

FRED TUNG

BOSTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW



- I. The Innovation Setting
- II. From Equity to Debt
- III. Three Looks at
 - **Bank Financing and Innovation**
- **IV.** The Ecosystem for Innovation Finance

The Innovation Setting

- Not like conventional corporate investment (e.g., capital expenditures)
 - Radical uncertainty:
 - Difficult to predict even the form of the potential outcomes
 - Not possible to estimate expected values for range of possible outcomes

The Innovation Setting











2003



1980

The Innovation Setting

Innovation is experimental

Difficult to discern worthy projects:
Only way to get better information
about a project is to invest and see
what happens

The Innovation Setting

Innovation is experimental

Staged financing

Continuing re-evaluation of real options Winners and losers don't get decided in product markets

Whether best projects get to the top depends on investors' org environments
Somewhat *idiosyncratic* live-or-die decisions

The Innovation Setting

Innovation is experimental

Staged financing

Skewed returns: 10% of innovations may acct for 90% of returns

Information asymmetry: Contracting is difficult.

High adjustment costs

High %-age of intangible assets
Especially embedded in human capital
50% of R&D is wages & salaries
Loathe to lose or layoff human K

From Equity to Debt

Early assumption: equity more conducive to innovation

Uncertainty and long time horizons: Lenders risk averse; short-term focused **Share no upside from borrower** firm's success Instead, debt demands regular cash flows Seemingly not set up to tolerate failure as easily as equity Lenders like tangible, redeployable assets for collateral

From Equity to Debt

Early assumption: equity more conducive to innovation

"[I]nformation problems, skewed and highly uncertain returns, and lack of collateral value likely make debt a poor substitute for equity finance."

Brown, Fazzari, Peterson (JF '09)

From Equity to Debt

Intangible assets used as collateral Lender intervention \rightarrow

Efficient refocusing of innovation activity

Agency costs of equity

Going public reduces novelty Analyst coverage, stock liquidity

—reduce info asymmetry, lower capital costs BUT analyst coverage \rightarrow S/T earnings targets Stock liq \rightarrow TKO exposure

Managerial myopia

→ Activist investors may demand short-term stock returns

Information asymmetry

- → stock market undervaluation
- → manager ouster or hostile TKO

Anti-TKO provisions may go too

far: no benefit to innovation

Three Looks at Bank Financing and Innovation

Lender governance

Post-covenant-violation intervention

→ Efficient refocusing of innovation activity **Especially for high-agency-cost firms**

(Gu, Mao & Tian (JLE '17); Chava, Nanda & Xiao (Rev. Corp. Fin Stud. '17))

Three Looks at Bank Financing and Innovation

- 2a. Improved property rights for patents
 - → lower loan pricing

Especially for:

higher patent and citation counts more general, younger patents

Natural experiments:

TRIPS

State anti-recharacterization statutes (protect SPV)

(Chava, Nanda & Xiao (Rev. Corp. Fin Stud. '17))

Three Looks at Bank Financing and Innovation

2b. Improved property rights for patents
Among innovating firms, pledging patent collateral

→ more borrowing, R&D spending
Especially for financially constrained firms

Natural experiment:

DE state anti-recharacterization statute + 4 fed court decisions

(Mann (JFE '18))

Three Looks at Bank Financing and Innovation

- 3. Interstate and intrastate banking deregulation
- a. Interstate deregulation
 - increased innovation by public manufacturing firms
 Enabled geographic diversification of credit risk
 Enabled banks to finance riskier projects
 (Amore, Schneider & Zaldokas (JFE '13)
- b. Intrastate deregulation
 - → less, and less risky, innovation in small private firms
 Market concentration benefited large banks
 Enhanced bargaining power over small firms
 (Chava, Oettl, Subramanian & Subramanian (JFE '13))

The Ecosystem for Innovation Finance

Institutional context surrounding bank-borrower relationship [CDS & securitization mkts & FinReg]

CDS markets- Limits of lender governance

The Ecosystem for Innovation Finance

Institutional context surrounding bank-borrower relationship [CDS & securitization mkts & FinReg]

CDS markets- Limits of lender governance

Inception of CDS trading

> riskier reference firm

Hedged banks increase credit supply to reference firms

→higher default risk

Looser covenants and monitoring

The Ecosystem for Innovation Finance

Institutional context surrounding bank-borrower relationship [CDS & securitization mkts & FinReg]

CDS markets- Limits of lender governance

Inception of CDS trading

> riskier reference firm

Potentially offsetting effects

Hedged banks increase credit supply to reference firms

→ higher default risk

Looser covenants and monitoring

CDS promotes innovation:

Improves banks' risk tolerance

→ allows borrower risktaking

Looser covenants:

Lower probability of lender intervention Later intervention if any

Could be good or bad:

More novel innovation?

More failures?

