Measuring Margin

NBER Initiative on Systemic Risk and Macro Modeling

Robert L. McDonald

April 27, 2011



- How much exposure is there to derivatives in the aggregate?
- How is this exposure split across different asset classes?
- How sensitive is required collateral (margin) to changes in estimated correlations?

- The estimated outstanding gross notional amount of derivatives globally as of June 30, 2010 was \$466.8 trillion. (ISDA and BIS)
 - This number by definition includes positions that are offset (notional overhang)
 - The vast majority (93%) are interest rate derivatives, with CDS second at about 5%
 - Over 10% of the interest rate derivatives are options
- OTC contracts raise at least two policy concerns related to credit risk:
 - Notional overhang offsetting a position with a similar position from a different counterparty — creates interlocking credit exposures
 - Positions may not be margined, or may be margined less than a clearinghouse would require (e.g, AIG)

- A main thrust of Dodd-Frank is increased use of clearinghouses for "standardized" derivative contracts
- Clearinghouses would require margin of all participants, should reduce notional overhang, and should facilitate reporting of positions
- For non-standard contracts, there is intended to be "real-time" reporting of transactions and swap data repositories for position data.
 - Analyzing this data centrally is likely to be difficult
- Dodd-Frank requires margin on all non-cleared swaps, but there will likely be an "end-user exemption"

We don't know

- How large clearinghouses will get
- How many clearinghouses there will be
- How international integration and resolution will function
- How empirically important the end-user exemption will be.
- How much market-making business will flee traditionally-regulated entities (e.g., banks subject to Basel III)
- The question is what information will be useful across different future configurations of activity

- The mandate for clearing may have unintended consequences
 the exchange-traded universe is currently small relative to OTC
- The CMEGroup and Eurex, for example, typically hold margin of less than \$10 billion each
- Estimates of additional collateral with a widespread move to clearinghouses are orders of magnitude greater than current clearinghouse margin

Proposed Treasury et al margin and capital requirements for covered swap entities, April 2011:

> ... a covered swap entity would not be required to collect initial or variation margin from a nonfinancial end user counterparty as long as the cover swap entity's exposures to the nonfinancial end-user were below the credit exposure limits that the covered swap entity has established ... (p. 25)

 One can envision loopholes (e.g., splitting positions across multiple dealers, imposing risk on the system if not on any one dealer)

- Margin is a buffer against counterparty credit risk
- Most derivative users seek a defined exposure but typically do not seek exposure to counterparty credit risk
 - User would endogenously seek counterparty margin or other credit protection
 - Dealer banks may be willing to bear credit risk for a fee as part of their business
- Empirically, firms and banks oppose margin rules
- Current common practice in the OTC market is to post no initial margin (the "independent amount") but to mark the position to market
 - This leaves counterparties with no buffer against an overnight failure, a liquidity event, or a systemic event

Why is There a Controversy About Margin?

- Margin benefits the counterparty. Shouldn't this be reflected in pricing?
- There are possible externalities
 - Perception that derivatives can be unwound quickly; this may generate runs
 - Perception that rescue will occur if there is a crisis.
 - Traders don't internalize costs of a failure
- The existing bankrutpcy regime has given derivatives special status
- With one very notable exception, derivatives narrowly-defined were not a huge issue in 2008.
- So end-users may try to continue to minimize margin

 There is widespread use of "portfolio margining" at clearinghouses, but this is currently limited to cross-margining within asset classes (e.g. equity indexes)

Probably this is done more comprehensively at dealers

- Clearinghouses in the future may compete on margin rules, so wider future application of portfolio margining seems likely
 - One can imagine margining CDS against equity derivatives
- Portfolio margining necessarily makes assumptions about correlation
 - AAA Mortgage CDOs are an extreme example of portfolio margining — the non-AAA tranches provide sufficient protective margin if the assumption of zero correlation is correct

- Cross-margining can reduce margins either by assuming high or low correlations
- Spread positions can receive low margins with the assumption that positions are positively correlated (e.g. corn across time)
- Margins can be lowered by assuming that correlation is not one (specialty stock indexes)

- Gross and net aggregate open interest are relatively uninformative about net risk borne by traders
- Measuring aggregate *margin* would provide a better proxy for total derivatives risk
- Measuring margin by asset class is interesting but difficult because of cross-margining
 - One could measure notional aggregate margin, by asset class, by elimininating portfolio margin reductions
 - A large difference between notional and true margin would signal increased demand for collateral if correlations change
- Increases in category margin could signal economic developments (e.g. increase in CDS use signaling diversity of opinion about defaults)

- We don't know if the value of the end-user exemption will be big or small
- One can view the exemption as if the dealer lends the margin amount to the end-user
- The aggregate values of these loans could be reported and potentially even carried as debt

 Assume the clearinghouse has no credit risk and that debt is the marginal source of short-term finance

End-user			
Assets	Liabilities		
Risky asset	Α	Financing	А
Derivative	0		—
Cash (Margin)	M_E	Debt	M_E

Dealer			
Assets		Liabilities	
—		Derivative	0
Margin	M_D	Debt	M_D

If an end-user and dealer enter into an OTC contract with both posting initial margin, the economic balance sheets look like this:

End-user			
Assets		Liabilities	
Risky asset	Α	Financing	А
Derivative	0	—	—
Cash (Margin)	M_E	Debt (3rd party)	M_E
Dealer Margin	M_D	Exposure to Dealer	M_D

Dealer			
Assets		Liabilities	
—		Derivative	0
Cash (Margin)	M_D	Debt (3rd party)	M_D
End-user Margin	M_E	Exposure to end-user	M_E

If an end-user and dealer enter into a non-cleared derivatives contract, with neither posting initial margin, balance sheets conceptually look like this (note the inside loans):

End-user			
Assets		Liabilities	
Risky asset	A	Financing	А
Derivative	0	—	
Margin	M _E	Debt (from dealer)	M_E
Loan to dealer (Margin)	M_D	Exposure to Dealer	M_D
Dealer			
Assets		Liabilities	
—	_	Derivative	0
Margin	M_D	Debt (from end-user)	M_D
Loan to end-user (margin)	M _E	Exposure to end-user	M_E

- In the last case, none of the debt and exposure items appear on the balance sheet, so there is systematic understatement of leverage by both dealers and end-users
- It would be possible for both dealers and end-users to report the margin they are *not* posting.
 - This would be analogous to debt on the balance sheet
 - Reporting by asset class, with cross-margining adjustments, could be the same as for clearinghouses and margined OTC trades

- The push to central clearing will create new systemically important financial utilities, some of which will be too big or interconnected to fail
- During a systemic event, there will likely be losses, a demand for collateral, and an increase in correlations
- The goal is to know how much collateral is supporting which kinds of positions
 - This should help regulators and market participants assess the risk of aggregate positions and changes in the level of risk
- As portfolio margining becomes more widespread, it may be important for market participants and regulators to understand the importance of correlation assumptions