

# INTERNATIONAL LINKAGES: *Financial markets and technology*

DEBORAH RALSTON, Executive Director, Australian Centre for Financial Studies and Professor of Finance,  
Monash University

MARTIN JENKINSON, Research Officer, Australian Centre for Financial Studies

---

*Technology has facilitated increased cross-border participation in financial markets and a growing prevalence of cross-jurisdictional financial market infrastructure providers. This paper investigates the potential impact of these trends on the location of various financial markets and the financing of Australian businesses. The benefits of centralised markets seem clearly to outweigh any costs in both the foreign exchange and derivative markets. However, the outcome of this trade-off is less clear in the capital markets. An earlier version of this paper was presented to the 2014 Australian Centre for Financial Studies' Melbourne Money and Finance Conference.*

---


The increased cross-border participation in financial markets which has been facilitated by technology has allowed investors to diversify their portfolio holdings and corporate issuers to access new pools of capital. In some cases this trend has led activity in certain markets, such as foreign exchange and debt capital markets, to become increasingly concentrated in a small number of geographic locations.

Economies of scale and the creation of efficient global platforms for financial transactions have significantly reduced the cost of transacting in markets and led to more active markets with large pools of liquidity. All of these factors benefit participants in these global markets. However, this trend toward large global financial market providers, driven by participation rather than location, may have implications for real economies. The most widely discussed consequence of multi-jurisdictional financial market infrastructure providers is the potential loss of domestic regulatory control and the implications that this may have for systemic stability. While this is undoubtedly an important concern, the move away from locally based financial market infrastructure providers (FMIs), particularly in primary issuance or 'core capital markets', may have implications for the operational choices of domestic businesses and for the availability of capital – particularly for smaller corporates and during global economic shocks.

## **Australian businesses move toward market based funding**

Since the global financial crisis (GFC), market-based funding has played an increasingly important role in the funding of Australian businesses. Over this period, bank credit growth has been driven by mortgage lending while the stock of business credit issued by banks has declined (Figure 1).

**FIGURE 1: Intermediated credit growth provided by Australian financial institutions post-GFC<sup>1</sup>**




Source: Derived from RBA D2: Lending and credit aggregates.

To some extent, this reduction in intermediated lending to businesses may be explained by reduced demand for finance as a result of increased volatility and general pessimism in the economic outlook. Supply-side factors including changes to capital requirements introduced through the Basel III capital reforms and a more general repricing of risk by banks have also played a role.

Despite the reduction in bank business lending post-GFC, market-based funding has returned to pre-GFC levels after a period of above-average equity issuance as a result of business deleveraging in the 12 months following September 2008 (Figure 2).

**FIGURE 2: Business external funding (net change as % of GDP)**



Source: AFMA, 2014.

The increased importance of market-based funding for Australian businesses is a trend that is expected to continue. According to Maddock and Munckton (2013) the convergence of retail deposit and wholesale rates, in combination with increased capital requirements for business lending, will encourage banks to move assets off balance sheet either via securitisation or by assisting their clients in directly accessing the debt capital markets. The vigour with which a number of Australian banks are supporting the development of a viable retail corporate bond market suggests that banks are already moving in this direction.

In view of the increasing importance of financial markets as a source of business funding, we now turn to international trends in financial markets and FMI.

## **Technology trends and international integration of FMIs globally**

Financial markets rely on financial market infrastructure to perform their role effectively. Financial market infrastructure determines the means and rules by which financial transactions are governed, conducted and reported, and how information is disseminated. Major components of financial infrastructure include international rules on Central Clearing Counterparties, global information platforms such as Bloomberg, clearing systems such as Australian Securities Exchange (ASX) Clear or LCH Clearnet, and payment systems such as RITS or SWIFT, as well as markets for conducting transactions, including OTC and listed markets. Financial market infrastructure can be defined as:

- > the technology available to financial market participants and intermediaries
- > the regulation that governs financial market participants and intermediaries
- > the processes used to collect and disseminate information pertinent to financial transactions
- > the quality and number of financial market participants
- > the financial instruments available.

Ultimately, the quality of financial market infrastructure has a direct impact on the cost of capital for those issuing financial securities and the returns realised by investors. A 2001 study by Domowitz and Steil estimates that a 10 per cent increase in transaction costs leads to an approximate 1.5 per cent increase in the post-tax cost of equity capital.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the quality of financial market infrastructure can be expected to have a strong bearing on the issuance decisions of businesses.

The provision of financial market infrastructure is capital intensive and, as noted by John Kay, 'Markets for homogeneous commodities are natural monopolies'.<sup>3</sup>

There are two reasons cited for markets being natural monopolies. These are: (1) market participants are attracted to liquidity, meaning new liquidity is captured by already liquid markets — network externalities; and (2) the operation of financial market infrastructure is comprised of high fixed costs and low marginal costs — economies of scale.

Before technology made active cross-border provision of financial market infrastructure feasible, financial market infrastructure providers were typically domestic monopolies. However, in recent times there is an increasing trend toward global consolidation among FMIs. This is most aptly portrayed by the merger of the New York Stock Exchange and Euronext in 2007 and the subsequent takeover of the merged entity by Intercontinental Exchange Inc in 2013. Cross-jurisdictional provision of financial market infrastructure has raised a number of well-documented regulatory and stability concerns which are currently being worked through by international regulatory bodies like the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO).

Perhaps more important, however, is the role that technology has played in making foreign markets available to domestic corporations. This is portrayed most vividly in the foreign exchange market in which around 60 per cent of all activity occurs in two financial centres — London and New York.<sup>4</sup> Third-party owned and operated electronic trading venues like Reuters Dealing and EBS have increased the ease with which domestic market participants can bypass an intermediary and access these markets directly. A similar trend could be expected to take place in OTC derivative markets with an international push towards standardisation of contracts and the emergence of Swap Execution Facilities, electronic venues which increase transparency in these markets. Listed derivative and commodities exchanges have also become venues for international participants engaging in contracts that are either unavailable or illiquid in domestic exchanges. The impact of technology and global participation in all of these markets have played a role in increasing liquidity, allowing access for a greater diversity of participants and reducing costs. Technology has also increased the ease by which investors (both international and domestic) can access debt and equity markets. International integration in these markets has led to lower costs of capital for issuers,<sup>5</sup> increased diversification and the potential for improved returns through a wider range of investment opportunities.

---

*The impact of technology and global participation in all of these markets have played a role in increasing liquidity, allowing access for a greater diversity of participants and reducing costs. Technology has also increased the ease by which investors (both international and domestic) can access debt and equity markets.*

---

Offsetting the benefits of the international integration of core funding markets is the increased risk of global crises adversely affecting the domestic economy. The near failure of the Australian residential mortgage-backed security (RMBS) market due to the outflow of international capital post-GFC is evidence that Australia is not immune to this risk. Ease of access to liquid and low-cost international markets may also influence not only the issuance decisions of domestic firms but, along with other factors like domestic laws and taxation, the locational decisions of Australian corporations as well. While the focus of regulators has typically been on the implications of the international FMIs for financial market stability<sup>6</sup> it may well be this last factor that has the greatest implications for the Australian economy in the long term.

### **Internationalisation of Australian financial markets**

The shift in locational dependence of Australian financial markets can be seen across a number of domestic markets.


Increased liquidity in foreign exchange markets during the business hours of London and New York coupled with the development of efficient trading platforms and the internal netting abilities of large global banks has resulted in less than 3 per cent of global FX transactions occurring in Australia, despite the Australian dollar being the fifth-most-traded currency.

The electronic trading venue, Yieldbroker, is creating a similar dynamic in the Australian over-the-counter (OTC) derivative market providing increased pre-trade pricing transparency for the most common OTC derivative contracts. Because OTC derivative market participants can engage in a contract with either local or global dealers, the pre-trade transparency created by platforms like Yieldbroker can be expected to provide increased competition among both global and domestic derivative dealers leading to reduced prices and business going to the most efficient dealers. Likewise, listed derivative exchanges compete directly with one another for the business of international customers with some exchanges offering similar contracts and competing through both price and secondary market activity. With this in mind, liquidity in the ASX derivative exchange is perhaps larger than would be expected, with more than \$40 trillion in notional turnover, primarily in AUD interest rate futures, in 2012–13.

Competition between domestic and international FMIs can also be seen in the clearing of OTC derivatives. To meet the increased demand for central clearing of OTC derivatives,<sup>7</sup> the ASX has developed and now operates clearing services for a number of the highest volume OTC swaps. The most significant development in clearing across Australia's financial markets occurred on 14 July 2013, when LCH Clearnet was given the right to compete directly with ASX Clear in the clearing of OTC interest rate derivatives. The granting of these rights to LCH Clearnet is significant for two reasons. First, this is the first and currently only example of competition in clearing of Australian financial securities and second, because LCH Clearnet operates in Australia as an international organisation, not as a local subsidiary. LCH Clearnet is the largest global clearing house for OTC interest rate swaps, clearing more than 50 per cent of the global interest rate swap market.

Globalisation and increased participation in these markets have contributed to reduced transactions costs for Australians operating in these markets. For example, competition between OTC central clearing counterparties has resulted in little difference in the price of clearing services between ASX and LCH Clearnet, and spreads in both the OTC derivative markets and FX markets have declined significantly over the past 15 years (Figure 3).

**FIGURE 3: AUD/USD FX Spread, 1997–2013**



Source: AFMA, 2014.

The main cost of increased globalisation in these markets has been seen as the potential loss of regulatory control over transactions in these instruments.<sup>8</sup> Whether this is indeed a cost will depend on the competence of international regulatory bodies like the G20 and IOSCO. In any case, the move toward an international regulatory framework for transactions in this market suggests that the benefits of lower transaction costs and greater liquidity for participants in these markets will greatly exceed the cost.


Australian corporates have also become increasingly dependent on international capital markets over the past decade. This is most obvious in the debt market where overseas issuance by non-financial corporates is almost four times larger than domestic issuance. The preference for overseas issuance relative to domestic issuance has increased substantially post-GFC (Figure 4). Relatively attractive international yields have no doubt played a role in this shift, as has the development of a deep and liquid FX swap market allowing international issuers to more easily hedge the associated FX risk. Perhaps more important, however, has been the clear lack of interest by Australian institutional investors in Australian corporate debt, with only 13 per cent of the stock of corporate debt issued into Australia held by institutional investors in 2013.<sup>9</sup> Retail participation in the Australian corporate debt market is almost non-existent as a result of limited access, greater savings being held by superannuation funds and, ironically, the increasing ease by which stocks can be accessed relative to bonds through online trading. In this regard, recent initiatives to level the playing field in terms of retail and institutional investors' access to bonds and stocks, as well as the relative costs of issuance, should be commended.

---

*Australian corporates have also become increasingly dependent on international capital markets over the past decade. This is most obvious in the debt market where overseas issuance by non-financial corporates is almost four times larger than domestic issuance. The preference for overseas issuance relative to domestic issuance has increased substantially post-GFC (Figure 4). Relatively attractive international yields have no doubt played a role in this shift, as has the development of a deep and liquid FX swap market allowing international issuers to more easily hedge the associated FX risk.*


---

**FIGURE 4: Australian non-financial corporate bond issuance, 1997–2013, (\$ million)**



Source: ABS Cat 5232 Table 28.

**FIGURE 5: Holdings of corporate bonds issued in Australia, % of total**



Source: ABS 5232, Table 28.

Data is less readily available for Australian firms choosing to utilise international markets for equity capital. The international migration of Australian firms seeking equity capital is currently most evident among technology start-ups who establish operations in areas with a strong venture capital ecosystem like Silicon Valley. Data on Australian firms that would otherwise be listing internationally and subsequently moving operations overseas is scarce. However, high-profile stories such as the proposed listing of Atlassian on the US stock exchange, and the concentration of the Australian equity market in essentially two sectors suggests that it does happen.


---

*The creation of even larger pools of liquidity and a more diverse range of participants through the consolidation of large international exchanges is likely to increase the attractiveness of listing on international exchanges.*

---

For small, non-resource companies, the allure of listing on an international exchange is clear. The primary motivating factor is the low activity in smaller stocks listed on the ASX, with almost 90 per cent of total stock market turnover occurring in stocks in the largest decile by market capitalisation. Furthermore, the desire of superannuation funds to reduce costs and invest in ASX 200 companies<sup>10</sup> has resulted in a dearth of investment analysts, funds and brokerage reports covering small cap Australian stocks outside of the resources sector. The creation of even larger pools of liquidity and a more diverse range of participants through the consolidation of large international exchanges is likely to increase the attractiveness of listing on international exchanges.

**FIGURE 6: Turnover to market capitalisation on ASX by decile, 2008–13**



Source: CRC Capital Markets MQ Database 2014.

### The cost of relying on international financial market infrastructure

It is clear from the above discussion that Australian companies are increasingly relying on FMIs located outside of Australian borders. There is a rising trend for Australian corporates to issue into international debt markets at low cost and under better terms than can be accessed in Australian markets. Similar trends may be appearing in the domestic equity market, particularly for firms in industries outside of mining and financial services.

While internationally located equity and debt markets can reduce the cost of capital for Australian firms, there are a number of key differences between the foreign exchange and derivative markets and those that facilitate the issuance and secondary market trading of capital securities. These include:

- An issuer typically decides on which secondary markets an instrument can subsequently be traded based on its listing decision.
- The choice to raise capital through a given market may influence an organisation's subsequent locational decisions in regards to headquarters and operations, benefiting the real economy of the jurisdiction with the desirable capital market.
- For domestic companies that lack access to international markets, the availability of domestic financial market infrastructure may provide the only avenue to raise non-intermediated capital and therefore the only source of competition for these lenders.
- These markets provide the capital that supports the financing of real businesses. International capital flows can be fickle and repatriation of funds is not uncommon in times of stress, having consequences for real businesses and industries.

These differences suggest that the issue of financial market infrastructure location has wider implications for the Australian economy with regard to capital markets compared to foreign exchange and derivatives markets. These concerns go beyond the well-documented potential loss of regulatory control to include issues such as the inability for Australian firms to raise capital as a result of global shocks and the potential for Australian firms that would otherwise operate in Australia moving overseas to be closer to capital providers — an issue that can already be seen in Australian technology start-ups moving operations to established 'start-up ecosystems'.

While the number of small firms listed on the ASX is commendable, the concentration in the resource sector and the lack of liquidity in these stocks raises questions around the ability of growing Australian firms outside of these industries to expand operations in Australia. Secondary market liquidity is key to the attractiveness of issuing into a market. In this regard, there is a concerning lack of interest from superannuation funds, by far the largest group of domestic investors, in both Australian corporate debt and stocks outside of the ASX 200. Furthermore, the participation of superannuation funds in small cap equities can be expected to be further reduced as a result of cost-cutting initiatives to comply with the introduction of the MySuper reforms.

It seems likely that with the ongoing consolidation of international markets and technology increasingly enhancing the ease with which international investors and issuers can access international markets, Australian capital markets will face increasing difficulty in their ability to compete. With this in mind, it would appear prudent that the issues raised in this paper be given further consideration both by policy makers and those in academia.

## Notes

1. Includes securitisation.
2. Domowitz and Steil (2001).
3. Kay (2006).
4. Bank for International Settlements (2013).
5. See, for example, Quinn and Toyoda (2008) and Gupta and Yuan (2009).
6. See, for example, Council of Financial Regulators (2014).
7. Driven by both international trends and the possibility of mandatory central clearing of particular contracts being enforced by regulatory bodies.
8. See Council of Financial Regulators (2012).
9. The low holdings of corporate bonds by Australian institutional investors can possibly be explained by the potential for concentration risk as the current issuers of corporate bonds also represent a substantial proportion of total equity market capitalisation.
10. Association of Superannuation Funds Australia (2014).

## References

- Association of Superannuation Funds of Australia 2014, 'Submission to the Financial System Inquiry', available at <http://fsi.gov.au/files/2014/04/ASFA.pdf>
- Bank for International Settlements 2013. 'Triennial central bank survey of foreign exchange and derivatives market activity in 2013', available at [www.bis.org/publ/rpfx13.htm](http://www.bis.org/publ/rpfx13.htm)
- Council of Financial Regulators 2014, 'Application of the Regulatory Framework for Cross-Border Central Clearing Counterparties', a report by the Council of Financial Regulators, March.
- Council of Financial Regulators 2012, 'Competition in Clearing Australian Cash Equities: Conclusions', a report by the Council of Financial Regulators, December.
- Domowitz, I and Steil, B 2001, 'Automation, trading costs, and the cost of equity', Chapter 7 of *Institutional Investors*, MIT Press, London.
- Gupta, N and Yuan, K 2009, 'On the growth effect of stock market liberalizations', *Review of Financial Studies*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 4715–52.
- Kay, J 2006, 'A giant's strength is valuable — if not used like a giant', *Financial Times*, 26 November.
- Maddock, R and Munckton, P 2013, 'Funding Australia's Future: The Future Demand and Supply of Finance', Australian Centre for Financial Studies.
- Quinn, D and Toyoda, AM 2008, 'Does capital account liberalization lead to economic growth?: An empirical investigation', *Review of Financial Studies*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 1403–49.