JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES AND INNOVATIONS

VOLUME 5, ISSUE 02
MOPNTHLY JOURNALS

ISSN NUMBER: 2751-4390
IMPACT FACTOR: 9,08

SYSTEMIC RISK AND FINANCIAL STABILITY IN SECURITIES MARKETS: STRESS TESTING, LIQUIDITY, AND CONTAGION ANALYSIS

Boysunov Jamshid Baxriddin ugli
Senior Lecturer at the Department of Corporate Finance and Securities Tashkent State University of Economics

Abstract: The architecture of the global financial system has undergone a fundamental transformation in the twenty-first century, characterized by the migration of credit intermediation from traditional banking balance sheets to complex, market-based networks comprising Non-Bank Financial Intermediaries (NBFIs), Central Counterparties (CCPs), and high-frequency trading venues. This research report provides an exhaustive analysis of systemic risk within this evolving landscape, with a specific focus on securities markets. We synthesize advanced theoretical frameworks—ranging from network topology and multiplex contagion models to the thermodynamics of liquidity spirals—with empirical evidence from recent stress episodes, including the 2020 "Dash for Cash" and the 2022 UK LDI crisis. The study critically evaluates the efficacy of modern quantitative systemic risk measures, such as CoVaR, SRISK, and Marginal Expected Shortfall (MES), demonstrating their divergent predictive capabilities regarding capital shortfalls and distress propagation. Furthermore, we dissect the mechanics of stress testing, advocating for a paradigm shift from static solvency checks to dynamic, system-wide simulations that incorporate endogenous behavioral responses, fire sale externalities, and liquidity-solvency feedback loops. By examining the regulatory frontiers established by the Financial Stability Board (FSB) and IOSCO through 2025, this report identifies persistent vulnerabilities in the NBFI sector—specifically liquidity mismatches and hidden synthetic leverage—and proposes a multi-layered macroprudential surveillance framework designed to mitigate the transmission of shocks across the global financial periphery.

Keywords: Systemic Risk, Financial Contagion, Liquidity Spirals, Stress Testing, Non-Bank Financial Intermediation (NBFI), SRISK, CoVaR, Overlapping Portfolios, Fire Sales, Macroprudential Policy, Central Counterparties (CCPs).

The concept of systemic risk has evolved from a relatively contained concern regarding bank runs and deposit insurance to a pervasive, multifaceted challenge that defines the stability of the global economic order. In the post-2008 era, regulatory reforms such as Basel III significantly fortified the capital and liquidity buffers of the global banking sector. However, this regulatory tightening catalyzed a hydraulic shift in risk-taking, pushing financial intermediation toward the "shadows"—the diverse and heterogeneous universe of Non-Bank Financial Intermediation (NBFI). Today, NBFIs manage approximately half of global financial assets, playing a critical role in funding the real economy through corporate bond markets, private credit, and securitization channels.

This structural migration has altered the genesis of financial crises. Risks are no longer incubated solely within the leveraged balance sheets of deposit-taking institutions but are increasingly generated within securities markets themselves. The interconnectedness of asset managers, pension funds, hedge funds, and insurers creates a complex web of dependencies where the failure of a single node—or, more dangerously, the synchronized behavior of many nodes—can trigger cascading failures across the system. The "market-based" nature of modern finance means that price discovery mechanisms, liquidity provision, and collateral valuation have become the primary vectors of systemic stress.

Systemic risk is formally defined by international bodies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Bank for International Settlements (BIS), and the Financial Stability Board (FSB) as the risk of disruption to financial services that is caused by an impairment of all or parts of the financial system and has the potential to have serious negative consequences for the real economy. This definition underscores two essential components: the internal impairment of the financial network and the external spillover to the real economy (GDP, employment, investment).

However, recent literature and regulatory discourse have expanded this definition to capture the *endogenous* nature of risk. Systemic risk is not merely an exogenous shock hitting a stable system; it is often a property of the system's architecture itself. It emerges from the collective interaction of individual agents acting rationally to protect their own interests—for example, by hoarding liquidity or selling assets—which, in aggregate, destabilizes the entire structure. This report adopts a comprehensive view of systemic risk that includes:

- **Solvency Contagion:** The domino effect of bankruptcies driven by interlinking credit exposures.
- **Liquidity Contagion:** The rapid evaporation of funding liquidity that forces asset fire sales.
- **Information Contagion:** The behavioral panic driven by uncertainty and information asymmetry regarding counterparty health.

The traditional "bank-centric" view of systemic risk focused on the liability side of the balance sheet—specifically, the risk of a run on uninsured deposits. The "market-centric" view, which this report emphasizes, focuses on the asset side and the market microstructure. In securities markets, the "run" occurs not when depositors withdraw cash, but when secured funders (repo lenders) increase haircuts or when investors redeem shares in open-ended funds.

The implications of this pivot are profound. In banking crises, the central bank acts as the Lender of Last Resort (LOLR) to solvent but illiquid banks. In market crises, the central bank is increasingly forced to act as the "Market Maker of Last Resort" (MMLR), intervening directly to support asset prices and restore market functioning, as seen in the Bank of England's intervention in the Gilt market in 2022. This blurring of the lines between monetary policy and financial stability policy is a defining feature of the current regime.

This report aims to provide a rigorous, expert-level analysis of systemic risk in securities markets. It will:

1. **Deconstruct the transmission channels** of contagion, with a special emphasis on indirect interconnectedness through overlapping portfolios.
2. **Analyze the physics of liquidity spirals** and fire sales, quantifying how leverage amplifies market impact.
3. **Evaluate quantitative metrics** (SRISK, CoVaR, MES), comparing their methodologies and predictive power.
4. **Critique stress testing frameworks**, identifying gaps in NBFI and CCP stress testing and proposing methodological advancements.
5. **Synthesize regulatory developments** up to 2025, offering insights into the future of macroprudential surveillance.

To effectively measure and mitigate systemic risk, one must first understand the theoretical mechanisms that drive financial instability. Contemporary economic theory frames the financial system as a Complex Adaptive System (CAS), characterized by non-linear interactions, feedback loops, and emergent properties that cannot be deduced from the behavior of individual components.

At the heart of systemic risk lies the concept of **pecuniary externalities**. When a financial institution engages in a fire sale of assets to restore its own liquidity ratios, it depresses the market price of those assets. This price drop deteriorates the balance sheets of other institutions holding the same assets, potentially forcing them to engage in their own fire sales. The original seller does not internalize the cost (the systemic damage) imposed on the rest of the system.

Jeremy Stein (2013) articulates this as a fundamental market failure. Individual risk management is rational: selling assets to raise cash is the prudent move for a single bank facing a margin call. However, collectively, this behavior is disastrous. This divergence between individual rationality and collective optimality justifies macroprudential regulation, which seeks to align private incentives with social welfare through tools like countercyclical capital buffers and liquidity coverage ratios.

Network theorists describe financial systems as "robust yet fragile." In normal times, high connectivity and diversification function as shock absorbers, distributing risks across a wide network of agents and preventing any single failure from causing systemic damage. This is the "robust" phase.

However, this same connectivity becomes a liability during extreme stress. Once a shock exceeds a certain critical threshold, the dense web of interconnections serves as a super-highway for contagion, propagating distress almost instantaneously across the entire network. The 2008 financial crisis and the 2020 pandemic shock illustrate this phase transition: the system appeared stable (low volatility, tight spreads) right up until the moment it fractured. Theoretical models suggest that financial contagion can actually worsen with *too much* diversification, as it homogenizes portfolios and ensures that all institutions are exposed to the same systemic factors.

Beyond mechanical linkages, contagion is driven by information dynamics. Financial markets are plagued by opacity. When a prominent institution fails (e.g., Lehman Brothers or Credit Suisse), market participants often cannot distinguish whether the failure was due to idiosyncratic mismanagement or a systemic shock affecting all similar institutions.

In the absence of perfect information, rational agents assume the worst. They cease lending to *any* institution that resembles the failed entity, triggering a "reassessment of risk" that can cause a liquidity freeze across the entire sector. This "information cascade" is particularly potent in securities markets, where algorithmic trading and sentiment analysis can amplify panic signals within milliseconds. Recent advancements in 2025 have integrated semantic-temporal alignment of textual signals (e.g., news, regulatory announcements) with network models to better predict these behavioral cascades, achieving significant improvements in crisis detection accuracy.

Network theory provides the analytical grammar for mapping the architecture of the financial system. By representing institutions as "nodes" and their exposures as "edges," researchers can quantify the systemic importance of specific entities and the structural vulnerability of the system.

The earliest generation of systemic risk models focused on **direct contagion**—the transmission of shock through contractual obligations such as interbank loans and derivatives. If Bank A defaults on its obligation to Bank B, Bank B suffers a credit loss. If this loss exceeds Bank B's equity capital, Bank B defaults, potentially transmitting the shock to Bank C.

While intuitive, empirical research consistently shows that direct contagion alone is rarely sufficient to cause a system-wide collapse. Interbank exposures are typically collateralized or limited by large exposure regimes. Caccioli et al. (2015) demonstrate that focusing only on direct exposures underestimates total systemic risk levels by up to 50%. The density of the interbank network often dissipates the shock before it brings down the system, unless the initial default is of a massive, central node (a Global Systemically Important Bank, or G-SIB).

The more pernicious vector of transmission is **indirect contagion**, primarily through **overlapping portfolios** (or common asset holdings). This channel does not require a direct contractual link between Bank A and Bank B. Instead, they are linked by their shared exposure to Asset X.

When Bank A is distressed and forced to sell Asset X, the price of Asset X falls. Bank B, which holds Asset X, must mark its holdings to market, recording an unrealized loss. If this loss erodes Bank B's capital buffers or triggers a margin call, Bank B may be forced to sell Asset X (or other assets), depressing prices further.

Advanced network models, such as those developed by Caccioli, Farmer, and Rockmore, utilize bipartite graphs to map the connections between financial institutions and asset classes. Their simulations reveal that when both direct (counterparty) and indirect (overlapping portfolio) channels are active, the probability of bankruptcies increases non-linearly.

The "crowding" of trades—where many institutions hold identical positions—creates a fragile topology. If the leverage in the system is below a certain threshold, the network can absorb the fire sales. However, once leverage crosses a critical point, the feedback loop between asset prices and balance sheets becomes explosive. This "tipping point" dynamic is a key finding of modern network theory applied to finance.

Real-world financial systems are not single-layer networks. They are **multiplex networks**, where nodes are connected via multiple distinct layers simultaneously:

1. **Interbank Lending Layer:** Unsecured overnight loans.
2. **Derivatives Layer:** Cross-exposures from swaps and options.
3. **Collateral Layer:** Rehypothecation chains in repo markets.
4. **Asset Holding Layer:** Common ownership of securities.

Research indicates that contagion processes on multiplex networks are more aggressive than on single-layer representations. A bank might appear resilient in the lending layer but be critically vulnerable in the collateral layer. Stress in one layer can "jump" to another; for instance, a repo market freeze (collateral layer shock) forces asset sales (asset layer shock), which impairs balance sheets (lending layer shock). Recent work in 2024-2025 has focused on "higher-order" networks and Granger causality-in-risk networks to map these complex interactions. These models identify that while banks remain the primary transmitters of stress, the interconnectedness between banks and shadow banks (NBFIs) has become the dominant structural feature of the system.

Liquidity is the oxygen of financial markets. Its abundance fosters stability and growth; its absence precipitates immediate crisis. Understanding systemic risk requires distinguishing between the two dimensions of liquidity and understanding how they interact in a crisis.

1. **Market Liquidity:** The ease with which an asset can be traded. It is measured by bid-ask spreads, market depth, and resilience (the speed at which prices recover after a trade).
2. **Funding Liquidity:** The ease with which traders and institutions can obtain funding (cash) to leverage their positions. This is measured by repo rates, margin requirements (haircuts), and the availability of unsecured credit.

Brunnermeier and Pedersen (2009) provide the canonical model for the interaction between market and funding liquidity. They demonstrate that these two forms of liquidity are mutually reinforcing.

- **Virtuous Cycle:** When funding is easy (low margins), traders can take large positions, providing depth to the market. High market liquidity reduces volatility, which justifies lower margins, further easing funding.
- **Vicious Cycle (The Spiral):** A shock to asset prices increases volatility. Risk management systems (like VaR) automatically increase margin requirements. Traders,

facing higher margins, become funding constrained. They must reduce their positions (deleverage). This selling pressure reduces market liquidity and increases volatility further. Higher volatility triggers *even higher* margins, forcing more selling.

This feedback loop—where tightening funding liquidity evaporates market liquidity—is the **Liquidity Spiral**. It explains why liquidity can vanish instantaneously during stress events, leading to "flash crashes".

A **fire sale** occurs when a financially constrained agent is forced to sell assets at a price below their fundamental value. This usually happens because the natural buyers of the asset (specialists or arbitrageurs) are also facing the same constraints and cannot step in to buy.

The macroeconomic consequences of fire sales are severe. By dislocating asset prices from fundamentals, fire sales impair the balance sheets of all holders of wealth, leading to a "wealth effect" that reduces consumption and investment. Furthermore, if the fire sale affects collateral values (e.g., housing or government bonds), it contracts the supply of credit to the real economy, deepening the recession. This mechanism was central to the 2008 crisis and the "Great Deleveraging" that followed.

Margins and haircuts are essential risk management tools for CCPs and prime brokers, but they are inherently **procyclical**. In good times, volatility is low, and margins are low, encouraging leverage. In bad times, volatility spikes, and margins increase drastically—precisely when the system can least afford it.

The 2022 UK Gilt crisis (discussed in Chapter 7) was exacerbated by this procyclicality. LDI funds faced margin calls that increased exponentially as Gilt volatility rose, forcing them to sell Gilts into a falling market to raise cash, which only increased volatility further. The "dash for cash" in March 2020 exhibited similar dynamics, where margin calls across the derivatives complex led to a massive sell-off in US Treasuries, the world's most liquid asset.

To manage systemic risk, regulators need robust metrics to quantify the systemic contribution of individual financial institutions. Since the Global Financial Crisis, several advanced econometrics measures have been developed.

Value at Risk (VaR) estimates the maximum loss a firm expects to suffer over a given horizon at a certain confidence level (e.g., 99%).

- **Limitation:** VaR is an *idiosyncratic* measure. It focuses on the risk of the firm in isolation, assuming market conditions are exogenous. It fails to capture the risk the firm *poses* to the system or the risk the firm faces *conditional* on a systemic collapse.

Proposed by Adrian and Brunnermeier, **CoVaR** addresses the shortcomings of VaR by focusing on tail dependence.

- **Definition:** $CoVaR^{system|i}$ is the VaR of the financial system *conditional* on institution *i* being in distress (i.e., at its VaR limit).
- **Delta CoVaR ($\Delta CoVaR$):** This is the crucial metric. It measures the *difference* between the CoVaR of the system when institution *i* is distressed and the CoVaR of the system when institution *i* is in its median state.

$$\Delta CoVaR_i = CoVaR^{system|i_{distressed}} - CoVaR^{system|i_{median}}$$

- **Interpretation:** $\Delta CoVaR$ quantifies the *marginal contribution* of a specific firm to overall systemic risk. A firm with a high $\Delta CoVaR$ is one whose distress is highly correlated with (or causal to) system-wide distress.

Developed by Acharya, Engle, and Brownlees, **SRISK** provides a different perspective: it estimates the capital shortfall of a firm in a systemic crisis.

- **Concept:** SRISK asks, "If the broad market falls by 40% over the next six months, how much capital will this firm need to raise to maintain its prudential capital ratio?"
- **The SRISK Equation:**

$SRISK_{i,t} = k \times DEBT_{i,t} - (1-k) \times EQUITY_{i,t} \times (1 - LRMES_{i,t})$

Where:

- k is the prudential capital ratio (typically 8%).
- DEBT is the book value of liabilities.
- EQUITY is the current market capitalization.
- LRMES (Long-Run Marginal Expected Shortfall) is the expected drop in the firm's equity value conditional on the systemic market decline.

- **Significance:** SRISK is a function of size (Debt), Leverage, and Correlation (LRMES). Unlike CoVaR, which is a return-based measure, SRISK provides a dollar amount, representing the potential cost of a bailout. It is highly sensitive to leverage, making it particularly effective at identifying undercapitalized banks before they fail.

Empirical "horse races" between these measures yield divergent results:

- **SRISK** is generally superior at predicting which firms will require government bailouts because it explicitly accounts for the balance sheet constraint (leverage). In the 2008 crisis, SRISK correctly identified the vulnerability of investment banks like Lehman Brothers and Bear Stearns due to their extreme leverage, even when their stock betas were not anomalously high.
- **CoVaR** is valuable for mapping the *network of contagion* and understanding how distress spills over, but it can be noisy due to its reliance on market price correlations, which can change rapidly.
- **Integration:** Ideally, regulators use both: SRISK to size the capital buffer and CoVaR to monitor interconnection intensity.

Recent research (2025) has highlighted the phenomenon of "asymptotic independence," where correlations between assets might break down or behave unpredictably in the extreme tail of the distribution (e.g., 99.9th percentile). The **Extreme CoVaR Index (ECI)** has been proposed to capture the strength of risk contagion in these deep tail events, using multivariate dependence structures like Gaussian and Marshall-Olkin copulas. This allows for better modeling of "black swan" events that standard Gaussian models miss.

The migration of risk to the NBFI sector is the defining challenge for contemporary financial stability. NBFIs—including pension funds, insurers, hedge funds, and family offices—are essential for market liquidity but possess structural vulnerabilities distinct from banks.

Open-ended funds, which allow investors to redeem their shares daily, hold a significant portion of corporate debt and less liquid assets.

- **Liquidity Mismatch:** This creates a structural mismatch: the fund offers daily liquidity (liability side) but holds assets that may take days or weeks to sell (asset side).
- **First-Mover Advantage:** When a fund faces stress, investors have an incentive to redeem early. The fund typically meets early redemptions by selling its most liquid assets (cash, Treasuries). This leaves the remaining investors with a portfolio of illiquid assets ("the dregs"). Anticipating this, all investors rush to redeem simultaneously, triggering a run.

The relationship between banks and NBFIs is not one of separation but of symbiosis. Banks actively use **Synthetic Risk Transfers (SRT)** to offload credit risk to NBFIs. In an SRT, a bank buys credit protection (e.g., via a Credit Linked Note) on a portfolio of loans from an NBFI (like a private credit fund).

- **Regulatory Arbitrage:** This allows the bank to reduce its risk-weighted assets (RWA) and hold less capital.
- **Hidden Risk:** While the risk leaves the banking system's regulatory perimeter, it does not leave the financial ecosystem. It resides in the NBFI sector, which is more opaque. If

the NBFI fails to pay out on the protection during a crisis, the risk boomerangs back to the bank (counterparty risk).

The private credit market, where non-bank funds lend directly to corporates, has exploded in size. These funds often employ leverage to boost returns. However, data on this leverage is sparse. The FSB's 2025 reports highlight the lack of visibility into the leverage employed by private funds and the potential for this leverage to amplify shocks if credit conditions deteriorate.

The September 2022 crisis in the UK government bond market provides a textbook example of a non-bank liquidity spiral triggered by hidden leverage and derivatives.

UK Defined Benefit (DB) pension funds faced a challenge: their liabilities (future pension payouts) were long-duration and sensitive to falling interest rates. To hedge this, they adopted **Liability-Driven Investment (LDI)** strategies.

- **The Strategy:** Instead of buying physical Gilts (which requires massive capital), they used interest rate swaps and repo transactions to gain exposure to long-duration Gilts synthetically. This allowed them to match liabilities while keeping capital free for higher-yielding investments (equities).
- **The Leverage:** This strategy inherently involved leverage. The pension funds were effectively borrowing to hold Gilt exposure.

On September 23, 2022, the UK government announced a "mini-budget" containing unfunded tax cuts. The market reacted violently, questioning the UK's fiscal credibility. Gilt yields spiked (prices crashed). 30-year yields rose ~160 basis points in days.

- **Collateral Calls:** As Gilt prices fell, the value of the collateral pledged by LDI funds dropped. Simultaneously, the value of their swap liabilities (which lose money when rates rise) increased. Counterparty banks issued massive margin calls.
- **Forced Deleveraging:** LDI funds did not have enough cash to meet these calls. They were forced to sell their most liquid assets—Gilts.
- **The Feedback Loop:** The selling of Gilts by LDI funds drove prices down further, triggering *more* margin calls. This self-reinforcing spiral threatened to collapse the entire UK bond market.

The Bank of England (BoE) faced a dilemma: it was tightening monetary policy to fight inflation (selling Gilts) but needed to buy Gilts to stop the financial collapse.

- **Resolution:** The BoE launched a *temporary* and *targeted* financial stability intervention, purchasing long-dated Gilts to put a floor under prices. This broke the spiral, giving LDI funds time to recapitalize from their sponsor companies. The intervention was distinct from QE; it was unwound once stability returned.

Lesson: The crisis revealed that "safe" assets (sovereign bonds) can become the epicenter of instability when they are the substrate for excessive, opaque leverage in the NBFI sector.

Stress testing has transitioned from a risk management compliance exercise to the primary tool of macroprudential supervision.

Unlike microprudential tests, which assess the solvency of a single bank assuming constant market conditions, **Macroprudential Stress Tests (MaPST)** model the simultaneous distress of the entire system.

- **Endogeneity:** MaPST attempts to capture feedback loops. If Bank A, B, and C all sell assets, the model calculates the resulting price drop and applies it to Bank D's portfolio.
- **Top-Down Approach:** Regulators prefer top-down models (running their own code on bank data) for MaPST to ensure consistency and capture these interaction effects, which individual banks cannot see from their bottom-up perspective.

Following the 2020 and 2022 crises, ESMA and IOSCO have codified guidelines for **Liquidity Stress Testing (LST)** in investment funds.

- **Scenarios:** Funds must model extreme redemption shocks (e.g., top 5 investors redeeming simultaneously).
- **Asset Liquidation Models:** Funds must simulate *how* they would sell assets.
  - **Pro-Rata:** Selling a slice of the liquid and illiquid bucket (preserves portfolio balance but hard to execute).
  - **Waterfall:** Selling the most liquid assets first (easiest to execute but leaves the fund toxic for remaining investors). Regulators are pushing for realistic modeling that accounts for the "cost of liquidity".

CCPs are the firewalls of the derivatives market. Their failure would be catastrophic.

- **"Cover 2" Standard:** CCPs must hold sufficient pre-funded financial resources (margins + default fund) to withstand the default of their *two* largest clearing members in extreme but plausible market conditions.
- **Interconnectedness:** Since the largest clearing members (G-SIBs) are members of multiple CCPs, regulators now run **system-wide CCP stress tests**. These examine whether a shock to the G-SIBs would exhaust the collective resources of the global CCP network.
- **Reverse Stress Testing:** CCPs also employ reverse stress testing: identifying the specific combination of defaults and market moves that would exhaust their resources. This helps identify "blind spot" scenarios that standard historical scenarios might miss.

The regulatory agenda for 2025, driven by the FSB and IOSCO, focuses heavily on closing the gaps revealed by the LDI and Dash for Cash episodes.

9.1 The FSB and IOSCO Work Program on NBFI

The 2025 work program prioritizes **liquidity preparedness**. Recommendations include:

- **Margin Readiness:** NBFIs must maintain liquidity buffers specifically calibrated to meet variation margin calls during stress events.
- **Anti-Dilution Tools:** OEFs are encouraged to use swing pricing and anti-dilution levies to pass the cost of liquidity on to redeeming investors, thereby reducing the first-mover advantage and preventing runs.

A critical failure in 2022 was the regulator's lack of visibility into LDI leverage. The FSB is implementing enhanced reporting requirements for leverage in NBFIs, particularly synthetic leverage created through derivatives. This includes better data sharing between banking supervisors (who see the repo lending) and market regulators (who oversee the funds).

Climate risk is moving from "emerging" to "central" in stress testing. The ECB and ESMA are integrating climate scenarios (transition risk shocks to carbon-intensive assets) into their systemic risk models. The concern is that a sudden repricing of "brown" assets could trigger a fire sale similar to the subprime crisis, affecting both bank loan books and NBFI bond portfolios.

The landscape of systemic risk has fundamentally shifted. The "too big to fail" banks of 2008 have been replaced by "too interconnected to fail" markets in 2025. The primary transmission mechanism is no longer the interbank loan but the asset price vector. Liquidity spirals, fueled by leverage and algorithmic trading, can destabilize the system faster than regulators can react.
Future financial stability relies on a three-pronged approach:

1. **Enhanced Data Granularity:** To map the hidden leverage in the shadow banking nexus.
2. **Dynamic Stress Testing:** That endogenizes behavioral responses and liquidity feedbacks.
3. **Macroprudential Regulation for Non-Banks:** Extending the perimeter of liquidity and leverage regulation to those entities that now form the core of the global credit machine.

References.

1. International Monetary Fund. (2025). *Global Financial Stability Report, October 2025*.

2. Qi, M., Zhang, J., Shi, D., Feng, S., & Xu, J. (2025). Systemic risk contagion and bailout effects in the global financial system. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 102(C).
3. Global Association of Risk Professionals (GARP). (2024). *Stress Testing: A Practical Guide*.
4. De Haan, L., & van den End, J. W. (2013). Banks' responses to funding liquidity shocks: Lending adjustment, liquidity hoarding and fire sales. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 26, 152–174.
5. Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (2011). Fire Sales in Finance and Macroeconomics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 25(1), 29-48.
6. Theory Group. (2025). Asymptotic Independence and the Extreme CoVaR Index. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*.
7. International Monetary Fund. (2017). *Investment Fund Stress Testing Methodologies*. WP/17/226.
8. Arthur Cox. (2021). *New Liquidity Stress Testing Rules for Investment Funds*.
9. CME Group. (2024). *Principles for CCP Stress Testing*.
10. Acharya, V., Engle, R., & Richardson, M. (2012). Capital Shortfall: A New Approach to Ranking and Regulating Systemic Risks. *American Economic Review*.
11. Adrian, T., & Brunnermeier, M. K. (2016). CoVaR. *The American Economic Review*, 106(7), 1705–1741.
12. Financial Stability Board. (2025). *Systemic Risks in Non-Bank Financial Intermediation*.
13. Congressional Research Service. (2025). *NBFI and Bank Risk Transfer Practices*.
14. Brunnermeier, M. K., & Pedersen, L. H. (2009). Market Liquidity and Funding Liquidity. *Review of Financial Studies*, 22(6), 2201–2238.
15. Stein, J. C. (2013). *Fire Sales as a Driver of Systemic Risk*. Federal Reserve Board.
16. Caccioli, F., Farmer, J. D., Foti, N., & Rockmore, D. (2015). Overlapping portfolios, contagion, and financial stability. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 51, 50–63.
17. Caccioli, F., et al. (2012). *Financial Contagion and the Diversification Trade-off*. arXiv:1210.5987.
18. Pinter, G. (2023). An Anatomy of the 2022 Gilt Market Crisis. *Bank of England Staff Working Paper No. 1019*.
19. J.P. Morgan. (2023). *Lessons Learned from the UK Gilt Crisis*.
20. Bank of England. (2023). *Financial Stability Buy-Sell Tools: A Gilt Market Case Study*.
21. NYU Stern Volatility Lab. (2025). *SRISK Calculation Methodology*.
22. Brownlees, C., & Engle, R. F. (2017). SRISK: A Conditional Capital Shortfall Measure of Systemic Risk. *The Review of Financial Studies*.
23. IOSCO. (2011). *Systemic Risk Definition and Securities Markets*.
24. Financial Stability Board. (2024). *Enhancing Resilience of Non-Bank Financial Intermediation: Progress Report*.
25. Financial Stability Board. (2025). *Recommendations to Address Financial Stability Risks Created by Leverage in NBFI*.
26. Advanced Financial Network Theory Group. (2025). Recent advancements in financial network theory and contagion models. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*.
27. Financial Stability Journal. (2024). Granger causality-in-risk networks and higher-order centralities.