

not invalidate my argument; a regulatory system based on a number of tools, including reinforced disclosure to authorities, is certainly a more robust system than the current one. This criticism is particularly relevant for focusing on the costs and expected benefits of reform initiatives, which always need detailed and careful assessment – though the cost of failure has proven to be astronomical.

Individual actors in the financial marketplace have run businesses within institutions that were not conceived for those businesses.

The second criticism, often associated with the work of Merton and Bodie (2005), is that financial regulations can be bypassed by financial innovation. Indeed, these authors argue that financial organisations innovate their way away from the constraints imposed on them by regulations when their business evolves in directions inconsistent with existing rules. While the phenomenon described by Merton and Bodie is certainly present and needs to be taken into account, I do not think (and I believe that I am also interpreting these authors correctly) that this reasoning implies total ineffectiveness of regulatory constraints on financial activities. The characteristic speed, flexibility, and mobility of financial organisation certainly needs to be taken into account when considering regulatory design, but does not justify inactivity on the regulatory front. Once again, this criticism brings the attention on another aspect of implementation, essential in financial reform, which is the requirement of uniform initiatives by all relevant national authorities. Indeed, Initiatives on regulatory reform are being discussed in international fora, such as the Group of 20, the Financial Stability Board, the Bank for International Settlements. The US and European authorities, including the European Commission, have repeatedly highlighted the need to coordination and their efforts to achieve it.

6. Concluding remarks

A financial crisis is a market failure which destroys a fundamental function of financial intermediation, the function of liquidity transformation, with substantial social costs. The recognition of the mechanics of financial crises has led to a number of regulatory institutions that were designed to minimise the probability that liquidity transformation breaks down. Such institutions, however, were designed in a world that was different from today. Financial markets are now characterised by a wide diffusion of securities, derivatives and related businesses. These developments have had two effects; they have multiplied exponentially transactions and counterparty risk, and they have led to a progressive divergence between functions and institutions. In other words, individual actors in the financial marketplace have run businesses within institutions that were not conceived for those businesses. These institutions are inefficient in the current financial system. The end

result is that the mechanics of financial crises have changed.

The intended contribution of this paper is to offer an analytical framework to organise a reform strategy. It thus differs from many reform templates that consist of lists of (generally eminently sensible) reform initiatives. The strategy for financial reform that I propose starts from the premise that institutions are very important in financial markets, and have to be appropriate for the businesses they run. I thus propose ways to improve existing institutions, in the interest of more efficient markets. A major aspect of my proposal is a very significant increase in the supervisory responsibilities of financial authorities, necessary for them to regain effectiveness as managers of systemic risk.

References

- Acharya, Viral V. and Matthew Richardson eds. (2009), *Restoring Financial Stability*, New York: John Wiley and Sons
- Bagehot, W. (1873), *Lombard Street*, New York: Scribner, reprinted by John Wiley and Sons
- Blankfein, Looyd (2010), "Testimony to the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission," January 13.
- Brunnermeier, Markus K. and Lasse H. Pedersen (2008), "Market Liquidity and Funding Liquidity", *Review of Financial Studies*, 22(6), 2201-2238.
- Coase, Ronald (1964), "The Regulated Industries: Discussion," *American Economic Review*, 54:3, pp. 194-97.
- Demsetz, Harold (1969), "Information and Efficiency: Another Viewpoint," *Journal of Law and Economics*, 12:1, pp. 1-22.
- Diamond Douglas W. and Philip Dybvig (1983, "Bank runs, deposit insurance, and liquidity" *Journal of Political Economy* 91 (3): 401-19.
- Dixit, Avinash (1996), *The Making of Economic Policy: A Transaction Cost Politics Perspective*, Cambridge University Press.
- Geanakoplos, John (2009), "The Leverage Cycle," Cowles Foundation Discussion Paper 1715, July.
- Geithner, Timothy F. (2006), "Hedge Funds and Derivatives and Their Implications for the Financial System," Remarks at the Distinguished Lecture 2006, sponsored by the Hong Kong Monetary Authority and Hong Kong Association of Banks, September 15.
- Giovannini, Alberto (forthcoming), "Why the European Securities Market Is Not Fully Integrated," in Alberto Alesina and Francesco Giavazzi (editors), *Europe and the Dollar*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press and NBER.
- Huizinga, Harry and Luc Laeven (2009), "Accounting Discretion of Banks During a Financial Crisis", IMF Working Paper 09/207, October.
- International Monetary Fund (2009), *Global Financial Stability Report, Responding to the Financial Crisis and Measuring Systemic Risk*. Washington, D.C., April.
- Lowenstein, Roger (2004), *Origins of the Crash*, New York, The Penguin Press.
- Merton, Robert C. and Zvi Bodie (1995), "A Conceptual Framework for Analyzing the Financial Environment,"

- in Dwight Crane et al, (eds) *The Global Financial System*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Merton, Robert C. and Zvi Bodie (2005), "Design of Financial Systems, Towards a Synthesis of Function and Structure," *Journal of Investment Management*, vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 1-23.
- Rajan, Raghuram (2005), Has Financial Development Made the World Riskier?", manuscript, September.
- Richardson, Matthew (2009), "Causes of the Financial Crisis of 2007-2009", in Acharya and Richardson (2009).
- Ross Sorkin, Andrew (2009), *Too Big to Fail*, New York and London, Penguin.

Alberto Giovannini is Chief Executive Officer and a founding shareholder of Unifortune SGR SpA, an asset management company based in Milano, Italy. He has also been Principal Policy Advisor of the Commission's Clearing and Settlement Advisory and Monitoring Group (CESAME).

Mr. Giovannini started his professional career as an academic. He was the Jerome A. Chazen Professor of International Business at Columbia University, where he taught and conducted research from 1983 to 1995. He has held a number of positions in the public and private sector, including Co-Chairman of the Council of Experts at the Ministry of the Treasury in Rome, Italy (in charge of the Republic of Italy's international debt program), Senior Strategist at Long-Term Capital Management and Deputy General Manager of Banca di Roma.

Mr. Giovannini graduated from the University of Bologna, and holds a PhD in Economics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The Centre for Economic Policy Research, founded in 1983, is a network of over 700 researchers based mainly in universities throughout Europe, who collaborate through the Centre in research and its dissemination. The Centre's goal is to promote research excellence and policy relevance in European economics. CEPR Research Fellows and Affiliates are based in over 237 different institutions in 28 countries. Because it draws on such a large network of researchers, CEPR is able to produce a wide range of research which not only addresses key policy issues, but also reflects a broad spectrum of individual viewpoints and perspectives. CEPR has made key contributions to a wide range of European and global policy issues for over two decades. CEPR research may include views on policy, but the Executive Committee of the Centre does not give prior review to its publications, and the Centre takes no institutional policy positions. The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Centre for Economic Policy Research.