

**CREDITOR RIGHTS, ENFORCEMENT, AND DEBT OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE:
EVIDENCE FROM THE GLOBAL SYNDICATED LOAN MARKET ***

(Forthcoming in the *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*)

Benjamin C. Esty

Associate Professor of Finance
Harvard Business School

and

William L. Megginson

Professor & Rainbolt Chair in Finance
Michael F. Price College of Business
The University of Oklahoma

First Draft: June 27, 2000

Current Draft: October 29, 2002

* The authors thank Yiorgos Allayannis, Viral Acharya, Malcolm Baker, Amir Barnea, Michael Fishman, Charlie Hadlock, Campbell Harvey, Kose John, Leora Klapper, Stefanie Kleimeier, Larry Lang, Josh Lerner, Paul Malatesta, Scott Mayfield, John McConnell, Lalitha Naveen, Manju Puri, Ehud Ronn, Rick Ruback, Andrei Shleifer, David Smith, Jeremy Stein, and two anonymous referees. We would also like to thank seminar participants at the European Financial Management Association (Paris), Federal Reserve Board (Washington), Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, Florida, Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, Harvard Business School, Illinois, International Finance Conference at Georgia Tech, Kansas, London Business School, Maryland, NYU, Texas Finance Festival, World Bank, the University of Zurich and the Tuck/JFQA Conference on International Corporate Governance for helpful comments on earlier drafts, and Fuaad Qureshi for research assistance. Finally, we are especially grateful for the financial support from the University of Oklahoma's Michael F. Price College of Business, which allowed us to purchase the *Loanware* database, and the Division of Research at Harvard Business School. An earlier version of this paper was titled, "Legal Risk as a Determinant of Syndicate Structure in the Project Finance Loan Market."

Please address all correspondence to:

Benjamin C. Esty
Morgan 381
Harvard Business School
Boston, MA 02163
Tel: (617) 495-6159
Fax: (617) 496-6592
e-mail: besty@hbs.edu

CREDITOR RIGHTS, ENFORCEMENT, AND DEBT OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE: EVIDENCE FROM THE GLOBAL SYNDICATED LOAN MARKET

Abstract

Using a sample of 495 project finance loan tranches (worth \$151 billion) to borrowers in 61 different countries, we examine the relation between legal risk and debt ownership structure. The tranches exhibit high absolute levels of debt ownership concentration: the largest single bank holds 20.3% while the top five banks collectively hold 61.2% of a typical tranche. In countries with strong creditor rights and reliable legal enforcement, lenders create smaller and more concentrated syndicates to facilitate monitoring and low-cost contracting. When lenders cannot rely on legal enforcement mechanisms to protect their claims, they create larger and more diffuse syndicates as a way to deter strategic default.

Key words: creditor rights, international corporate governance, bank lending, project finance, syndication

JEL classification: G21, G32, F34, K33

CREDITOR RIGHTS, ENFORCEMENT, AND DEBT OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE: EVIDENCE FROM THE GLOBAL SYNDICATED LOAN MARKET

I. Introduction

Using the power of cross-country comparisons, economists have documented a relation between legal rules and such things as corporate ownership, financing policies, and capital allocation. Studies by La Porta, López-de-Silanes, Shleifer, and Vishny (hereafter, LLSV; 1998, 2000) show that common law systems provide stronger investor protection than civil law systems, and that stronger investor protection encourages investors to hold smaller equity positions without fearing expropriation by majority shareholders or other insiders. As a result, we observe more diffuse equity ownership structures in countries with stronger investor protection (La Porta, López-de-Silanes, and Shleifer, 1999, Claessens et al., 2000). Related work shows that stronger investor protection and better legal enforcement results in larger and more efficient capital markets (LLSV, 1997), higher equity values (LLSV 2002, Claessens et al. 2002) and faster economic growth (Demirgüç-Kunt and Maksimovic, 1998; Levine, 1999; and Wurgler, 2000).

Virtually all of this research, however, has focused on shareholder rights, equity ownership, and governance by large shareholders. Yet debt markets have historically provided a much greater percentage of external finance than equity markets, at least in developed countries. Logically, legal rules (creditor rights) and enforcement should also affect debt-financing policies. As a first step towards understanding the relation between debt financing and corporate governance, we analyze how legal risk—defined as the strength and enforcement of creditor rights—affects the structure of debt ownership using a sample of international syndicated loans. Although there is some theoretical research on the structure of debt ownership and the nature of governance by banks available to guide us, there is relatively little empirical research on either topic.¹ While our initial objective is to document the structure of debt ownership, our ultimate goal is to improve our understanding of creditor-based governance by exploring the different governance functions banks play and how they vary as a function of country's legal environment.

Theoretically, bank lending improves corporate governance in three ways. First, bankers

¹ The theoretical work includes: Diamond (1991), Chowdry (1991), Bolton and Scharfstein (1996), and Bris and Welch (2002). The empirical work includes: Simons (1993), Preece and Mullineaux (1996), Dennis and Mullineaux (2000), Jones, Lang, and Nigro (2000), Lee and Mullineaux (2001), and Panyagometh and Roberts (2002).

monitor borrower performance, and intervene in an effective and timely manner in case borrower non-performance seems likely. Second, concentrated debt ownership facilitates low-cost re-contracting in the event of default. Finally, by including a large number of creditors in a loan syndicate, banks can deter voluntary, or strategic, default by making it more costly to restructure loans. We focus on these three governance functions played by banks because they generate different empirical predictions regarding the relation between syndicate structure and legal risk. By syndicate structure, we mean the concentration and size of lending syndicates; by legal risk, we mean the degree to which creditors have legal rights and can rely on local enforcement. Based on LLSV (1998) and other legal scholars (Hoffman, 1998; Walsh, 1999), we assume that civil law systems provide fewer and weaker creditor rights. We measure legal enforcement using the Berkowitz, Pistor, and Richard's (hereafter BPR, 2001) composite legality index. When creditors have fewer rights, face less reliable enforcement, or both, we assume they are exposed to greater legal risk and, all else equal, have a lower probability of achieving a satisfactory return on their invested capital.

We predict there is a relation between syndicate structure and legal risk, and that this relation will help us understand the governance roles played by banks. As legal risk increases, both the demand for monitoring increases, because there are more opportunities for misappropriation of cash flows, and the demand for re-contracting increases, because the probability of economic default increases. If either effect is at work, we should observe an increase in syndicate concentration (i.e. fewer banks and larger individual shares). Conversely, if bankers are structuring syndicates to deter strategic default, we should observe a decrease in syndicate concentration as legal risk increases (i.e. more banks and smaller individual shares). By increasing syndicate size, the lenders credibly pre-commit to a more costly restructuring process and to an expanded group of "injured" banks that will be less likely to lend in the future.

We test these hypotheses using a sample of international syndicated loans for project-financed transactions. We analyze *international* loans because they provide the necessary cross-sectional heterogeneity of legal systems and enforcement. We analyze *syndicated* loans because they exhibit a wide range of ownership structures ranging from two to 200 banks organized in a pyramidal structure. Finally, we analyze *project finance* loans because governance by banks is likely to be more important in this than in other contexts. Project finance is defined by the creation of a legally independent project company financed with non-recourse debt for the

purpose of investing in an industrial asset. Governance by banks is important in this context because project companies are highly leveraged entities—the average project company has a debt-to-total capitalization ratio of 70% compared to 30-35% in the average publicly-traded company (Esty, 2002a)—and they get virtually all of their debt in the form of syndicated bank loans. Both collectively and individually, syndicate members are important capital providers in that they typically contribute more capital than any of the individual equity investors (known as sponsors). Another advantage of studying project companies is that it allows use to limit our analysis to the project company due to the non-recourse nature of project debt.

Our sample includes 495 loan tranches worth a total of \$151 billion. They come from loans made between 1986 and 2000 to borrowers in 61 different countries. Using univariate analysis, we document high absolute levels of debt ownership concentration. At closing, the largest single debt provider holds an average (median) of 20.3% (14.8%) of the tranche while the top five banks hold an average (median) of 61.2% (57.3%). Although the largest share declines with tranche size, the largest single bank still holds almost 10% of tranches over \$500 million.

We also document a significant relation between legal risk and syndicate concentration: tranches in countries with weaker creditor rights or weaker legal enforcement exhibit less concentrated ownership structures. Holding all else constant, loan tranches in civil law countries involve 3.2 more banks (for a total of 17.6 banks), compared to 14.4 banks in the average tranche in our sample. This positive relation between creditor rights and debt ownership concentration is particularly interesting because it is the opposite of the *negative* relation LLS (1999) find between shareholder rights and equity ownership concentration. Similarly, loan tranches in countries with weak legal enforcement contain 8.5 more banks than comparable tranches in countries with strong legal enforcement. These results are even more significant in countries with low to moderate legal risk, which leads us to conclude that legal considerations, rather than concerns about portfolio diversification, are driving our results. Based on this evidence, we conclude that banks act as monitors and providers of low-cost re-contracting in settings where they have stronger legal rights and can rely on local enforcement to protect their invested capital. As legal risk increases, however, their governance role shifts to one of deterring strategic defaults, which they accomplish by increasing syndicate size and decreasing concentration.

The paper is organized into four sections. In Section II, we present important institutional details about syndicated lending and the project finance loan market, and describe

how this helps us test the relationship between syndicate structure and legal risk. Section III discusses our dataset and provides univariate analyses of creditor rights, enforcement, and syndicate structure variables. Our analysis on the determinants of syndicate structure appears in Section IV. We conclude with a brief discussion of our findings and their implications in Section V.

II. Background Information and Hypotheses

Before presenting our hypotheses, we need to establish some basic facts and terminology about syndicated lending, describe project finance in greater detail, and define legal risk. A bank syndicate is a collection of banks that jointly extends a loan to a specific borrower (see Esty, 2001, for a more detailed description of the syndication process.) Unlike a loan sale to a third party in which no direct contract exists between the borrower and the buyer, syndication involves a direct contract between each member bank and the borrower (Pennachi, 1988; and Gorton and Pennachi, 1995). Lending syndicates resemble pyramids with a few *arranging banks* (arrangers) at the top and many *providing banks* (providers) at the bottom. Prior to closing a loan, the arranging (or mandated) banks meet with the borrower, assess the credit quality, negotiate key terms and conditions, and prepare an information memorandum for providing banks. Once the key terms are in place, the arranging banks invite other banks to participate in the deal and allocate shares to the providing banks as they see fit. The syndication process allows us to assume that syndicate structures are endogenously determined in response to project characteristics including legal risk. After closing, the arranging banks monitor compliance with loan covenants (e.g. ensure conditions precedent are met prior to loan draw downs), negotiate contingency agreements as needed, and lead negotiations in default situations. Because the arranging banks play a more prominent role than providing banks leading up to and after syndication, we focus most of our attention on the arranging banks.

Syndicated loans are the predominant form of funding for project-financed investments. What makes project companies particularly appropriate for our analysis is that they are, perhaps more than almost any other type of company, built on contractual agreements—in fact, some people refer to project finance as “contractual finance.” Prior to financing a project company, sponsoring firms sign contracts with construction firms, suppliers, customers, and host

governments. Lenders, on the other hand, negotiate commitment letters, collateral packages, and loan documents with project companies, and inter-creditor agreements among themselves. This nexus of contracts, to use Jensen and Meckling's (1976) characterization of the firm, is intended to ensure loan repayment when the project is solvent and loan recoverability when the project is in default. Typically, New York or UK law governs the financing contracts. In contrast, the operating contracts and the enforcement of security provisions (e.g., seizure of collateral upon default) depend on the legal system in the country where the assets—the project—is located. As a result, lenders must understand their rights as creditors and the efficiency of local enforcement before lending in a given country.

In practice, countries vary considerably in terms of the rights they grant creditors and the efficiency with which they respect property rights and enforce contract law. For example, there is a well-documented difference between civil law and common law jurisdictions in terms of investor protection. Coffee (2000) argues that common law systems provide greater flexibility to address new unforeseen situations because civil law systems are restricted to the body of current laws. Consistent with this view, LLSV (1998) show that common law countries provide stronger legal protection for both shareholders and creditors. In the context of project finance, Hoffman (1998, pp. 76-77) notes that common law countries provide greater leeway in the types of collateral that can be seized in default and the types of liens that can be placed on assets.² Resolving legal issues, particularly when the financing documents and the collateral agreements are governed by different legal systems, can be extremely time consuming and complex.³

In addition to ensuring they have legal rights, creditors must also ensure their rights are enforceable in the host country. According to Moody's (2001, pp. 47, 48):

Project finance is typically a pyramid of contracts. In many countries, investors simply do not know if these contracts will be upheld as legal, binding, or enforceable ...these contracts are worth little more than the paper on which they

² For similar reasons, Walsh (1999, p. 125) concludes, "...civil law jurisdictions restrict the security rights available to project lenders...In contrast to the civil law, the common law offers a far more expedient approach to securing assets." As an example, civil law countries generally forbid "floating liens," do not permit mortgages to be registered in a foreign currency, and forbid foreign entities from operating or purchasing foreclosed assets. Penrose and Rigby (2000, p. 60), two S&P analysts, claim that, "In many countries, the notion of contract supported debt remains a novelty. Little case law or civil law, for instance, exists to support the assignment of contracts to lenders as collateral. The legal system may not support the Western-style contracts so typical in project finance."

³ Esty's (2002b) analysis of Poland's A2 Motorway shows that resolving legal differences between UK common law and Polish civil law was one of the major challenges for the bankers and lawyers. One difference between the two legal systems was that Polish law did not allow banks to earn interest on interest in default situations.

are written if the host country's legal and political system cannot guarantee that they will be consistently enforced.

Ratings analysts at Fitch (Dell et al., 2001, p. 10) and S&P (Penrose and Rigby, 2000, pp. 44-51) echo similar sentiments regarding the importance of contract enforceability while recent academic research reinforces the relation between judicial efficiency well-functioning credit markets (see Djankov et al., 2002; Giannetti, 2002; and Jappelli, Pagano, and Bianco, 2002). We refer to countries where creditors have few rights and/or cannot rely on local enforcement as having high legal risk.

A. Hypotheses Relating Syndicate Structure and Legal Risk

We hypothesize that legal risk affects the way banks perform their primary governance functions, and that banks will adjust syndicate structure in response to legal risk to facilitate their various governance roles. According to previous research, banks have three primary governance functions. First, as described in Diamond (1984) and Fama (1985), they provide valuable *monitoring* services. Empirical research by James (1987), Lummer and McConnell (1989), and Dahiya, Puri, and Saunders (2001) on the returns associated with new loan agreements, and by De Long (1991) and Hoshi, Kashyap, and Scharfstein (1991) on the relation between bank finance and firm performance, is consistent with the idea that bank monitoring adds value.⁴

Second, banks facilitate low-cost *re-contracting* in the event of default. Bolton and Scharfstein (1996) and Gertner and Scharfstein (1991) present theoretical models showing the conditions under which small groups of banks are able to restructure firms faster and more cheaply than larger groups of public bondholders can. Consistent with these models, Gilson, John, and Lang (1990) and Asquith, Gertner, and Scharfstein (1994) find that the time and cost of restructuring increases as the number of creditors increases, yet declines with the fraction of bank debt. Also consistent with the models, Preece and Mullineaux (1996) show that the positive abnormal returns associated with new bank loan announcements are negatively related to syndicate size. In explaining this finding, they argue that the renegotiation costs associated with larger syndicates gradually offset the monitoring benefits. Low-cost re-structuring is

⁴ Rajan (1992), Kang and Stulz (2000), and Weinstein and Yafeh (1998) highlight the disadvantages of bank control, namely the danger of getting locked into banking relationships. Because project finance involves a one-time transaction rather than an on-going relationship, and involves multiple rather than single creditors, concerns

important in the context of project finance because projects involve dedicated assets with going concern value, but little salvage value. As a result, asset liquidations are rare and restructurings are the norm (see Hoffman, 1998, p. 656). Knowing that restructuring is the likely course for a defaulted project, lenders may rationally structure syndicates to minimize restructuring costs.

Bolton and Scharfstein (1996) aptly point out that low-cost restructuring can, perversely, encourage borrowers to default strategically. Lenders can discourage strategic defaults by intentionally making such discretionary acts more costly to the borrowers. One way to discourage strategic default is to increase the number of creditors in a syndicate, thereby creating a more costly restructuring process and pre-committing to imposing costs on the strategic defaulter (Gertner and Scharfstein, 1991; Diamond, 1991; and Bolton and Scharfstein, 1996). A second way to make default more costly is to impose a penalty on defaulting firms. In Chowdry's (1991) model of sovereign lending, banks threaten to withhold future lending. Chowdry's model assumes that banks can credibly commit not to lend after a default only if they have previously lost money to a particular borrower. Thus, as syndicate size increases, the pool of potential creditors willing to lend to a defaulting borrower at some point in the future declines. Of course, the defaulting borrower must depend on external finance for the threat to withhold future lending to be credible. For projects with little on-going funding requirements, this form of deterrence may be less effective. It may, however, be effective against sponsoring firms that rely on external finance to fund their capital expenditures.

We focus on these governance function—monitoring, re-contracting, and deterrence—because they generate different empirical predictions regarding the relation between syndicate structure and legal risk. We present three hypotheses to test which (if any) of these functions most influences observed syndicate structures, although we readily admit that observed structures represent complex combinations of these and other non-governance related factors. The *monitoring hypothesis* predicts that banks will hold larger shares, resulting more concentrated syndicates, when monitoring is most valuable. Banks with larger positions have less incentive to free ride on the monitoring of others. While we expect monitoring to be more important in countries with high legal risk—there is greater opportunity for misappropriation of cash flow—there is an offsetting effect: banks have fewer legal rights and cannot rely on local enforcement. As a result, banks may bear the cost of concentrating ownership in the form of

regarding lock-in are less relevant in this setting.

sub-optimal diversification, yet may not get any benefit in the form of improved monitoring. Thus, we expect more concentrated lending syndicates in countries with low legal risk where the detection of problems can lead to corrective actions through legal mechanisms. In countries with high legal risk, however, the empirical prediction is not clear.

The *low-cost re-contracting hypothesis* similarly predicts that banks will choose more concentrated loan syndicates to reduce re-contracting costs when the probability of economic default (as opposed to strategic default) is higher. By definition, low-cost re-contracting is similar to monitoring in that it relies on the existence of legal rights and the enforcement of contracts. For this reason, we predict more concentrated syndicates in countries with low legal risk, and view a positive relation between increases in legal risk and debt ownership concentration as being consistent with the re-contracting hypothesis (as well as the monitoring hypothesis).

Finally, the *deterrence hypothesis* predicts there should be a negative relation between legal risk and debt ownership concentration. Banks, knowing they have few legal rights and cannot rely on local enforcement, attempt to deter strategic default by making it more costly to default. They can make voluntary default costly by choosing more diffuse ownership structures. Of course, lenders must be mindful of the potential for economic defaults—the situation when debt value exceeds asset value—in which case they bear the incremental restructuring costs. This concern, combined with the fixed costs of underwriting a loan, prevents arranging banks from expanding syndicate size (or decreasing concentration) without bound.

III. Data and Methodology

Our sample of syndicated loans comes from Capital Data's (now Dealogic) Loanware database, which contains information on more than 85,000 syndicated loan tranches made between 1980 and April 2000. Although the Loanware database provides detailed information on the loan tranches themselves, it provides much less information on the borrowing entities (i.e. the project companies), sponsoring firms, and lenders. As a result, we are unable to collect potentially interesting data items such as project leverage, sponsor characteristics, or lender characteristics for most observations. We use this information when it is available, but it severely limits our sample size.

We begin with the 6,505 loan tranches designated as project finance loans and apply three screens to obtain the final sample. First, we exclude all bilateral loans—loans between a single bank and a borrower. Second, we exclude tranches less than \$75 million because they have simpler structures: the median number of banks in tranches under \$75 million is three compared to five banks for tranches from \$75-\$85 million and 20 banks for tranches greater than \$250 million. To determine if this selection criteria induces a bias against riskier countries, we test for and reject the hypothesis that loan amounts are smaller in countries with high sovereign or legal risk. And third, we require that the database contain complete syndicate share information (i.e. the amount held by each bank) so that we can analyze the structure of the syndicate. The presence of syndicate share information, however, is not statistically related to tranche size, signing date, or location. After applying these three screens, our final sample consists of 495 tranches for projects in 61 different countries. Because the unit of observation is a loan tranche, multiple tranches from the same loan appear as separate observations in our database—there are 468 different loans, 22 of which have multiple tranches in our dataset (446 loans have a single tranche while 22 loans account for 49 tranches). Thus, most observations are independent observations.

Given the reported dollar investment made by each bank at closing, we manually calculate several concentration measures for each tranche, including the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI), the share of the five largest participating banks (five-bank concentration ratio, CR5), the largest single bank share (CR1), and the total share held by arranging banks. We define arrangers to include any bank that is listed as a mandated arranger, arranger, or co-arranger in the database. Because Loanware reports syndicate structure as of the closing date, we are unable to track what happens to ownership after the loan has closed.⁵ As part of this process, we calculate syndicate size in terms of the number of total banks, number of arranging banks, and number of providing banks. Finally, we collect information on loan pricing, loan characteristics (signing date, tranche size, maturity, whether the loan was secured or guaranteed, and whether it was a refinancing), and project characteristics (industrial sector and location). To control for sovereign risk, we collect the most recent *Institutional Investor* country credit rating

⁵ Although arranging banks can and occasionally do sell down their positions after closing, they usually retain meaningful positions. In personal interviews with bankers and traders, they are very concerned about signaling effects associated with selling down loans they originated. In general, the trading volume on project loans is relatively low.

(II RATING) prior to closing—the scale runs from zero (high risk) to 100 (low risk).

Institutional Investor publishes ratings twice per year based on surveys of 75 to 100 international bankers and weights the results by actual lending exposures. One attractive feature of these ratings is that they are forward-looking estimates of sovereign debt capacity and repayment probabilities. As a word of caution, it is important to remember that the II RATING is an inverse scale so that country risk decreases as the II RATING increases.

Table 1 presents the geographic distribution for the full listing of all PF loans and for our final sample of 495 loan tranches. Consistent with Kleimeier and Megginson's (2000) analysis of syndicated lending, we find that project loans are predominantly international credits, yet the U.S. and U.K. still account for 15.1% and 9.5%, respectively, of the number of loans in our final sample. At the same time, there is no evidence that tranches in a few outlier countries drive our results.

****** Insert Table 1 about here ******

For our final sample, we gather data on the legal rules and the level of enforcement in the countries where the projects are located. We measure creditor and shareholder (anti-director) rights using LLSV's (1998, 1999) indices. Unfortunately, the indices are based on legal rules in existence at a single point in time and they yield some counter-intuitive results. For example, the US, Canada, and Australia are classified as having weak creditor rights while South Korea, Indonesia, and Egypt are classified as having the strongest creditor rights. A more general classification scheme based on legal origin—common vs. civil law—yields more intuitive results and is more consistent with legal research on creditor rights: the US, Canada, and Australia are all common law countries while South Korea, Indonesia and Egypt are civil law countries. Moreover, legal origin is less time dependent than the existence or lack of particular creditor rights. We measure the strength of a country's legal system using BPR's (2001) legality index, which is a summary statistic from a principal components analysis on five measures of legal enforcement: effectiveness of the judiciary, rule of law, risk of contract repudiation, absence of corruption, and risk of expropriation. The index runs from 8.51 for the Philippines to 21.91 for Switzerland, and covers the same 49 countries in the LLSV (1998) analysis.

Having described the data and defined the key variables, we now present summary

statistics. Table 2 presents four panels describing project characteristics, legal environment, syndicate structure, and loan pricing variables. To illustrate the importance of size, we report results for all 495 loan tranches greater than \$75 million and for the 74 loan tranches greater than \$500 million.

****** Insert Table 2 about here ******

A. Project and Tranche Variables

Panel A of Table 2 provides general information about the projects and loan tranches in our sample. Because project data are available for only a limited number of observations, the sample sizes drop from 495 to as low as 45 observations for some variables. For the full sample, the average (median) tranche size is \$304 (\$180) million and is part of a project costing \$820 (\$586) million. Panel A also confirms our earlier assertion that projects are highly leveraged transactions. Projects have an average (median) debt-to-total capitalization ratio of 69.4% (70.7%), and the tranches provide 47.8% (43.8%) of total capital. The average tranche matures in just over nine years and is in a country with an II Rating of 68.5. For purposes of comparison, New Zealand, Iceland, and the United Arab Emirates had 1999 II Ratings of 74.0, 67.8, and 63.2, respectively. More than 10% of our tranches are in countries with risk ratings below 44.0; Egypt (45.4), India (44.3) and Argentina (42.4) had 1999 II Ratings at this level. In terms of size effects, the tranches over \$500 million are from projects with slightly lower average leverage, but longer maturities.

B. Legal Risk Variables

Panel B of Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for our creditor rights and enforcement indices. The LLSV (1998) creditor rights index shows that the average score is 2.4 on a scale from 0 to 4. Larger tranches tend to be in countries with stronger creditor rights: the median index is 3.0 compared to 2.0 for the full sample. When it comes to the shareholder rights index, both the means (3.8 for the full sample, 4.1 for the larger loans) and medians (4.0 and 4.1) are approximately equal. Finally, the BPR legality index has an average score of 17.6 and a standard deviation of 4.0, which indicates there is significant heterogeneity across our sample in terms of enforcement. Larger projects tend to be located in countries with stronger legal

enforcement.

C. Syndicate Structure Variables

Panel C of Table 2 presents a description of syndicate structure. We find that debt ownership is highly concentrated. The single largest bank holds 20.3% of the tranche on average (the median holding is 14.8%), the five largest banks hold 61.2% (57.3 %), and the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index is 14.9% (10.25%). It is not necessarily surprising that the top 5 banks cluster near 60% because waivers of loan terms typically requires approval from banks controlling at least 60% of the outstanding principal. Because loan tranches represent on average 47.8% of total project capital, the largest single lender is providing almost 10% of the total capital provided by all banks. In dollar terms, the largest single bank holds an average of \$61.7 million while the top five banks hold a total of \$186.0 million.

There are noticeable size effects across the two samples: the single largest (top five) bank share declines from 20.3% (61.2%) for all tranches greater than \$75 million to 9.6% (36.7%) for the tranches greater than \$500 million. With regard to the average arranger share, it falls from 16.7% to 7.0% as one moves from the full sample to the largest tranches. Interestingly, however, total arranger share does not decline much as tranche size increases: the average total arranger share falls from 39.2% to 34.2%. The reason total arranger share is relatively invariant to tranche size is that the number of arrangers increases from 3.6 banks in the average tranche to 5.8 banks in the largest tranches.

D. Loan Pricing Variables

Panel D of Table 2 describes loan spreads and fees for the loans used in this study. In terms of loan fees, the median commitment fee (the fee charged for making funds available) and the median Undrawn Return (the sum of all fees paid assuming the borrower does not draw down any of the loan proceeds) are both approximately 30 basis points. In terms of loan spreads, we collect the spreads over various base lending rates such as LIBOR, HIBOR (Honk Kong) and SIBOR (Singapore). The median loan spread is 102.5 basis points. Finally, we collect the Drawn Return (the sum of fees and spreads assuming the loan is fully drawn). The mean and median drawn returns are 132.2 and 122.2 basis points, respectively. The fees and spreads are slightly smaller for the larger tranches. As a caveat, note that loan pricing data are reported far

less frequently than other data items, which limits our sample size in later analysis.

In summary, projects are highly leveraged transactions, project debt is highly concentrated, and tranche size has a major effect on debt ownership concentration. The analysis also shows there is significant heterogeneity in legal and sovereign risk and in syndicate structures.

IV. The Determinants of Syndicate Structure

We now attempt to explain the determinants of syndicate structure using regression analysis. We examine the relation between syndicate structure, creditor rights, and legal enforcement using two sets of Tobit regressions. In the first set of regressions, we use syndicate concentration as the dependent variable. We measure concentration in six ways: Herfindahl Index, largest single bank share, combined share of the top five banks, total arranging bank share, average arranging bank share, and average providing bank share (we do not include total providing bank share because it is the complement of total arranging bank share). In the second set of regressions, we use syndicate size (measured as the number of total banks, number of arrangers, and number of providers) as the dependent variable. While syndicate concentration and size are clearly related, they differ in important ways. The concentration variables incorporate bank-specific shares in a measure of combined ownership. In contrast, the size variables do not distinguish between banks other than by type (arranger vs. provider)—all banks count as a single observation. Moreover, the concentration measure allows us to analyze monitoring intensity as a motivation for syndicate structure under the assumption that incentives are correlated with fractional holdings while the size measure allows us to analyze the re-contracting and deterrence functions under the assumption that restructuring costs increase with syndicate size. We use a Tobit specification because the data are censored: loan shares run between 0% and 100% while the number of banks is limited below.

The key independent variables are our measures of legal risk. We use a CIVIL LAW dummy variable to measure creditor rights—it equals one for civil law countries, indicating weaker creditor rights, and zero for common law countries. The BPR LEGALITY INDEX measures legal enforcement. We also include LLSV's SHAREHOLDER (anti-director) RIGHTS as an independent variable for two reasons. On the one hand, stronger shareholder

rights could be a measure of shareholder monitoring, which, in turn, could be a substitute for creditor monitoring. On the other hand, stronger shareholder rights could be used against creditors. With limited power against shareholders, creditors might resort to high-cost re-contracting (diffuse ownership) as the only way to curb abusive use of powers. Both explanations predict a negative relation between debt concentration and shareholder rights. In any case, we include both because the correlation between shareholder and creditor rights in the 49 countries in the LLSV (1998) sample is only 11%.

The independent variables control for tranche characteristics, project characteristics, and sovereign risk. In particular, the tranche variables are: SIZE (the *inverse* of tranche size, in millions of US dollars); MATURITY (tranche maturity, in years); and dummy variables equal to one for REFINANCED, GUARANTEED, and SECURED loans. We also include an AGENCY PARTICIPATION dummy variable equal to one when a multi- or bi-lateral agency such as the International Finance Corporation (IFC) or the U.S. Export-Import Bank (US Exim—an export credit agency) is involved in the deal. These agencies help facilitate lending in high-risk settings and help deter sovereign interference. Their involvement not only suggests a higher level of ex ante sovereign risk, it also indicates a lower level of ex post project risk. Because they participate as equity investors, lenders, and guarantors, we measure their participation in a binary fashion (present/not present) rather than in degree (e.g. fraction of total capital).

The project variables include J.P. Morgan's Emerging Markets Bond Spread (a weighted index of spreads used to measure lending conditions in emerging markets) and industry sector dummy variables. We do not include other information on the sponsors due to the non-recourse nature of the loan. Without doubt, other project characteristics are important. For example, whether a project contains a long-term purchase contract or a fixed-price construction contract (or both) has a major effect on the overall level of risk, assuming creditworthy counterparties. The Loanware database does not include this information nor can we obtain it from the proprietary loan documents supporting each deal. The fact that most project companies are private (not listed) firms severely hinders data collection. To address this problem, we create a new variable using the loan spread to measure residual project risk. We first regress the loan spread on all of the independent variables using an OLS specification (results not shown), and then calculate a LOAN PRICING RESIDUAL for use in the Tobit regressions on syndicate

structure.⁶ The idea is that the regression residual will be a proxy for unobserved project risk: high positive residuals indicate high project risk. In an attempt to distinguish between sovereign and project risk, we include the II RATING as a measure of sovereign risk in both the loan pricing and syndicate structure regressions. We also include a dummy variable for tranches in the US because they account for 15.2% of our sample, and because the US has a large bond market available for borrowers. Similar dummy variables for tranches in other countries are not significant.

Although we estimate Tobit regressions that treat the independent variables as exogenous, several of them, particularly the tranche variables, are likely to be endogenous. As robustness checks, we also estimate a series of simultaneous equation regressions with up to three dependent variables (maturity, loan pricing, and syndicate structure). Despite lacking truly exogenous variables, which are required to identify the equations, the regressions (not shown) produce coefficients that are similar in sign, magnitude, and significance to the results in our Tobit regressions presented below. We also estimate the Tobit regressions with just the country and legal risk variables, the ones most likely to be exogenous. Again the results are similar, but are not shown in this paper.

A. Syndicate Concentration and Legal Risk

Table 3 presents the results on the relation between loan concentration, creditor rights, and enforcement. Unfortunately, data restrictions reduce the sample from 495 tranches to approximately 300 tranches. We are unable to detect statistical differences for any of the key variables when we compare the tranches included in the regression analysis against those that are excluded from it. Despite the decline in sample, the regressions explain a significant amount of variation in syndicate structure based on the fact that all of the Chi-square statistics are significant at the 1% level.

****** Insert Table 3 about here ******

In almost all of the regressions, the creditor rights and legal enforcement variables are

⁶ In the interest of space, we only briefly discuss, but do not show the results of these regressions and those described in the next paragraph. The results are available from the authors upon request.

significant. The CIVIL LAW dummy variable is negative and significant, which implies that tranches in civil law countries (weaker creditor rights) are less concentrated. Importantly, the coefficients are economically meaningful, as well. For example, the coefficient is - 0.037 for the largest single bank share. Considering that the largest single bank share holds on average 20.3% of the total tranche (see Table 2), the 3.7 percentage point decline for tranches in countries with weak creditor rights equals a 18.2% reduction. Judged against the median value for the largest single bank share of 14.8%, the decline is 25.0%. Similar calculations for the average Herfindahl Index and total arranger share show declines of 29% and 45%, respectively, in civil law countries. The existence of a *positive* relation between creditor rights and debt ownership concentration stands in contrast to the *negative* relation between shareholder rights and equity ownership concentration found by LLSV (1998).⁷ The BPR Legality Index is positive and significant in five out of six regressions, which indicates that debt becomes more concentrated and individual banks are willing to hold larger shares as legal enforcement improves. Moving from a country like Turkey with an index rating of 11.84 to a country like Australia with a rating of 20.44 (the inter-quartile range), increases the largest single bank share by 9.5 percentage points. This change represents a 42% increase over the average share held by the largest single bank. These findings are consistent with the idea that banks structure syndicates to facilitate monitoring or low-cost re-contracting in countries where they have stronger rights and more reliable enforcement mechanisms. However, it is also consistent with the hypothesis that banks decrease syndicate concentration to deter strategic defaults when they have fewer rights or face less certain local enforcement.⁸ An alternative interpretation, discussed below, is that banks choose to hold smaller portions of “riskier” loans because of portfolio diversification demands.

Of the other variables, shareholder rights, agency participation, size, and sovereign risk are all significant in at least three regressions. The SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS variable is negative and significant, which is consistent with either of two propositions: first, that shareholder and creditor monitoring are substitutes or, second, that creditors protect themselves from stronger shareholders by making strategic default more costly. We cannot econometrically

⁷ Consistent with our results, Ongena and Smith (2000) find that firms maintain more and, presumably, smaller banking relationships in countries with weak creditor rights and ineffective legal systems.

⁸ We are unable to determine whether the deterrence comes from credible threats to withhold future lending [Chowdry’s (1991) explanation] or from increased restructuring complexity [Bolton and Scharfstein’s (1996) explanation]. Given the number of banks that participate in the project loan market—see footnote 18—we suspect the deterrence comes through increased complexity.

distinguish between these two propositions. The positive coefficient on the AGENCY PARTICIPATION dummy variable indicates that banks hold larger shares and that syndicates are more concentrated when a multi- or bilateral agency participates in the deal. The positive coefficient on the SIZE variable (inverse of size) implies that larger tranches are less concentrated (consistent with Table 2). The II RATING variable is negative and highly significant in all but one regression. Given this variable's scale (high ratings imply low sovereign risk), a negative coefficient means that ownership concentration *increases* in countries with high sovereign risk, and that the arranging banks hold larger shares of riskier loans. Perhaps more interestingly, even the providing banks hold larger shares of loans in riskier countries. While limited lending capacity in high-risk markets could explain this finding, it is consistent with other research on syndicated lending. Simons (1993), Dennis and Mullineaux (2000), and Jones, Lang, and Nigro (2000) find that arranging banks retain larger shares of riskier syndicated loans, and attribute this finding to concerns about adverse selection. Similarly, Gorton and Pennachi (1995) find larger ownership positions offset concerns about adverse selection when banks sell loans while Leland and Pyle (1977), Admati and Pfleiderer (1994), and Lerner (1994) show increasing ownership positions help resolve adverse selection problems in equity transactions. Apparently, reputation alone is not sufficient to mitigate concerns about adverse selection.⁹ Our finding of greater concentration and larger individual loan shares in high-risk countries is not consistent with a diversification motive.

B. Syndicate Size and Legal Risk

Table 4 presents the results on the relation between syndicate size and creditor rights, and largely mirrors the results in Table 3. Using a similar Tobit specification, we find that the regressions have a high degree of explanatory power: the chi-square statistics are all significant at the 1% level. The CIVIL LAW (weak creditor rights) dummy variable is positively related to the number of total banks and providing banks, but negatively related to the number of arranging banks. In other words, an increase in the number of providing banks more than offsets a decrease in the number of arranging banks causing a net increase in the number of banks. On

⁹ While the evidence is consistent with agency explanations, we cannot distinguish between adverse selection or moral hazard as a motivating force. If we had post-closing ownership data, e.g. after any sell-down had occurred, then we might be able to distinguish between the two explanations. Adverse selection would predict high original ownership while moral hazard would predict high on-going ownership.

average, tranches in civil law countries contain 3.2 more total banks (4.8 more providing banks) than an equivalent tranche in a common law country. Considering the average tranche has 14.4 banks (see Table 2), this represents a 22% increase in the total number of banks. Similarly, weak enforcement results in larger syndicates. Moving from Australia with a rating of 20.44 to Turkey with an index rating of 11.84 increases the total number of banks by 8.4 banks. This represents a 58% increase in syndicate size.

****** Insert Table 4 about here ******

This positive relationship between syndicate size and legal risk is again consistent with only the deterrence function. Clearly this direct relationship indicates that syndicate sizes are not made larger in order to facilitate low-cost re-contracting, but rather to deter strategic default. The results also appear to refute the monitoring hypothesis. At first, the finding that there are fewer arranging banks in situations with weak creditor rights appears to be consistent with an objective of enhancing monitoring incentives—having fewer lead banks (arrangers) would reduce free-riding. The arrangers, however, hold smaller shares in these settings (Table 3 shows the average arranger share falls by 5.7% off an average holding of 16.7%, see Table 2), which reduces monitoring incentives. Once again, this evidence seems most consistent with the idea that banks monitor when monitoring can be effective (i.e. in low legal risk settings), and resort to deterrence in situations where legal recourse is in doubt.

An alternative interpretation of the negative (positive) relation between legal risk and syndicate size (concentration) is that lenders structure syndicates to diversify their exposure to legal risk rather than to deter strategic defaults. Because the results reflect a net, not a gross, benefit of a given syndicate structure, both factors are certainly relevant, and we cannot definitively distinguish between them. We first address this issue indirectly by examining sovereign risk and then directly by examining legal risk. To begin with, the results are not consistent with banks attempting to diversify away sovereign risk. In fact, both arranger loan shares and overall concentration increase as sovereign risk increases (II rating falls). Interestingly, even providing banks, the ones presumably most interested in diversification because they hold fewer total assets, hold larger shares of riskier loans (see Table 3)—we discuss the possibility of capacity constraints in the next section.

Additional evidence against a pure diversification explanation for the observed positive

relation between legal risk and syndicate size comes from the impact of multi-lateral agency participation in a loan. Given the positive relation between sovereign risk and syndicate concentration documented above, we would expect the presence of a multi-lateral agency (AGENCY PARTICIPATION dummy variable) to reduce sovereign risk and, therefore, reduce concentration, at least compared to comparable deals without agency participation. Yet the opposite happens: there are fewer banks and they hold larger positions when a multi- or bilateral agency participates in a transaction. Such a finding is consistent with deterrence motives. Multi-lateral agencies such as the IFC and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), as lenders of last resort, deter strategic defaults and help resolve complicated legal issues. In other words, agency participation lowers legal risk and reduces the demand for syndicate-based deterrence.

To verify the positive relation between syndicate size and legal risk, we re-estimate the regressions in Tables 3 and 4 after eliminating the tranches in high-risk countries (the bottom quartile based on the BPR index). The negative relation between legal risk and syndicate concentration is significant for the low- and moderate-risk countries, but insignificant for the high-risk countries. Finally, we examine the magnitude of the changes to shed light on the diversification vs. deterrence question. In civil law countries, syndicates contain up to 50% more providing banks. This dramatic increase in size complicates restructuring efforts. In contrast, the average providing bank cuts its holdings by \$5.5 million compared to an average holding of \$28.3 million—a 19% decline. For the large banks that participate in the syndicated loan market, the diversification benefits resulting from a relatively small reduction in loan amounts, especially compared to a multi-billion dollar loan portfolio, seem small compared to the deterrence benefits created by increasing the syndicate size by 20-50%. Nevertheless, we believe the net change incorporates both deterrence and diversification effects.

Of the remaining variables, the coefficients on SIZE are negative and significant (larger tranches include more banks), on MATURITY are negative and significant (longer maturity tranches have more banks), and on the US dummy variable are negative and significant (US tranches are smaller). Consistent with earlier results, we observe a positive coefficient on II RATING at least in Regressions #1 and #3. Holding creditor rights and enforcement constant, this finding implies smaller syndicates in countries with higher levels of sovereign risk. One interpretation of this finding is that projects exposed to higher levels of sovereign risk may be

more subject to *liquidity* defaults, caused by temporary imbalances between cash inflows and outflows. As a result, bankers want to ensure rapid approval of covenant waivers in the event of minor problems or low-cost restructuring in the event of more serious problems.

C. *Sensitivity Analysis*

We conduct sensitivity analyses to ensure the results in Tables 3 and 4 are robust to alternative independent variables and regression specifications. With regard to the independent variables, we replace the II RATING with International Country Risk Guide's (ICRG) composite rating (available from the PRS Group, Inc.), the inverse of tranche size with the natural logarithm of size in millions, and year dummy variables with the JP Morgan Emerging Markets Bond Index, all without changing the basic results. Instead of the BPR legality index, we try the various components (legality, enforcement, and corruption variables) from LLSV (1998), both individually and in combination. The problem with this approach is that the variables are highly correlated, which is why BPR did the principal components analysis. For this reason, the composite legality index provides more meaningful results. We also change the sample period by including only tranches from 1990 to 2000, and the regressions' specifications by estimating a fixed effects specification to control for inclusion of loans with multiple tranches. Again, the key results remain intact. Based on this analysis, we conclude that our primary finding, that syndicates are larger (more banks participating) and less concentrated in countries characterized by weak creditor rights or weak enforcement, is robust.

Although we believe our secondary finding—that syndicates are smaller and more concentrated in countries with greater sovereign risk—is largely due to agency and re-contracting concerns, an alternative explanation based on restricted lending capacity in high-risk countries is plausible. Because lending to projects in high-risk countries is a complex activity requiring specialized underwriting skills, only a limited number of banks participate in this market. By necessity, syndicates are smaller and more concentrated in these markets.

We test the capacity hypothesis in several ways. First, we spoke with project finance bankers and loan arrangers who told us that limited lending capacity is, indeed, an issue in high-risk countries. To test this assertion, we analyze the number of banks involved in a typical syndicate and compare that number against the total number of participating banks for each II Rating decile. In all but the most risky deciles of the II Rating spectrum (the two lowest deciles

with ratings from 0 to 10 and from 11 to 20), fewer than 10% of the available banks participate in any given tranche. For example, 211 different banks participate in syndicates for loans made in countries with an II Rating between 20 and 30.¹⁰ Yet according to Table 2, the average syndicate has only 11 providing banks, which means that almost 95% of the available banks do not participate. Based on this and other analysis (not shown), we conclude that capacity constraints bind only in the most risky countries (II ratings of 20 or less) though they probably have some impact in countries with moderate sovereign risk. Even if we remove all the observations from riskiest quintile of our dataset, the basic result holds: both arranging banks and providing banks hold larger shares in riskier countries.

The apparent robustness of the positive relation between sovereign risk and syndicate concentration raises an interesting question. Why would banks respond to greater *legal* risk with larger, less concentrated syndicates, but respond to greater *sovereign* risk with smaller, more concentrated syndicates. One explanation may be that the banks are addressing different kinds of problems. Legal risk exposes banks to strategic defaults, which they try to deter by increasing syndicate size. The presence of sovereign risk, on the other hand, creates two different kinds of problems. First, participating banks may have greater concerns about adverse selection in the syndication process because it is more difficult to assess sovereign risk *ex ante* than it is to assess legal risk. Compare the following two questions: is Peru likely to expropriate project cash flows (sovereign risk) vs. is Peru a civil law country (legal risk). Second, sovereign risk may be a proxy for the probability of economic or liquidity defaults. For example, a project may default for sovereign reasons (e.g. currency inconvertibility) rather than strategic reasons (e.g. managerial theft). When facing an economic default, lenders want smaller syndicates to ensure low-cost re-contracting because they bear the economic consequences. In summary, we believe that syndicate structure reflects a complex interaction of capacity considerations, reputation effects, portfolio concerns, agency conflicts, and optimal contracting. Yet we maintain that the net positive relation between syndicate concentration and sovereign risk is the result of concerns about adverse selection and low-cost re-contracting. This assertion is consistent with our findings and the findings in related work on syndication in other settings [see Lerner (1994) on

¹⁰ The number 211 is an understatement of the actual number of arrangers because the Loanware database treats merged banks as a single bank rather than two banks, and there have been numerous bank mergers during the 1990s. Unfortunately, if you fail to correct for mergers, the database does not consolidate subsidiaries into bank holding

venture capital; Jones, Lang, and Nigro (2000) on bank loans; and Gorton and Pennachi (1995) on loan sales].

V. Summary and Conclusions

This paper examines the relationship between creditor rights, legal enforcement, and syndicate structure in the global market for syndicated project finance loans as a way to improve our understanding of the governance role played by large creditors in general and banks in particular. We find that debt ownership is highly concentrated, and significantly more concentrated than equity ownership in most US industrial firms. While it is true that debt does not have the control rights associated with equity, except in default scenarios, the structure of debt ownership affects monitoring incentives, re-contracting costs, and deterrence effectiveness, three functions traditionally associated with bank debt. Second, we show that debt ownership concentration (syndicate size) is positively (negatively) related to the strength of creditor rights and the reliability of legal enforcement after controlling for loan size, sovereign risk, and project risk. These findings are consistent with the idea that banks monitor and provide low-cost re-contracting when they have strong legal rights and can rely on enforcement mechanisms, but resort to deterrence through costly re-contracting when they possess few legal rights or cannot rely on local enforcement.

We view these results as an initial foray into two, largely unexplored realms of finance—creditor governance and syndicated lending. We show that creditor rights and legal enforcement affect the structure of debt ownership, but have not shown that there is a link to either corporate financing policies more generally or to economic growth. What our results do show, however, is that syndicated loans represent an intermediate form of debt financing. Observed debt structures are far more complex than most of the simple financing models admit, and the range between single bank creditors (private debt) and atomistic public bondholders is far more continuous than binary. We hope this paper informs future models of debt choice by clarifying actual debt ownership structures and highlighting some key determinants of syndicate structure. Finally, with regard to the governance role played by banks, we have shown that bankers structure syndicates in ways that are consistent with attempts to deter strategic default. Whether less

companies either. As a result, Chase New York and Chase Hong Kong appear as separate arrangers.

concentrated syndicates do, indeed, deter strategic default is an unanswered question. Just as the research on equity ownership and governance by large shareholders has branched out over the past five years, we expect the research on debt ownership and governance by large creditors to do the same in the years ahead.

Bibliography

- Admati, A. R. and P. Pfleiderer. "Robust Financial Contracting and the Role of Venture Capitalists." *Journal of Finance*, 49 (1994), 371-402.
- Asquith, P., R. Gertner, and D. Scharfstein, "Anatomy of Financial Distress: An Examination of Junk-Bond Issuers," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 109 (1994), 625-58.
- Berkowitz, D., K. Pistor, and J.F. Richard. "Economic Development, Legality, and the Transplant Effect." *European Economic Review* (2001).
- Bolton, P. and D. Scharfstein. "Optimal Debt Contracts and the Number of Creditors." *Journal of Political Economy*, 104 (1996), 1-25.
- Bris, A., and I. Welch. "The Optimal Concentration of Creditors." Working Paper, Yale School of Management, (January, 2002).
- Campbell, T. S. and W. A. Kracaw. "Information Production, Market Signaling, and the Theory of Financial Intermediation." *Journal of Finance*, 35 (1980), 863-882.
- Chowdry, B. "What is Different About International Lending?" *Review of Financial Studies*, 4 (1991), 121-148.
- Claessens, S., S. Djankov, L.H.P. Lang. "The Separation of Ownership and Control in East Asian Corporations." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 58 (2000), 81-112.
- Claessens, S., S. Djankov, J. P.H. Fan, and L.H.P. Lang. "Disentangling the Incentive and Entrenchment Effects of Large Shareholdings." *Journal of Finance*, (2002), forthcoming.
- Coffee, J. "Privatization and Corporate Governance: The Lessons From Securities Market Failure." Columbia Law School working paper no. 158 (2000), New York.
- Dahiya, S., M. Puri, and A. Saunders. "Bank Borrowers and Loan Sales: New Evidence on the Uniqueness of Bank Loans." *Journal of Business*, (2001), forthcoming.
- Dell, J.C., J.W. Kunkle, W. Streeter, D. Champeau, and R. Hunter. "Rating Approach to Project Finance." Fitch IBCA, Duff & Phelps Special Report (April 26, 2001).
- De Long, J. B., 1991, "Did Morgan's Men Add Value? An Economist's Perspective on Financial Capitalism." In P. Temin, Ed.: *Inside the Business Enterprise: Historical Perspectives on the Use of Information* (University Press, Chicago).
- Demirgüç-Kunt, A. and V. Maksimovic. "Law, Finance, and Firm Growth." *Journal of Finance*, 53 (1998), 2107-2139.

- Dennis, S.A., and D.J. Mullineaux. "Syndicated Loans." Gatton College of Business and Economics, University of Kentucky, mimeo (2000).
- Diamond, D. "Financial Intermediation and Delegated Monitoring." *Review of Economic Studies*, (1984), 393-414.
- Diamond, D. "Monitoring and Reputation: The Choice Between Bank Loans and Directly Placed Debt." *Journal of Political Economy*, 99 (1991), 689-721.
- Djankov, S., R. La Porta, F. Lopez-de-Silanes, and A. Shleifer. "Courts: the *Lex Mundi* Project." Harvard University working paper, March 2002.
- Esty, B. "An Overview of Project Finance—2001 Update." Harvard Business School case # 9-202-105 (2002a).
- Esty, B. "Poland's A2 Motorway." Harvard Business School case # 9-202-030 (2002b).
- Esty, B. "Structuring Loan Syndicates: A Case Study of the Hong Kong Disneyland Project Loan." *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 14 (2001), 80-95.
- Esty, B. "Petrolera Zuata, Petrozuata C.A." Harvard Business School case #299-012 (1998).
- Fama, E.F. "What's Different About Banks?" *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 15 (1985), 29-39.
- Gertner, R. and D. Scharfstein. "A Theory of Workouts and the Effects of Reorganization Law." *Journal of Finance*, 46 (1991), 1189-1222.
- Giannetti, M. "Do Better Institutions Mitigate Agency Problems? Evidence from Corporate Finance Choices." Stockholm School of Economics working paper, May 2002.
- Gilson, S.C., K. John, and L.H.P. Lang. "Troubled Debt Restructurings: An Empirical Study of Private Reorganization of Firms in Default." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 27 (1990), 315-353.
- Gorton, G.B. and G.G. Pennachi. "Banks and Loan Sales: Marketing Non-Marketable Assets." *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 35 (1995), 389-411.
- Hoffman, S.L. *The Law and Business of International Project Finance*. Kluwer Law International (The Hague, The Netherlands, 1998).
- Hoshi, T., A. Kashyap, and D. Scharfstein. "Corporate Structure, Liquidity, and Investment: Evidence from Japanese Industrial Groups." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106 (1991), 33-50.
- James, C. "Some evidence on the uniqueness of bank loans." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 19 (1987), 217-235.

- Jappelli, T., M. Pagano, and M. Bianco. "Courts and Banks: Effects of Judicial Enforcement on Credit Markets, University of Salerno - CSEF working paper, April 2002.
- Jensen, M.C., and W.H. Meckling. "Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs, and Ownership Structure." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3 (1976), 305-360.
- Johnson, S., R. LaPorta, F. López-de-Silanes, and A. Shleifer. "Tunneling." *American Economic Review* (2000), 22-27.
- Johnson, S. P. Boone, A. Breach and E. Friedman. 2000. "Corporate Governance in the Asian Financial Crisis," *Journal of Financial Economics* 58, (2001), 141-186.
- Jones, J., and W.W. Lang, and P. Nigro. "Recent Trends in Bank Loan Syndications: Evidence from 1995 to 1999." Economic and Policy Analysis Working Paper #2000-10, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Washington, DC (December 2000).
- Kang, J.K. and R.M. Stulz. "Do Banking Shocks Affect Borrowing Firm Performance? An Analysis of the Japanese Experience." *Journal of Business*, 73 (2000), 1-23.
- Kleimeier, S. and W.L. Megginson. "Are Project Finance Loans Different from Other Syndicated Credits?" *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 12 (2000), 75-87.
- La Porta, R., F. López-de-Silanes, and A. Shleifer. "Corporate Ownership Around the World." *Journal of Finance* 54 (1999), pp. 471-517.
- La Porta, R., F. López-de-Silanes, A. Shleifer, and R.W. Vishny. "Legal Determinants of External Finance." *Journal of Finance* 52 (1997), pp. 1131-1150.
- La Porta, R., F. López-de-Silanes, A. Shleifer, and R.W. Vishny. "Law and Finance." *Journal of Political Economy*, 106 (1998), 1113-1150.
- La Porta, R., F. López-de-Silanes, A. Shleifer, and R. W. Vishny. "The Quality of Government." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 15 (1999), 222-279.
- La Porta, R., F. López-de-Silanes, A. Shleifer, and R. Vishny. "Investor Protection and Corporate Governance," *Journal of Financial Economics* 58 (2000), 3-27.
- La Porta, R., F. López-de-Silanes, A. Shleifer, and R. Vishny. "Investor Protection and Corporate Valuation." *Journal of Finance* 57 (2002), pp. 1147-1170.
- Lee, S.W., and D.J. Mullineaux, 2001, The size and composition of commercial lending syndicates, University of Kentucky, mimeo, December.
- Leland, H.E. and D. H. Pyle. "Informational asymmetries, financial structure, and financial intermediation." *Journal of Finance*, 32 (1977), 371-387.

- Lerner, J. "The Syndication of Venture Capital investments, *Financial Management*, 23 (1994), 16-27.
- Levine, R. "Law, Finance, and Economic Growth, *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 8 (1999), 8-35.
- Lummer, S. L., and J.J. McConnell. "Further evidence on the bank lending process and the capital-market response to bank loan agreements." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 22 (1989), 99-122.
- Moody's Investors Service, "Debt Financing of Projects in Emerging Economies: Lessons from Asia." *Project & Infrastructure Finance Sourcebook* (December 2001), 45-49.
- Ongena, S., and D. C. Smith. "What Determines the Number of Bank Relationships? Cross-Country Evidence." *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 9 (2000), 26-56.
- Panyagometh, K., and G.S. Roberts. "Private Information, Agency Problems, and Determinants of Loan Syndication." York University (Canada) working paper, (August 2002).
- Pennacchi, G. "Loan Sales and the Cost of Bank Capital." *Journal of Finance*, 43 (1988), 375-396.
- Penrose, J. and P. Rigby. "Debt Rating Criteria for Energy, Industrial, and Infrastructure Project Finance." *Infrastructure Finance: Criteria and Commentary* (October 2000). 15-65.
- Preece, D., and D. Mullineaux. "Monitoring, Loan Renegotiability, and Firm Value: The Role Lending Syndicates." *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 20 (1996), 577-593.
- Rajan, R.G. "Insiders and Outsiders: The Choice Between Informed and Arm's-Length Debt." *Journal of Finance*, 47 (1992), 1367-1400.
- Shleifer, A. and R. Vishny. "A Survey of Corporate Governance." *Journal of Finance*, 52 (1997), 737-783.
- Simons, K. "Why Do Banks Syndicate Loans?" *New England Economic Review* (Jan./Feb., 1993), 45-52.
- Walsh, R. "Pacific Rim Collateral Security Laws: What Happens When the Project Goes Wrong?" *Stanford Journal of Law, Business, and Finance*, 115 (1999), 115-147.
- Weinstein, D.E., and Y. Yafeh. "On the Costs of a Bank-Centered Financial System: Evidence from the Changing Main Bank Relations in Japan." *Journal of Finance*, 43 (1998), 635-672.

White, H. "A Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator and a Direct Test for Heteroskedasticity." *Econometrica*, 48 (1980), 817-838.

Wurgler, J. "Financial Markets and the Allocation of Capital." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 58 (2000), 187-214.

Table 1
Distribution of Syndicated Loans by Country
(Sorted by the dollar value of all Project Finance Loans)

This table shows the geographic distribution of syndicated loans from the Loanware database for the 15 countries with the largest dollar value of project finance loans (it excludes bilateral loans with only one lender). The table includes all project finance tranches and project finance tranches greater than \$75 million with syndicate data (our sample).

No.	Country	Project Finance Loans All Tranches				Project Finance Loans Tranches >\$75 Million with Syndicate Data			
		Value (\$B)	Percent	Number	Percent	Value (\$B)	Percent	Number	Percent
1	United States	\$141.2	16.3%	964	14.8%	\$20.2	13.4%	75	15.2%
2	United Kingdom	110.4	12.8	405	6.2	17.1	11.4	47	9.5
3	Australia	46.1	5.3	268	4.1	10.9	7.2	33	6.7
4	Indonesia	47.6	5.5	330	5.1	8.9	5.9	30	6.1
5	China	37.1	4.3	558	8.6	7.3	4.9	38	5.7
6	Taiwan	24.7	2.9	83	1.3	17.5	11.6	25	5.1
7	Malaysia	26.0	3.0	195	3.0	5.6	3.7	24	4.9
8	Canada	24.5	2.8	148	2.3	2.3	1.5	7	1.4
9	Hong Kong	24.9	2.9	159	2.4	13.9	9.2	38	7.7
10	Thailand	24.9	2.9	204	3.1	5.1	3.4	18	3.6
11	Italy	15.3	1.8	81	1.3	0.8	0.5	5	1.0
12	Saudi Arabia	16.0	1.9	99	1.5	3.6	2.4	8	1.6
13	Turkey	17.9	2.1	240	3.7	1.6	1.1	7	1.4
14	Mexico	15.8	1.8	130	2.0	0.5	0.3	4	0.8
15	Qatar	15.2	1.0	34	0.5	0.6	0.4	2	0.4
Totals:									
Top 15 Countries		\$587.6	68.0%	3,898	59.9%	\$115.9	77.0%	361	72.9%
Full Database		\$864.3		6,505		\$150.5		495	

Source: Capital DATA Loanware

Table 2
Univariate Analysis of Syndicate Structure

This table provides a univariate description of the main variables used in the study. The variables are broken into four groups: project variables (Panel A), legal variables (Panel B), syndicate structure variables (Panel C), and loan pricing variables (Panel D). The table shows the number of loan tranches with data available, and the mean, median, and standard deviation for each variable.

Variable	Project Finance Loan Tranches >\$75m				Project Finance Loan Tranches >\$500m			
	Number	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Number	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
Panel A: Project and Loan Variables								
Project Size (\$ millions)	113	820.0	586.0	1302.1	20	1927.9	1304.7	2683.8
Tranche Size (\$ millions)	495	304.0	180.0	540.9	74	948.2	702.3	1194.3
Leverage: Debt/Total Project Size (%)	45	69.4%	70.7%	13.7%	9	65.6%	68.0%	13.4%
Tranche/Total Debt (%)	45	66.3%	67.6%	28.2%	9	60.5%	59.5%	34.9%
Tranche/Total Project Size (%)	113	47.8%	43.8%	26.2%	20	42.5%	43.6%	23.2%
Maturity (Years)	474	9.4	9.0	4.8	74	10.2	10.0	5.6
Instit. Investor Rating [0-100 low risk]	493	68.5	68.5	18.2	74	70.4	72.5	16.7
Panel B: Legal Risk Variables								
LLSV (1998) Creditor Rights [0-4 strong]	406	2.4	2.0	1.4	57	2.5	3.0	1.5
LLSV (1998) Shareholder Rights [0-6 strong]	408	3.8	4.0	1.3	57	4.1	4.1	1.2
BPR (1999) Legality Index	408	17.5	19.1	4.0	57	18.5	20.4	3.6
Panel C: Syndicate Structure Variables								
Concentration Ratios								
Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI)	495	14.9%	10.25%	13.5%	74	5.7%	4.9%	3.4%
Largest Single Share (CR1)	495	20.3%	14.8%	16.2%	74	9.6%	8.0%	5.3%
Top Five Shares (CR5)	495	61.2%	57.3%	25.6%	74	36.7%	33.4%	15.6%
Arranging Banks								
Total Arranger Share (%)	495	39.2%	33.0%	28.5%	74	34.2%	30.2%	25.9%
Number of Arrangers	495	3.6	2.0	3.9	74	5.8	4.0	5.8
Average Arranger Share (%)	490	16.7%	11.4%	16.1%	73	7.0%	5.9%	5.0%
Providing Banks								
Total Non-Arranger Provider Share	495	60.8%	67.0%	28.5%	74	65.8%	69.8%	11.6%
Number of Non-Arranger Providers	495	11.0	9.0	9.3	74	22.2	21.0	11.6
Average Non-Arranger Provider	457	9.3%	6.5%	9.9%	73	3.6%	3.1%	2.5%
Total Number of Banks	495	14.4	12.0	10.3	74	28.0	25.5	11.7
Providers/Arrangers	490	5.7	3.5	6.5	73	8.4	5.2	9.4
Panel D: Loan Pricing Variables								
Fees (bp)								
Commitment	262	31.9	30.0	20.3	47	29.1	25.0	15.1
Undrawn Return	349	30.4	28.4	23.5	65	28.5	28.6	19.8
Spreads (bp)								
Loan Spread	404	122.8	102.5	79.1	68	105.0	95.0	53.1
Drawn Return	287	132.2	122.2	77.9	46	112.3	100.8	60.3

Source: Capital DATA Loanware.

Table 3
Determinants of Syndicate Structure—Concentration and Share Measures

This table shows the results of Tobit regressions on syndicate structure variables. The dependent variables are various debt ownership concentration measures: Herfindahl Index, largest single bank share, share of the five largest banks, arranging banks, total and average share for arranging banks, and average share for providing banks.

	Concentration and Share Measures					
	Herfindahl Index	Largest Single Share	Top 5 Banks Share	Total Arranger Share	Average Arranger Share	Average Provider Share
	Reg. #1	Reg. #2	Reg. #3	Reg. #4	Reg. #5	Reg. #6
Constant	0.100 * (2.04)	0.143* (2.33)	0.495 ** (4.28)	0.783 ** (5.18)	0.108 (1.59)	0.038 (1.20)
Weak Creditor Rights (Civil Law) Dummy Variable	-0.043 ** (-2.63)	-0.037 * (-1.79)	-0.113 ** (-2.90)	-0.175 ** (-3.43)	-0.057 * (-2.49)	-0.017 (-1.63)
LLSV Shareholder Rights	-0.012 * (-1.70)	-0.016 * (-1.86)	-0.038 * (-2.33)	-0.017 (-0.83)	-0.025 ** (-2.70)	-0.009 * (-2.13)
BPR Legality Index	0.008 ** (2.70)	0.011 ** (2.75)	0.032 ** (4.27)	0.008 (-0.88)	0.013 ** (2.93)	0.009 ** (4.67)
Loan Pricing Residual	0.0001 (1.12)	0.0001 (0.90)	0.0003 (1.55)	0.0002 (0.83)	0.0001 (1.08)	9.9e-06 (0.22)
Multi-/Bi-lateral Agency Dummy Variable	0.054 * (1.86)	0.063 * (1.74)	0.072 (1.05)	0.079 (0.89)	0.106 ** (2.65)	-0.006 (-0.34)
Inverse of Tranche Size (\$m)	13.404 ** (8.42)	15.898 ** (7.96)	39.654 ** (10.41)	6.783 (1.39)	14.597 ** (6.65)	8.847 (8.08)
Institutional Investor Rating	-0.002 ** (-2.80)	-0.003 ** (-2.77)	-0.008 ** (-4.32)	-0.002 (-0.97)	-0.002 * (-2.10)	-0.002 ** (-4.91)
Maturity (Years)	0.002 (1.40)	0.002 (1.01)	0.008 ** (2.62)	0.002 (-0.49)	0.002 (1.16)	0.003 (3.18)
Refinanced Loan Dummy Variable	-0.013 (-0.70)	-0.018 (-0.82)	-0.014 (-0.33)	-0.007 (-0.14)	-0.001 (-0.06)	0.005 (0.45)
Guaranteed Loan Dummy Variable	0.003 (0.19)	0.001 (0.06)	0.013 (0.41)	-0.012 (-0.29)	-0.015 (-0.83)	0.004 (0.53)
Secured Loan Dummy Variable	0.005 (0.50)	0.014 (0.99)	-0.005 (-0.21)	0.047 (1.41)	0.016 (1.09)	-0.003 (-0.39)
JP Morgan Emerging Market Bond Spread (bps)	6.0e-06 (0.34)	22.0e-06 (0.98)	12.7e-06 (0.30)	84.6e-06 (1.53)	16.9e-06 (0.68)	-5.9e-06 (-0.50)
US Dummy Variable	0.038 * (2.17)	0.059 ** (2.69)	0.154 ** (3.74)	-0.032 (-0.59)	0.032 (1.35)	0.049 ** (4.27)
Sector Dummy Variables	Included *	Included *	Included *	Included *	Included *	Included *
Number of Observations	304	304	304	304	303	290
Likelihood Ratio	101.85	99.53	152.27	43.61	77.39	114.36
Prob. > Chi-Square	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000

Note: * and ** denote significance at the 10% and 1% level in a one-tailed test, respectively. NM denotes not meaningful.

Table 4
Determinants of Syndicate Structure—Syndicate Size

This table shows the results of Tobit regressions on the number of banks included in the syndicate. The dependent variables are the number of total banks, arranging banks, and providing banks.

	Syndicate Size (Number of Banks)		
	Total Banks	Arranging Banks	Providing Banks
	Reg. #1	Reg. #2	Reg. #3
Constant	29.911 ** (6.71)	19.182 ** (4.89)	14.883 ** (3.50)
Weak Creditor Rights (Civil Law) Dummy Variable	3.215 * (2.15)	-2.510 * (-1.90)	4.805 ** (3.36)
LLSV Shareholder Rights	0.907 (1.46)	0.710 (1.18)	1.016 * (1.72)
BPR Legality Index	-0.984 ** (-3.47)	-0.760 ** (-3.01)	-0.709 ** (-2.66)
Loan Pricing Residual	-0.013 * (-2.09)	-0.004 (-0.63)	-0.010 * (-1.67)
Multi-/Bi-lateral Agency Dummy Variable	-5.777 * (-2.19)	-10.481 ** (-3.48)	-1.875 (-0.74)
Inverse of Tranche Size (\$m)	-1715.943 ** (-11.84)	-686.028 ** (-4.98)	-1394.872 * (-10.09)
Institutional Investor Rating	0.169 * (2.51)	-0.033 (-0.57)	0.200 ** (3.11)
Maturity (Years)	-0.306 ** (-2.77)	-0.135 (-1.35)	-0.234 * (-2.23)
Refinanced Loan Dummy Variable	1.444 (0.90)	-0.468 (-0.31)	1.492 (0.98)
Guaranteed Loan Dummy Variable	0.609 (0.51)	-0.332 (-0.31)	0.905 (0.79)
Secured Loan Dummy Variable	0.101 (0.10)	0.647 (0.73)	0.235 (0.25)
JP Morgan Emerging Market Bond Spread (bps)	-0.001 (-0.86)	0.002 (1.32)	-0.001 (-0.93)
US Dummy Variable	-2.797 * (-1.77)	-0.658 (-0.45)	-2.708 * (-1.80)
Sector Dummy Variables	Included *	Included	Included *
Number of Observations	304	304	304
Likelihood Ratio	159.87	77.21	130.91
Prob. > Chi-Squared	0.000	0.000	0.000

Note: * and ** denote significance at the 10% and 1% level in a one-tailed test, respectively.
NM denotes not meaningful.