Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques • No. 87 • 2025: 85 – 97

ORIGINAL PAPER

The role of macroprudential regulation in global financial stability

Dumitru Cinciulescu[1)]

Abstract:
The global financial system has witnessed significant turbulence over the past decades, underscoring the critical need for robust regulatory frameworks to ensure financial stability. This article examines the role of macroprudential regulation in safeguarding global financial stability, focusing on its mechanisms, effectiveness, and challenges in a rapidly evolving financial landscape. Macroprudential regulation, which aims to mitigate systemic risks that could destabilize the entire financial system, has gained prominence since the 2008 financial crisis. By addressing interconnected risks across institutions, markets, and economies, it complements traditional microprudential approaches that focus on individual entities.
The study explores key macroprudential tools, such as capital buffers, countercyclical capital requirements, and liquidity regulations, and evaluates their impact on reducing systemic vulnerabilities. It highlights the importance of cross-border coordination in implementing these policies, as financial systems are increasingly interconnected, and risks often transcend national boundaries. It also discusses the challenges faced by regulators, including the difficulty of identifying systemic risks in real time, the potential for regulatory arbitrage, and the trade-offs between financial stability and economic growth.
Drawing on case studies from various jurisdictions, the research underscores the effectiveness of macroprudential policies in curbing excessive credit growth, asset bubbles, and leverage during economic booms, while enhancing resilience during downturns. However, it also emphasizes the need for continuous adaptation of regulatory frameworks to address emerging risks, such as those posed by digital currencies, climate change, and non-bank financial intermediaries.
Keywords: *macroprudential regulation, financial stability, systemic risk, cross-border coordination, regulatory frameworks.*
JEL Classification: G28, F36

[1)] PhD Student, University of Craiova, Doctoral School of Economics Sciences „Eugeniu Carada”,Finance specialization, Craiova, Romania, Email: cinciulescu.dumitru.k6c@student.ucv.ro

1. Introduction

The stability of the global financial system has emerged as one of the foremost policy concerns of the 21st century, particularly in light of recurrent episodes of systemic disruption that have underscored the vulnerabilities inherent in interconnected financial markets. The 2008 global financial crisis marked a watershed moment, revealing the profound limitations of prevailing regulatory paradigms that were predominantly microprudential in nature, those oriented toward the solvency and soundness of individual financial institutions. While these micro-level regulations remain necessary, they proved insufficient in addressing the broader, system-wide fragilities that can emerge from the complex web of interdependencies characterizing modern finance.

A foundational understanding of financial stability and institutional soundness necessitates engagement with the underlying principles of banking operations and governance. Spulbar (2008), in his seminal work on banking management, emphasizes the structural and functional interdependencies within the banking sector that, if left unchecked, can serve as amplifiers of systemic risk. His analysis remains relevant in the context of macroprudential regulation, as it highlights the importance of risk culture, internal controls, and capital adequacy within individual financial institutions, elements that collectively serve as micro-foundations for macro-level financial resilience. The architecture of prudential supervision, as argued in this text, must incorporate both operational and strategic dimensions of banking behavior to be truly effective in anticipating systemic vulnerabilities.

The intensification of cross-border capital flows, the proliferation of complex financial instruments, and the growth of systemically important financial institutions (SIFIs) have all contributed to a financial ecosystem where localized shocks can rapidly transmit across institutions, sectors, and national boundaries. These dynamics necessitate a regulatory approach that transcends firm-level supervision and instead focuses on the identification, monitoring, and mitigation of systemic risks. In this context, macroprudential regulation has gained considerable prominence as a strategic framework designed to safeguard financial stability at the systemic level.

Macroprudential regulation is distinguished by its objective to contain the build-up of systemic risk and to enhance the resilience of the financial system to adverse shocks. Unlike microprudential oversight, which is concerned with idiosyncratic risks and the stability of individual entities, macroprudential policy operates with a broader lens, addressing the amplification mechanisms that can lead to collective instability. These mechanisms include excessive credit growth, over-leverage, maturity mismatches, interconnectedness among institutions, and herding behavior in asset markets, all of which played a critical role in exacerbating the financial turmoil of the late 2000s.

The conceptual foundations of macroprudential regulation are deeply rooted in the recognition that financial markets are not inherently self-correcting and that systemic risk is an endogenous feature of financial capitalism. This recognition has compelled regulators and policymakers to adopt a more holistic view of financial supervision, one that explicitly accounts for the time dimension (i.e., the procyclicality of financial markets) and the cross-sectional dimension (i.e., the distribution of risk across institutions and sectors). The former dimension captures the tendency for credit booms to amplify economic cycles, often culminating in painful busts, while the latter emphasizes the interconnectedness that enables the transmission and magnification of shocks throughout the financial system.

Furthermore, the architecture of global finance has evolved significantly in recent decades, presenting novel challenges for regulatory oversight. The rapid digitalization of financial services, the rise of non-bank financial intermediaries, and the increasing relevance of climate-related financial risks all demand continuous innovation in regulatory thinking. These emerging risks do not merely complement traditional sources of instability but often interact with them in complex and unpredictable ways, thereby complicating efforts to maintain systemic resilience.

The interaction between macroprudential regulation and broader economic fundamentals, such as investment flows and fiscal sustainability, remains a critical domain of inquiry, particularly in emerging markets where procyclical vulnerabilities are amplified by institutional constraints. Moldovan et al., (2025) provide robust empirical evidence from Romania illustrating how investment dynamics and fiscal performance are tightly interlinked with real GDP trajectories. Their findings underscore that financial regulation cannot be conceptualized in isolation but must be situated within a broader macroeconomic policy matrix, where poorly coordinated fiscal policy can magnify systemic risks, while strategic investment can enhance financial stability by reinforcing economic buffers.

In this evolving context, macroprudential regulation is not merely a technocratic solution to a set of well-defined problems but a dynamic and adaptive policy domain that must continuously evolve in response to shifting financial realities. The implementation of macroprudential tools, such as countercyclical capital buffers, systemic risk surcharges, loan-to-value caps, and liquidity requirements, reflects an attempt to internalize systemic externalities and to align private risk-taking with public stability objectives. However, the effectiveness of these tools is contingent upon timely risk identification, coherent policy design, and international coordination, particularly given the globalized nature of contemporary finance.

At its core, macroprudential regulation embodies a paradigm shift in financial governance: one that seeks to preempt rather than merely react to crises, to regulate markets as complex adaptive systems, and to embed resilience into the fabric of financial intermediation. As such, its role in ensuring global financial stability is not only instrumental but foundational to the sustainability of economic development in an increasingly volatile world.

2. Core mechanisms and tools of macroprudential regulation

Systemic risk, a concept that remained largely peripheral in financial regulation prior to the 2008 crisis, has since become central to the discourse on financial stability. It denotes the risk of disruption to the financial system as a whole, arising from the correlated distress or failure of interconnected financial institutions or markets, which in turn can cause significant adverse effects on the broader economy. Unlike idiosyncratic risk, which can be diversified away or contained within individual entities, systemic risk is endogenous, non-linear, and prone to amplification through feedback loops, information asymmetries, and behavioral contagion.

The theoretical foundation for systemic risk is deeply rooted in network theory, endogenous cycles of leverage and liquidity, and the behavioral tendencies of market participants under stress. Haldane and May (2011), in their influential work on complexity in financial networks, argue that interconnectedness is a double-edged sword: while it can promote efficiency and risk-sharing under normal conditions, it can also facilitate rapid

contagion during periods of distress. The collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008 illustrated how the failure of a single institution, deeply embedded within a web of counterparty exposures, could catalyze a chain reaction that brought the global financial system to the brink of collapse.

Given the limitations of microprudential supervision, which primarily addresses the solvency of individual entities without accounting for their systemic relevance, macroprudential regulation emerged as a necessary complement. Its core objective is to identify and contain risks that threaten the stability of the financial system as a whole, particularly those that manifest through procyclical behaviors, excessive leverage, and misaligned incentives across institutions and markets. Borio (2003) was among the early proponents of the macroprudential perspective, emphasizing the importance of addressing the collective behavior of financial institutions and the aggregate build-up of risk over time.

The goals of macroprudential policy are twofold: first, to increase the resilience of the financial system to shocks by building buffers that can absorb losses during downturns; and second, to lean against the financial cycle by curbing the accumulation of systemic risk in boom periods. These goals are operationalized through both structural and time-varying instruments. Structural instruments aim to strengthen institutions deemed systemically important, while time-varying tools seek to moderate the cyclical fluctuations that contribute to instability. The macroprudential framework should also incorporate forward-looking assessments of emerging risks, particularly those stemming from technological innovation and environmental transitions.

Importantly, the identification of systemic risk requires the integration of both quantitative models and qualitative judgment. While early warning indicators, such as credit-to-GDP gaps, asset price misalignments, and leverage ratios, are useful, they are far from infallible. Moreover, as highlighted by Galati and Moessner (2013), the effectiveness of macroprudential policy is contingent upon institutional arrangements, data availability, and the coordination between monetary, fiscal, and regulatory authorities. There remains an ongoing debate regarding the optimal design of macroprudential governance structures and the delineation of responsibilities across agencies.

The operationalization of macroprudential regulation is materially anchored in a diverse set of policy instruments, designed to contain systemic risk by either enhancing the resilience of financial institutions or curbing the build-up of vulnerabilities across the financial system. These instruments are typically categorized along two axes: time-varying (or countercyclical) tools, which adjust according to fluctuations in financial cycles, and structural tools, which address persistent sources of systemic fragility embedded in the architecture of the financial sector. The calibration and deployment of these instruments are context-dependent, varying in intensity and scope across jurisdictions based on institutional capacity, economic structure, and the maturity of financial markets.

Among the most prominent time-varying macroprudential instruments is the countercyclical capital buffer (CCyB), which requires banks to build up additional capital during periods of excessive credit growth. The primary objective of the CCyB is to create a cushion that can be drawn down in times of stress, thereby sustaining credit flows when risk aversion spikes. Empirical evidence supports its efficacy: Behn, Mangiante, and Schanz (2020), in a study of European banks, found that the activation of CCyBs had a statistically significant dampening effect on credit supply growth and risk-taking behavior during expansions. The Basel III framework, which formally introduced the CCyB,

mandates national authorities to assess systemic risk indicators, such as the credit-to-GDP gap, in determining buffer rates.

Capital surcharges for systemically important financial institutions (SIFIs) represent a structural measure aimed at addressing the moral hazard and externalities associated with institutions deemed "too big to fail." These surcharges compel SIFIs to maintain higher loss-absorbing capacity, thereby reducing their probability of failure and the systemic consequences thereof. According to the Financial Stability Board (FSB, 2015), the implementation of these capital surcharges, along with enhanced resolution regimes, constitutes a cornerstone of the post-crisis macroprudential agenda.

Loan-to-value (LTV) and debt-to-income (DTI) caps are targeted tools aimed at the household sector, primarily used to temper housing market exuberance and mitigate the build-up of leverage among borrowers. These instruments are particularly effective in jurisdictions where real estate cycles have historically been a source of financial instability. Claessens, Ghosh, and Mihet (2013) demonstrate that the use of LTV and DTI ratios has a significant constraining effect on mortgage lending growth and house price inflation, thereby lowering systemic vulnerabilities associated with housing booms.

In parallel, liquidity-based instruments, such as the Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR) and Net Stable Funding Ratio (NSFR), are designed to reduce maturity mismatches and ensure that banks maintain adequate buffers of high-quality liquid assets to withstand short-term funding shocks. These tools not only bolster institutional resilience but also help mitigate contagion risks during periods of market stress. The literature highlights their positive role in enhancing financial system robustness; for instance, King (2013) finds that the LCR, when implemented in concert with other macroprudential measures, significantly improves bank liquidity profiles and reduces systemic risk exposure.

Further, sectoral capital requirements, which adjust risk weights on exposures to specific sectors such as real estate or corporate lending, allow authorities to target overheating credit segments without imposing blanket constraints on the entire banking system. These measures have gained traction in emerging markets where sector-specific booms pose distinct macro-financial risks.

Despite their diverse nature, macroprudential instruments share a unifying characteristic: they aim to internalize the negative externalities that stem from excessive risk-taking and interconnectedness. Yet their effectiveness hinges on institutional credibility, data granularity, and the capacity for timely implementation. Moreover, as Haldane et al. (2017) argue, the dynamic interaction between instruments must be carefully managed to avoid unintended consequences and policy redundancy, a challenge that underscores the importance of macroprudential governance and empirical evaluation.

The effective deployment of macroprudential instruments lies not merely in their individual design or implementation but in the synergies created when these tools are employed as part of an integrated regulatory architecture. Financial systems are inherently complex, adaptive, and interlinked, exhibiting non-linear dynamics that cannot be adequately contained through isolated interventions. Hence, the coordinated application of macroprudential tools, spanning capital, liquidity, borrower-based, and structural dimensions, represents a necessary strategy for mitigating the systemic vulnerabilities that can emerge both over time and across institutions.

Systemic vulnerabilities typically evolve along two principal dimensions: the time dimension, characterized by the procyclical behavior of financial markets and institutions, and the cross-sectional dimension, which refers to the distribution and concentration of risk across the financial network. Macroprudential tools address these vulnerabilities by

influencing the incentives and constraints faced by financial actors, thereby shaping aggregate outcomes in ways that reduce the likelihood and severity of system-wide stress.

The interaction between countercyclical capital buffers and borrower-based measures such as loan-to-value (LTV) and debt-to-income (DTI) caps is illustrative of how macroprudential tools can be synchronized. During periods of excessive credit growth and rising asset prices, the combined imposition of capital buffers and LTV/DTI caps serves a dual purpose: it restricts credit supply on the lender side by raising capital requirements while simultaneously constraining credit demand by limiting household leverage. This interaction creates a reinforcing mechanism that curbs the feedback loop between credit expansion and asset inflation. As highlighted by Kuttner and Shim (2016), countries employing both supply- and demand-side tools in tandem observed more pronounced effects on credit growth containment and house price moderation compared to those relying on a single category of intervention.

Similarly, the effectiveness of liquidity standards such as the Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR) and Net Stable Funding Ratio (NSFR) is enhanced when combined with capital adequacy requirements. While capital buffers absorb losses and bolster solvency, liquidity standards ensure short-term funding stability, thereby reducing the likelihood of fire sales and funding runs under stress. Farhi and Tirole (2012) emphasize that a multi-dimensional regulatory approach, one that simultaneously addresses solvency and liquidity, is critical in preventing the amplification of shocks through market-based channels.

Moreover, sectoral capital requirements, when aligned with macroprudential surveillance indicators, allow for the dynamic reallocation of regulatory constraints toward pockets of overheating or excess leverage. For instance, in jurisdictions where real estate or corporate credit is expanding unsustainably, sector-specific risk weights can be adjusted preemptively without distorting the broader credit supply. Bruno, Shim, and Shin (2017) demonstrate that this targeted approach, especially when accompanied by real-time monitoring of sectoral exposures, enhances the precision and effectiveness of macroprudential interventions.

The coordination of tools also plays a pivotal role in mitigating regulatory arbitrage—the tendency of financial actors to shift activities across borders or into lightly regulated sectors in response to tightened regulations. When macroprudential instruments are applied in a fragmented or inconsistent manner, their effectiveness can be undermined by such leakages. A comprehensive policy mix that integrates bank-based, market-based, and institutional measures reduces the scope for circumvention and reinforces the credibility of the regulatory stance.

However, while the joint application of tools offers considerable advantages, it also introduces potential policy interaction effects, including overlaps, redundancies, and unintended procyclical outcomes. For instance, excessive tightening through multiple instruments may unduly restrict credit availability, particularly in fragile economies. This necessitates careful calibration, ongoing impact assessment, and an institutional framework capable of resolving tensions between competing policy objectives. The IMF (2020) underscores the importance of "macroprudential policy frameworks" that incorporate formal coordination mechanisms, clear communication strategies, and macro-financial modeling capabilities to optimize the deployment of instruments across economic cycles.

3. Global integration and the role of cross-border coordination

In an era marked by unprecedented financial globalization, the effectiveness of macroprudential regulation is inherently contingent upon the degree of international coordination among regulatory authorities. As financial institutions expand their operations across borders and global capital markets become increasingly interdependent, systemic risks are no longer confined within national jurisdictions. Instead, they migrate, morph, and amplify through transnational linkages, rendering purely domestic macroprudential measures insufficient. This evolution has necessitated the emergence of a coordinated, multilayered regulatory framework capable of responding to cross-border contagion, regulatory arbitrage, and collective action failures.

The 2008 global financial crisis laid bare the inadequacy of fragmented regulatory oversight in a highly integrated financial system. The collapse of U.S.-based subprime mortgage markets cascaded across European and Asian banking sectors, illustrating how shocks in one jurisdiction can rapidly compromise the stability of distant yet interconnected systems. In response, international bodies such as the Financial Stability Board (FSB), the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) intensified efforts to harmonize macroprudential policies and establish platforms for supervisory cooperation. These institutions have since played a crucial role in disseminating best practices, setting global standards, and fostering mutual surveillance among national regulators.

Despite these advances, the practical implementation of cross-border coordination remains fraught with challenges. A fundamental problem lies in the asymmetry of national incentives. While global stability is a shared objective, the transmission channels of systemic risk—and the fiscal consequences of potential bailouts—often vary significantly across countries. As a result, there exists a latent tension between national sovereignty and collective prudence. This tension is particularly acute in the context of activating countercyclical capital buffers or imposing restrictions on capital flows, where the costs and benefits are not evenly distributed.

Empirical studies have shown that macroprudential policy spillovers are real and consequential. For example, Buch, Bussière, and Goldberg (2019) provide evidence that capital requirement adjustments in one country can influence lending behavior and risk-taking in neighboring jurisdictions through international banks with cross-border exposures. In the absence of harmonized implementation, these spillovers can create incentives for regulatory arbitrage, where financial activities migrate to less stringently regulated jurisdictions, undermining the policy effectiveness of more stringent regimes.

Table 1. Empirical Evidence on Cross-Border Spillovers of Macroprudential Policies

Study	Methodology	Key Finding
Buch et al. (2019)	Panel regression with bilateral bank data	Capital buffers in home countries affect foreign lending patterns significantly
Cerutti et al. (2017)	Cross-country analysis of 119 countries	Spillovers are more pronounced in countries with open capital accounts
Aiyar et al. (2014)	Bank-level analysis in the UK	Foreign branches can offset domestic tightening through increased credit supply

Houston et al. (2012)	Global bank survey data (101 countries)	Lending by global banks is influenced by home- and host-country regulatory gaps
Ongena et al. (2015)	Difference-in-differences on Swiss bank data	Foreign macroprudential tightening reduces cross-border lending in exposed sectors
Avdjiev et al. (2020)	BIS international banking statistics	Macroprudential policies affect the composition of cross-border bank flows

Source: Author's elaboration based on Buch et al. (2019), Cerutti et al. (2017), Aiyar et al. (2014), Houston et al. (2012), Ongena et al. (2015), and Avdjiev et al. (2020).

These findings underscore the importance of reciprocal supervisory arrangements and the need for comprehensive data-sharing mechanisms. In this respect, the European Union has made significant strides through the establishment of the European Systemic Risk Board (ESRB) and the Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM), which allow for a more integrated supervisory approach within the Eurozone. However, outside the EU, institutional capacity and political will to engage in binding macroprudential coordination remain uneven. Multilateral surveillance tools, such as the IMF's Financial Sector Assessment Program (FSAP) and the FSB's peer review process, provide valuable platforms for dialogue and transparency, yet they fall short of enforcement capacity.

Moreover, the growing prominence of non-bank financial intermediaries and digital finance has introduced new dimensions to the coordination problem. These entities often operate across multiple regulatory domains, exploiting differences in national frameworks. The lack of international consensus on how to regulate fintech, stablecoins, and decentralized finance compounds the difficulty of establishing uniform macroprudential safeguards. As pointed out by Gabor and Vestergaard (2021), regulatory innovation at the national level often outpaces global standard-setting, resulting in a regulatory patchwork that leaves systemic blind spots.

A further complication arises from the interaction between macroprudential and monetary policy in a cross-border setting. Divergent monetary stances between major economies can weaken the transmission of macroprudential policies by affecting capital flows, exchange rates, and risk perceptions. For example, when the Federal Reserve adopts an accommodative stance, capital tends to flow into emerging markets, fueling credit booms that domestic macroprudential tools may struggle to contain. In this context, Rey (2015) argues that the global financial cycle imposes significant constraints on the monetary and macroprudential autonomy of smaller open economies, particularly when capital account liberalization is extensive.

Addressing these multidimensional challenges calls for a paradigm shift in global financial governance. One promising direction is the institutionalization of macroprudential reciprocity agreements, whereby countries agree ex-ante to apply equivalent measures to systemically important institutions operating across borders. This principle, already embedded in the Basel III framework for countercyclical capital buffers, could be expanded to other instruments. Another avenue involves developing early warning systems and systemic risk dashboards at the international level, drawing on high-frequency cross-border financial data to detect risk accumulation in real time.

4. Challenges and trade-offs in regulatory implementation

Despite the conceptual elegance and policy promise of macroprudential regulation, its practical implementation is fraught with a multitude of challenges and inherent trade-offs. These complexities stem from the dynamic nature of systemic risk, the limitations of forecasting tools, institutional constraints, and the evolving structure of the financial system. Moreover, macroprudential authorities must continuously navigate the fine line between preserving financial stability and supporting economic growth, all while ensuring that their measures remain politically and socially legitimate.

A foundational difficulty lies in the timely identification of systemic risk. Unlike credit or market risk, which can be quantified through firm-specific indicators, systemic risk is often latent, nonlinear, and influenced by behavioral, technological, and structural factors that are difficult to model ex ante. The information asymmetries between market participants and regulators exacerbate this uncertainty, often leading to delayed interventions or inappropriate policy calibration. Moreover, early warning indicators such as credit-to-GDP gaps or asset price inflation, though widely used, are notoriously imprecise and can generate false positives or lagging signals. As Borio (2014) argues, reliance on mechanical rule-based frameworks may underestimate the complexity of real-world financial cycles and the heterogeneous transmission of shocks across sectors and jurisdictions.

Another pressing challenge is regulatory arbitrage, a phenomenon where financial institutions exploit differences in regulatory regimes to shift activities to less regulated entities or jurisdictions. This is particularly problematic in the context of macroprudential policies that are not globally harmonized or coordinated, as previously noted in Chapter 3. The rise of non-bank financial intermediaries, often referred to as the "shadow banking" system, has amplified this risk. These entities are typically not subject to the same capital, liquidity, or risk management requirements as traditional banks, allowing them to engage in maturity and liquidity transformation with limited oversight. As macroprudential tools are tightened in the regulated sector, there is an increased propensity for credit and leverage to migrate toward these less visible corners of the financial system, thereby diluting the intended effect of regulatory intervention.

A further tension arises from the dual mandate of macroprudential policy: stabilizing the financial system while avoiding undue constraints on credit supply and economic growth. When macroprudential tools—such as countercyclical capital buffers or LTV caps—are aggressively activated, they may inadvertently suppress productive investment, especially in emerging economies where credit intermediation is crucial for development. This trade-off becomes particularly acute during periods of economic recovery, where restrictive measures may clash with expansionary monetary or fiscal policies. The literature underscores this dilemma; for instance, Claessens and Valencia (2013) point out that in some cases, the overextension of macroprudential controls can induce a self-reinforcing contractionary cycle, particularly when private sector confidence is fragile.

In addition, the governance structure of macroprudential policy frameworks remains a contested domain. In many jurisdictions, there is ambiguity regarding institutional responsibility, coordination mechanisms, and accountability. The presence of multiple authorities central banks, financial supervisory agencies, ministries of finance can lead to fragmented decision-making, institutional inertia, or even inter-agency conflict. This fragmentation is particularly dangerous when swift action is needed to contain emerging risks. The IMF (2020) has advocated for clear mandates, dedicated

macroprudential policy committees, and legal autonomy for systemic risk oversight bodies to address these governance shortcomings.

Technological innovation adds a new layer of complexity to this regulatory landscape. The advent of artificial intelligence, machine learning, and automated decision-making processes within the financial sector has introduced both opportunities and systemic threats. Algorithms capable of executing high-frequency trades, managing credit underwriting, or optimizing asset allocations may significantly increase efficiency and reduce costs. However, they also introduce opaque interdependencies and systemic feedback mechanisms that are difficult to monitor. The literature increasingly warns of the endogenous risks associated with algorithmic homogeneity and collective behavior under stress.

In this context, it is essential to integrate broader interdisciplinary insights into the macroprudential debate. As Mitrache et al. (2024) argue, the deployment of artificial intelligence within economic systems can act as a double-edged sword—on one hand catalyzing growth and innovation, but on the other amplifying structural vulnerabilities when not properly governed. Their findings suggest that macroprudential authorities should not merely adapt existing tools but rather engage with new methodologies, such as AI-driven systemic risk models and digital compliance frameworks, to match the pace of financial innovation. This argument is further reinforced by Spulbar et al. (2025), who emphasize that sustainable integration of human judgment and artificial intelligence is essential for fostering resilience within complex systems. They caution that overreliance on automated mechanisms may create a false sense of security, particularly if regulators themselves become dependent on algorithmic outputs that lack transparency or contextual nuance.

Finally, climate-related financial risks and environmental sustainability considerations are rapidly emerging as core components of the macroprudential agenda. The physical and transition risks associated with climate change pose long-term threats to financial stability, as they can undermine asset values, disrupt business models, and trigger systemic re-pricing events. However, integrating such risks into macroprudential frameworks is still in its infancy. Data gaps, modeling uncertainties, and definitional ambiguities complicate the development of forward-looking climate stress tests or green capital buffers. Policymakers must reconcile environmental objectives with traditional financial stability mandates, a task made more difficult by political pressures and competing interests.

The implementation of macroprudential regulation is not a static endeavor but a complex and adaptive process. It requires continuous learning, robust institutional frameworks, interdisciplinary collaboration, and the capacity to anticipate rather than merely respond to systemic threats. The core challenge lies in designing regulatory interventions that are both effective and proportionate, resilient yet flexible, and technocratic but grounded in a broader socio-economic context.

5. Conclusions

The role of macroprudential regulation in securing global financial stability constitutes not merely a policy toolset but a profound conceptual shift in the way economies confront systemic risk. As this research has demonstrated, financial systems are no longer governed solely by market discipline and individual institutional solvency, but by the dynamic interplay of interconnected behaviors, feedback loops, and latent structural imbalances. In this context, macroprudential regulation is not simply

complementary to microprudential and monetary frameworks, it is foundational to the integrity and resilience of the financial architecture itself.

The complexity of the topic lies not only in its technical breadth, encompassing capital buffers, liquidity ratios, and cross-sector risk monitoring, but also in the deeply interwoven socio-economic, technological, and political dimensions that shape financial systems in the 21st century. Financial crises, both historical and potential, reveal that vulnerabilities emerge less from isolated weaknesses and more from the system's own structure and adaptive failures. Consequently, the macroprudential perspective must remain holistic, forward-looking, and inherently multidisciplinary.

One of the most pressing developments intensifying this complexity is the proliferation of artificial intelligence across the financial ecosystem. AI technologies have already begun to redefine the architecture of financial intermediation, from real-time credit scoring to autonomous portfolio management and algorithmic risk modeling. These innovations offer remarkable potential for increased efficiency, responsiveness, and predictive precision in both private sector finance and public regulatory functions. However, they also introduce novel sources of systemic fragility. The risks posed by algorithmic opacity, model homogeneity, data-driven herding, and the emergence of AI-driven market microstructures demand a regulatory response that is not only reactive but anticipatory.

In this regard, the implications of AI for macroprudential oversight are profound. On one hand, supervisory authorities can leverage AI for more granular surveillance, faster detection of abnormal patterns, and scenario-based stress testing that is far more adaptive than traditional econometric models. On the other, the very use of AI within financial firms may evolve faster than regulatory frameworks can adapt, creating an asymmetry of capacity that undermines oversight. As Spulbar (2025) cogently argues, legal frameworks designed for analogue markets are increasingly strained under the demands of a digitized financial order. His analysis highlights both the opportunities and the legal-structural gaps that AI introduces, especially in markets characterized by high-frequency, decentralized, and cross-jurisdictional activity. This is particularly salient for macroprudential authorities, whose mandate now includes safeguarding the system from endogenous technological shocks that are neither well-understood nor easily contained.

As such, the future of macroprudential regulation depends not only on improving technical instruments or institutional designs, but on fostering a systemic intelligence—a capacity to think across domains, foresee complex interactions, and govern adaptively under deep uncertainty. It is no longer sufficient to calibrate tools around past crises or static indicators; regulators must instead construct models that can interpret emerging forms of systemic risk in real time, especially those emanating from digital infrastructures, climate change, and geopolitical volatility.

Moreover, the internationalization of finance calls for a coherent, transnational regulatory philosophy, one that moves beyond voluntary coordination and embraces shared governance, data interoperability, and mutual legal recognition. In the absence of such alignment, macroprudential measures risk becoming fragmented, undercut by regulatory arbitrage, and insufficiently equipped to contain globally mobile risks.

Macroprudential regulation is not a policy option but a structural necessity in the global financial ecosystem. It must be embedded in a broader institutional culture that values precaution over short-term optimization, systemic resilience over individual solvency, and dynamic oversight over static rule-making. Only through such an integrated and adaptive framework can policymakers navigate the profound transformations

underway, and ensure that finance continues to serve the real economy, even in the face of accelerating technological change.

References:

Aiyar, S., Calomiris, C. W., & Wieladek, T. (2014). Does macro-prudential regulation leak? Evidence from a UK policy experiment. Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, 46(s1), 181-214.

Avdjiev, S., Gambacorta, L., Goldberg, L. S., & Schiaffi, S. (2020). The shifting drivers of global liquidity. Journal of International Economics, 125, 103324.

Behn, M., Rancoita, E., & Rodriguez d'Acri, C. (2020). Macroprudential capital buffers–objectives and usability. Macroprudential Bulletin, 11.

Borio, C. (2003). Towards a macroprudential framework for financial supervision and regulation?. CESifo Economic Studies, 49(2), 181-215.

Borio, C. (2014). The financial cycle and macroeconomics: What have we learnt?. Journal of banking & finance, 45, 182-198.

Bruno, V., Shim, I., & Shin, H. S. (2017). Comparative assessment of macroprudential policies. Journal of Financial Stability, 28, 183-202.

Buch, C. M., Bussiere, M., Goldberg, L., & Hills, R. (2019). The international transmission of monetary policy. Journal of International Money and Finance, 91, 29-48.

Cerutti, E., Claessens, S., & Laeven, L. (2017). The use and effectiveness of macroprudential policies: New evidence. Journal of financial stability, 28, 203-224.

Claessens, S., Ghosh, S. R., & Mihet, R. (2013). Macro-prudential policies to mitigate financial system vulnerabilities. Journal of International Money and Finance, 39, 153-185.

Claessens, S., & Valencia, F. (2013). The interaction of monetary and macroprudential policies. IMF Working Paper No. 13/235.

Haldane, A. G., & May, R. M. (2011). Systemic risk in banking ecosystems. Nature, 469(7330), 351-355.

Houston, J. F., Lin, C., & Ma, Y. (2012). Regulatory arbitrage and international bank flows. The Journal of Finance, 67(5), 1845-1895.

Galati, G., & Moessner, R. (2013). Macroprudential policy–a literature review. Journal of Economic Surveys, 27(5), 846-878.

Farhi, E., & Tirole, J. (2012). Collective moral hazard, maturity mismatch, and systemic bailouts. American Economic Review, 102(1), 60-93.

Haldane, A. G., Aikman, D., Kapadia, S., & Hinterschweiger, M. (2017). Rethinking financial stability. Peterson Institute for International Economics, October 12th, mimeo.

King, M. R. (2013). The Basel III net stable funding ratio and bank net interest margins. Journal of Banking & Finance, 37(11), 4144-4156.

Kuttner, K. N., & Shim, I. (2016). Can non-interest rate policies stabilize housing markets? Evidence from a panel of 57 economies. Journal of financial stability, 26, 31-44.

Mitrache, M. D., Spulbar, L. F., & Mitrache, L. A. (2024). The Influence of AI Technology in Stimulating Growth and Innovation in Business. Revista de Ştiinţe Politice, (81), 51–61.

Moldovan, N. C., Spulbar, C., Ene, S. M., & Racataian, R. I. (2025). An Empirical Analysis of the Interdependencies Between Investment, Economic Growth, and Fiscal Performance: Evidence from Romania. Studies in Business and Economics, 20(1), 340-373.

Ongena, S., Popov, A., & Udell, G. F. (2013). "When the cat's away the mice will play": Does regulation at home affect bank risk-taking abroad?. Journal of Financial Economics, 108(3), 727-750.

Rey, H. (2015). Dilemma not trilemma: the global financial cycle and monetary policy independence (No. w21162). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Spulbar, C. (2008). Banking Management. Sitech, Craiova, Romania.

Spulbar, L. F., & Mitrache, L. A. (2025). How humans and AI can thrive together in the workplace? Revista de Științe Politice, (86), 274–287.

Spulbar, L. F. (2025). Legal frameworks for AI-driven markets and their challenges and opportunities in the digital economy. Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques, (86), 288–305.

Vestergaard, J., & Gabor, D. (2021). Central Banks Caught Between Market Liquidity and Fiscal Disciplining: A Money View Perspective on Collateral Policy. Institute for New Economic Thinking Working Paper Series, (170).

*** – International Monetary Fund. (2020): https://www.imf.org/-/media/Files/Publications/DP/2023/English/MPEEOQEA.ashx

*** – Financial Stability Board. (2015): https://www.fsb.org/2015/11/standards-and-processes-for-global-securities-financing-data-collection-and-aggregation-3/

Article Info

Received: July 01 2025
Accepted: August 10 2025

How to cite this article:
Cinciulescu, D. (2025). The role of macroprudential regulation in global financial stability. *Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques,* no. 87, pp. 85-97.