	–	62.5	48.1
Default frequency (%)	5.72	5.13	6.92
Welfare gains (rep)	–	0.21%	-0.079%

# Equilibrium with Exogenous Rules

- Welfare:  with size dependent  with risk-inducing

	Only market	Size dependent $r$	Risk inducing $r$
Avg spread (bps)	714	623	921
Std spread (bps)	399	315	552
$\sigma(c)/\sigma(y)$ (%)	113	115	115
Debt to GDP (%)	22.5	23.5	22.8
Loan to GDP (%)	0	0.71	0.972
Loan spread (bps)	–	682	1,264
Corr. loan & spreads (%)	–	62.5	48.1
Default frequency (%)	5.72	5.13	6.92
Welfare gains (rep)	–	0.21%	-0.079%

# Endogenous Bargaining

---

## Bargaining Stage with Monopolist

- At state  $z$ , owing debt  $b$  bonds and  $m$  on the loan and having issued  $b'$

$$\max_{x,m} \mathcal{L}_R(b', x, m, m', z)^\theta \times \mathcal{B}_R(b', b, x, m, m', z)^{1-\theta}$$

Government surplus  
Lender surplus

- Lender's surplus

$$\mathcal{L}_R(b', x, m, m', z) = \underbrace{(a - x + \beta_L \mathbb{E}[h(b', m', z') | z])}_{\text{agreement}} - \underbrace{(a + m + \beta_L \mathbb{E}[h(b', 0, z') | z])}_{\text{threat point}}$$

- Government's surplus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_R(b', b, x, m, m', z) = & \underbrace{u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) + x) + \beta \mathbb{E}[v(b', m', z') | z]}_{\text{agreement}} \\ & - \underbrace{(u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) - m) + \beta \mathbb{E}[v(b', 0, z') | z])}_{\text{threat point}} \end{aligned}$$



## Bargaining Stage with Monopolist

- At state  $z$ , owing debt  $b$  bonds and  $m$  on the loan and having issued  $b'$

$$\max_{x,m} \mathcal{L}_R(b', x, m, m', z)^\theta \times \mathcal{B}_R(b', b, x, m, m', z)^{1-\theta}$$

Government surplus  
Lender surplus

- Lender's surplus

$$\mathcal{L}_R(b', x, m, m', z) = \underbrace{(a - x + \beta_L \mathbb{E}[h(b', m', z') | z])}_{\text{agreement}} - \underbrace{(a + m + \beta_L \mathbb{E}[h(b', 0, z') | z])}_{\text{threat point}}$$

same sdf as markets

- Government's surplus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_R(b', b, x, m, m', z) = & \underbrace{u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) + x) + \beta \mathbb{E}[v(b', m', z') | z]}_{\text{agreement}} \\ & - \underbrace{(u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) - m) + \beta \mathbb{E}[v(b', 0, z') | z])}_{\text{threat point}} \end{aligned}$$

## Bargaining Stage with Monopolist

- At state  $z$ , owing debt  $b$  bonds and  $m$  on the loan and having issued  $b'$

$$\max_{x,m} \mathcal{L}_R(b', x, m, m', z)^\theta \times \mathcal{B}_R(b', b, x, m, m', z)^{1-\theta}$$

- Lender's surplus

$$\mathcal{L}_R(b', x, m, m', z) = \underbrace{(a - x + \beta_L \mathbb{E}[h(b', m', z') | z])}_{\text{agreement}} - \underbrace{(a + m + \beta_L \mathbb{E}[h(b', 0, z') | z])}_{\text{threat point}}$$

- Government's surplus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_R(b', b, x, m, m', z) = & \underbrace{u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) + x) + \beta \mathbb{E}[v(b', m', z') | z]}_{\text{agreement}} \\ & - \underbrace{(u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) - m) + \beta \mathbb{E}[v(b', 0, z') | z])}_{\text{threat point}} \end{aligned}$$

# Relational Overborrowing

## Government's surplus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_R(b', b, x, m, m', z) = & u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) + x) + \beta \mathbb{E} [v(b', m', z') \mid z] \\ & - (u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) - m) + \beta \mathbb{E} [v(b', 0, z') \mid z]) \end{aligned}$$

- Revenues from debt issuance  $B(b', b, m, z)$  modulate the value of the threat point
  - After large revenues (high  $q$ , high  $b'$ ), gov't flush with cash, **strong** in bargaining
  - After bad issuance (low  $q$  or low  $b'$ ), gov't **weak** in bargaining
- Strongly negative cross-elasticity of bilateral terms to market debt  
→ goes against market discipline of spreads

$$u'(c) \left( q + \frac{\partial q}{\partial b'} i + \frac{1}{1 + r_b} \frac{\partial m'}{\partial b'} + \frac{\partial \frac{1}{1 + r_b}}{\partial b'} m' \right) = \beta \mathbb{E} [u'(c)(1 - \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}})(\kappa + (1 - \delta)q' + \dots)]$$

# Relational Overborrowing

## Government's surplus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_R(b', b, x, m, m', z) = & u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) + x) + \beta \mathbb{E} [v(b', m', z') \mid z] \\ & - (u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) - m) + \beta \mathbb{E} [v(b', 0, z') \mid z]) \end{aligned}$$

- Revenues from debt issuance  $B(b', b, m, z)$  modulate the value of the threat point
  - After large revenues (high  $q$ , high  $b'$ ), gov't flush with cash, **strong** in bargaining
  - After bad issuance (low  $q$  or low  $b'$ ), gov't **weak** in bargaining
- Strongly negative cross-elasticity of bilateral terms to market debt  
→ goes against market discipline of spreads

$$u'(c) \left( q + \frac{\partial q}{\partial b'} i + \frac{1}{1 + r_b} \frac{\partial m'}{\partial b'} + \frac{\partial \frac{1}{1 + r_b}}{\partial b'} m' \right) = \beta \mathbb{E} [u'(c)(1 - \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}})(\kappa + (1 - \delta)q' + \dots)]$$

# Relational Overborrowing

## Government's surplus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_R(b', b, x, m, m', z) = & u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) + x) + \beta \mathbb{E} [v(b', m', z') \mid z] \\ & - (u(y(z) + B(b', b, m, z) - m) + \beta \mathbb{E} [v(b', 0, z') \mid z]) \end{aligned}$$

- Revenues from debt issuance  $B(b', b, m, z)$  modulate the value of the threat point
  - After large revenues (high  $q$ , high  $b'$ ), gov't flush with cash, **strong** in bargaining
  - After bad issuance (low  $q$  or low  $b'$ ), gov't **weak** in bargaining
- Strongly negative cross-elasticity of bilateral terms to market debt  
→ goes against market discipline of spreads

$$u'(c) \left( q + \frac{\partial q}{\partial b'} i + \frac{1}{1 + r_b} \frac{\partial m'}{\partial b'} + \frac{\partial \frac{1}{1+r_b}}{\partial b'} m' \right) = \beta \mathbb{E} [u'(c)(1 - \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}})(\kappa + (1 - \delta)q' + \dots)]$$

Surplus on loan requires spreads: relationship provides **incentives** for risk taking



## Concluding remarks


---

# The Perils of Bilateral Sovereign Debt

- Simple model of borrowing from **markets** and a **senior bilateral lender**
  - ... strong interaction between two markets for sovereign debt
  - ... even if bilateral loans are **not** used intensely on the equilibrium path
- **Dangerous** when bilateral interest rate responds negatively to *market* debt
  - ... cross-elasticity induces risk-taking, more defaults, welfare losses
  - ... Bargaining as an example of situation where cross-elasticity emerges
- Cross-elasticity constitutes a simple test to assess welfare gains of **new** instruments
  - ... or a boost to the gains of fiscal rules, state-contingent debt...








*Scan to find the paper*

# A New Landscape for Official Sovereign Debt


[◀ Back](#)

Total Official Debt




# When is the Loan Used?

- Further conditioning on default events lasting exactly two years



# When is the Loan Used?

- With Limited:  $\Gamma(m) = m$



Loan drawings  $m'$  (Limited)

