Central Bank Swap Lines as Bilateral Sovereign Debt

Francisco Roldán
IMF

César Sosa-Padilla
Notre Dame

Society for Economic Dynamics
June 2023

What is a Central Bank swap?

Swaps are symmetric currency exchanges

- A swap line is a contract between two Central Banks
- When activated, each institution provides an amount of its currency to the counterparty
- At maturity, positions are undone



- Symmetric swaps (AE-AE) potentially very different from asymmetric ones (AE-EM)

What is a Central Bank swap?



which can be asymmetric in practice

- The Fed doesn't really want Mexico's pesos
  - … treats them more like collateral
- Mexican authorities may need dollars for their BoP
  - … more similar to borrowed reserves

- Symmetric swaps (AE-AE) potentially very different from asymmetric ones (AE-EM)

What is a Central Bank swap?

Swaps are symmetric currency exchanges

- A swap line is a contract between two Central Banks
- When activated, each institution provides an amount of its currency to the counterparty
- At maturity, positions are undone

which can be asymmetric in practice

- The Fed doesn't really want Mexico's pesos
  - … treats them more like collateral
- Mexican authorities may need dollars for their BoP
  - … more similar to borrowed reserves

- Symmetric swaps (AE-AE) potentially very different from asymmetric ones (AE-EM)

How are Central Bank Swap Lines different from Sovereign Debt?

For an EM using the swap line to borrow from an AE

Regular debt (bond markets)

- Defaultable
- Many different lenders
- Interest rate (spreads) mainly reflects default risk

Bilateral loan (swap line)

- Non-defaulteable (Central Bank)
- No coordination issues
- Can be used to curb default risk
- Interest rate?

How do Central Bank Swap Lines interact with Sovereign Debt?

Main findings

- One type of debt affects borrowing conditions for the other
  - Borrowing from the market serves as explicit threat in swap negotiations
  - Swap can be used when spreads on the market are high
- Lending around or in default maximizes surplus for bilateral loans
- Without restricting swaps in default, welfare losses for government
- Bilateral debt worsens the debt dilution problem

Literature

Roadmap

Model with Swaps only

Model with Swaps and Debt

Concluding remarks

Model with Swaps only

Environment

The government of a small open economy borrows from a monopolist

- Income $y(z_t)$ follows an AR(1) process in logs
- Renegotiate the loan each period m
  - … Involves a transfer x and a new loan size m'
- The loan is non-defaultable
  - … Repaying the whole amount is a natural threat point

- Should expect
  - … Interest rate to vary over time
  - … Interest rate to reflect market power
  - … Interest rate to reflect outside options

Environment

The government of a small open economy borrows from a monopolist

- Income $y(z_t)$ follows an AR(1) process in logs
- Renegotiate the loan each period m
  - … Involves a transfer x and a new loan size m'
- The loan is non-defaultable
  - … Repaying the whole amount is a natural threat point

- **Should expect**
  - … Interest rate to vary over time
  - … Interest rate to reflect market power
  - … Interest rate to reflect outside options

Bargaining stage with monopolist

- At income state z and loan m, solve

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

- Government (borrower) surplus

$$\mathcal{B}(x, m, m', z) = \underbrace{u(y(z) + x) + \beta \mathbb{E}\left[v(m', z') \mid z\right]}_{\text{agreement: receive } x\text{, owe } m'} - \underbrace{\left(u(y(z) - m) + \beta \mathbb{E}\left[v(0, z') \mid z\right]\right)}_{\text{threat point: repay } m\text{, clean slate}}$$

- Lender surplus

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

- Value functions $v(m, z)$ and $h(m, z)$ encode expected outcomes of future rounds

Bargaining stage with monopolist

- At income state z and loan m, solve

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

- Government (borrower) surplus

$$\mathcal{B}(x, m, m', z) = \underbrace{u(y(z) + x) + \beta \mathbb{E}\left[v(m', z') \mid z\right]}_{\text{agreement: receive } x\text{, owe } m'} - \underbrace{\left(u(y(z) - m) + \beta \mathbb{E}\left[v(0, z') \mid z\right]\right)}_{\text{threat point: repay } m\text{, clean slate}}$$

- Lender surplus

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

- Value functions $v(m, z)$ and $h(m, z)$ encode expected outcomes of future rounds

Bargaining stage with monopolist

- At income state z and loan m, solve

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

- Government (borrower) surplus

$$\mathcal{B}(x, m, m', z) = \underbrace{u(y(z) + x) + \beta \mathbb{E}\left[v(m', z') \mid z\right]}_{\text{agreement: receive } x\text{, owe } m'} - \underbrace{\left(u(y(z) - m) + \beta \mathbb{E}\left[v(0, z') \mid z\right]\right)}_{\text{threat point: repay } m\text{, clean slate}}$$

- Lender surplus

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

- Value functions $v(m, z)$ and $h(m, z)$ encode expected outcomes of future rounds

Bargaining stage with monopolist

- At income state z and loan m, solve

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

- Government (borrower) surplus

$$\mathcal{B}(x, m, m', z) = \underbrace{u(y(z) + x) + \beta \mathbb{E}\left[v(m', z') \mid z\right]}_{\text{agreement: receive } x\text{, owe } m'} - \underbrace{\left(u(y(z) - m) + \beta \mathbb{E}\left[v(0, z') \mid z\right]\right)}_{\text{threat point: repay } m\text{, clean slate}}$$

- Lender surplus

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

- Value functions $v(m, z)$ and $h(m, z)$ encode expected outcomes of future rounds

Swap Line Terms: Loan Dynamics



Swap Line Terms: Transfers



Swap Line Terms: Interest rate



Swap Line Terms: Borrower's value function



Swap Line Terms: Lender's value function



Swap Line Terms: Takeaways

The threat point is less 'credible' when *m* is large

- This creates convexity in the lender's value function
  … making the lender act 'as if' risk-loving

- The lender initially subsidizes the loan to induce indebtedness and high profits
- Gamble for debt overhang

- Initial subsidy and high rates consistent with B's risk aversion – 'Participation constraint'

Model with Swaps and Debt

Timeline of events



Borrowing from markets

- Debt is a geometrically-decaying coupon

  ... get 1, pay $\kappa, (1-\rho)\kappa, \ldots (1-\rho)^{s-1}\kappa$

- Government enters first stage owing b in debt, m in swaps, income state z

$$v(b,m,z) = \max\left\{v_R(b,m,z) + \epsilon_R, v_D(m,z) + \epsilon_D\right\}$$
$$v_R(b,m,z) = \max_{b'} w_R(b',b,m,z)$$

- Lenders in competitive markets need to anticipate interactions with the monopolist

$$q(b',b,m,z) = \frac{1}{1+r}\mathbb{E}\left[(1-1_{\mathcal{D}}(b',m',z'))\left(\kappa + (1-\rho)q(b'',b',m',z')\right) \mid z\right]$$
$$m' = m'(b',b,m,z)$$
$$b'' = b'(b',m',z')$$

Borrowing from markets

- Debt is a geometrically-decaying coupon

  ... get 1, pay $\kappa, (1-\rho)\kappa, \ldots (1-\rho)^{s-1}\kappa$

- Government enters first stage owing b in debt, m in swaps, income state z

$$v(b,m,z) = \max\left\{v_R(b,m,z) + \epsilon_R, v_D(m,z) + \epsilon_D\right\}$$
$$v_R(b,m,z) = \max_{b'} w_R(b',b,m,z)$$

- Lenders in competitive markets need to anticipate interactions with the monopolist

$$q(b',b,m,z) = \frac{1}{1+r}\mathbb{E}\left[(1 - 1_{\mathcal{D}}(b',m',z'))\left(\kappa + (1-\rho)q(b'',b',m',z')\right) \mid z\right]$$
$$m' = m'(b',b,m,z)$$
$$b'' = b'(b',m',z')$$

Bargaining stage

- Similar to the case with swaps only with extra state variables (b, b')

$$\mathcal{L}_R(b', x, m, m', z) = -x - m + \beta_L \mathbb{E}\left[h(b', m', z') - h(b', 0, z') \mid z\right]$$

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

$$P(b', b, m, z) = q(b', b, m, z)(b' - (1-\rho)b) - \kappa b$$

Default probability

Both types of debt are clearly complements



When is the Swap Used?

- In repayment, average swap = XXXX with s.d. YYYY
- In default,

- Also consider Limited version: $m' \leq m$ while in default

When is the Swap Used?

- In repayment, average swap = XXXX with s.d. YYYY
- In default,

- Also consider Limited version: $m' \leq m$ while in default

Debt Tolerance with Swaps

More repayment with Limited and with bargaining power



Debt Prices with Swaps

More repayment with Limited but still lower prices — Tell-tale sign of debt dilution



Welfare effects of swap lines

with interior bargaining power, Limited $\succcurlyeq$ Unrestricted, but…



Welfare effects of swap lines — Debt dilution

Resolving with short-term debt: losses from Limited, gains of swaps (but not for all θ)



Concluding remarks

Concluding remarks

- Simple model with monopolist/fringe structure
- Strong interaction between two markets for sovereign debt
  - … even if swaps are not used intensely on the equilibrium path
- Market power crucial in model
  - … how to discipline in model?
  - … how to affect in reality?
- Large welfare effects, policy challenges
  - How to limit their use during defaults?
  - Strengthen debt dilution – more gains from fiscal rules, state-contingent debt?