Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques • No. 87 • 2025: 98 – 109

ORIGINAL PAPER

The evolution of derivative markets in the post-crisis era

Elena Carmen Fulga[1)]

Abstract:
The financial crisis of 2008 triggered a paradigm shift in derivative markets, leading to extensive regulatory reforms, structural changes, and evolving risk management practices. This paper examines the evolution of derivative markets in the post-crisis era, focusing on key developments in regulatory frameworks, market participants' behavior, and the role of financial innovation in enhancing market stability.
A primary area of analysis is the implementation of post-crisis regulatory measures, including the Dodd-Frank Act in the United States, the European Market Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR), and Basel III capital requirements. These regulations have reshaped the landscape of over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives by promoting central clearing, increasing transparency, and imposing stricter capital and collateral requirements. We assess the effectiveness of these measures in mitigating systemic risks and enhancing market resilience.
Furthermore, the paper explores the shift from bilateral trading to centrally cleared and exchange-traded derivatives, analyzing its impact on market liquidity, pricing efficiency, and counterparty risk. The role of financial technology (FinTech) and automation in improving trading efficiency, reducing operational risks, and fostering market access is also discussed.
Using case studies, we evaluate how derivative markets have adapted to regulatory changes while continuing to serve as essential tools for hedging, speculation, and risk management. Findings indicate that while reforms have reduced systemic vulnerabilities, challenges such as market fragmentation, increased compliance costs, and unintended liquidity constraints persist.

Keywords: *derivative markets, financial crisis, systemic risk, OTC derivatives, FinTech, market stability.*

[1)] PhD Student, University of Craiova, Doctoral School of Economics Sciences „Eugeniu Carada", Finance specialization, Craiova, Romania, Email: carmen.elena.fulga@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The global financial crisis that erupted in 2008 marked a turning point in modern economic history, shaking the foundations of international markets and exposing deep vulnerabilities within the financial system. Among the complex web of instruments and institutions that contributed to the crisis, derivative products occupied a particularly controversial and prominent role. While not the root cause, the proliferation of opaque, unregulated over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives (especially credit default swaps and structured credit products) amplified the transmission of risk across institutions and borders, revealing how intertwined and fragile the architecture of global finance had become. The magnitude of systemic exposure, combined with a lack of transparency and insufficient collateralization, allowed relatively isolated defaults to escalate into a global liquidity freeze.

Derivatives have long been essential tools in the financial ecosystem, serving as instruments for hedging, speculation, and risk transfer. Spulbar (2006) conceptualizes derivative financial instruments as contracts whose valuation is contingent upon the fluctuations of one or more underlying assets or reference variables, such as stock market indices, interest rates, exchange rates, or the market value of equities and fixed-income securities. Their ability to synthetically create exposures or hedge against volatility has made them indispensable to institutions ranging from multinational banks to commodity traders and institutional investors. However, the pre-crisis environment, characterized by exponential growth in the notional value of derivatives and weak oversight mechanisms, fostered a buildup of hidden leverage and interdependencies that many regulators and market participants failed to fully grasp. When major counterparties such as Lehman Brothers collapsed, the uncertainty surrounding derivatives exposures exacerbated the loss of trust that paralyzed markets.

In the aftermath of the crisis, regulators and policymakers around the world launched an ambitious agenda of financial reform aimed at reducing systemic risk and increasing market stability. Central to these efforts were measures specifically targeting derivative markets. Landmark regulatory frameworks such as the Dodd-Frank Act in the United States, the European Market Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR) in the European Union, and the Basel III global banking standards were introduced to strengthen oversight, enforce central clearing, enhance transparency, and impose stricter capital and collateral requirements on financial institutions engaging in derivatives trading. These reforms significantly altered the landscape of derivatives markets, transforming both the infrastructure of trading and the behavior of participants.

Yet the evolution of derivative markets in the post-crisis era cannot be fully understood through regulation alone. Market dynamics, technological innovation, and shifting strategic priorities among institutions have all played critical roles in reshaping how derivatives are designed, traded, and utilized. As trading platforms became increasingly digitized and sophisticated, the integration of financial technology (FinTech) began to redefine efficiency, risk management, and market access. New tools for automation, real-time analytics, and collateral optimization emerged, enabling more agile and transparent trading environments while also introducing novel challenges related to cybersecurity, algorithmic risk, and the resilience of market infrastructure.

Against this backdrop, a broader narrative has unfolded one that traces not just the regulatory tightening in response to crisis, but also the resilience and adaptability of a market that continues to fulfill vital economic functions despite undergoing structural upheaval. Derivative markets have demonstrated both vulnerability and vitality, revealing

how deeply financial innovation is intertwined with systemic risk and stability. The changes that followed 2008 reshaped the contours of risk transfer, redefined the boundaries of financial intermediation, and opened new debates on the future of regulation in an increasingly digitalized financial world.

This evolution offers rich insights not only into the technical transformation of markets but also into the shifting ethos of financial regulation, innovation, and global cooperation. The derivative market of today, while more regulated and transparent, must still navigate the complex terrain of fragmented jurisdictions, technological acceleration, and persistent questions about the unintended consequences of reform. As a critical node in the financial system, it continues to serve as both a mirror and a lever of the broader forces shaping modern finance.

2. Derivative markets before and after the crisis

The dramatic rupture caused by the global financial crisis of 2008 cannot be fully grasped without examining the structure and function of derivative markets before and after the event. These markets, which had experienced exponential growth in both volume and sophistication in the preceding decades, evolved in an environment marked by rapid financial innovation, light regulatory oversight, and increasing interconnectedness among global financial institutions. The contrast between the pre-crisis expansion and post-crisis reconstruction reveals the fundamental shifts in market philosophy, regulation, and risk management. Understanding this transformation requires a detailed look into how the system operated before the crisis, what vulnerabilities emerged, and how the regulatory and institutional landscape was reconfigured in its aftermath.

2.1 The derivatives market before the crisis

In the decades leading up to the 2008 financial crisis, derivative markets underwent a phase of remarkable expansion. Driven by liberalization, technological innovation, and increased demand for risk management instruments, these markets evolved from their relatively modest beginnings into complex, global networks of financial claims. By 2007, the notional value of outstanding OTC derivatives had surged to over $600 trillion, dwarfing the size of global GDP and equity markets. Much of this growth occurred in the absence of comprehensive regulation, particularly in OTC markets where contracts were negotiated privately and outside the purview of centralized exchanges.

The opacity of OTC derivatives, especially credit default swaps (CDS), played a central role in amplifying systemic vulnerabilities. As argued by Stulz (2010), the rise of OTC derivatives created a parallel banking system, one in which risk was dispersed in a way that evaded traditional regulatory scrutiny. The lack of central clearing mechanisms and real-time trade reporting made it nearly impossible to track exposures across institutions. Counterparty risk, previously confined to isolated defaults, became a system-wide concern once major institutions like Lehman Brothers and AIG became entangled in a web of contingent liabilities.

The attractiveness of derivatives in this era was not merely speculative. They offered sophisticated tools for managing credit, interest rate, and currency risks. Structured finance products such as collateralized debt obligations (CDOs) were heralded as innovative solutions for distributing risk. However, the belief in diversification and risk-

transfer efficiency often masked the reality of hidden leverage and poor asset quality. Gorton and Metrick (2012) describe how the securitization chain, closely tied to derivatives markets created an illusion of liquidity and safety that rapidly unraveled under stress.

The regulatory environment of the time reflected a deep trust in market discipline and self-regulation. In the U.S., instruments like CDS were explicitly excluded from regulation under the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000. The prevailing doctrine, reinforced by influential voices like Greenspan and Summers, favored innovation over intervention. This deregulatory stance was compounded by the difficulty regulators faced in understanding or overseeing the bespoke nature of OTC contracts, which lacked standardization and central visibility.

From a systemic perspective, the pre-crisis structure of the derivatives market can be seen as a highly interdependent, non-transparent network with limited shock absorption capacity. Brunnermeier and Pedersen (2009) highlight the phenomenon of liquidity spirals, wherein declining asset values and margin calls forced leveraged institutions to unwind positions, further depressing market values. In such an environment, derivatives not only failed to buffer shocks they transmitted and magnified them.

The picture that emerges from this pre-crisis era is one of innovation unmoored from robust risk management, supported by a regulatory philosophy that underestimated the potential for cascading failures. The derivatives market functioned efficiently during periods of stability but lacked the resilience to contain stress once confidence eroded. Its architecture, built on bilateral trust and complexity, proved fatally fragile when faced with systemic uncertainty.

2.2 The derivatives market after the crisis

The financial crisis of 2008 served as a global wake-up call, exposing systemic vulnerabilities that had accumulated over years of unchecked market expansion and regulatory leniency. In response, the post-crisis period ushered in a sweeping wave of reforms aimed at reengineering the architecture of derivative markets. This transformation was not merely cosmetic; it altered the very fabric of financial intermediation by redefining the rules of engagement, the institutions involved, and the underlying logic of risk management. The guiding imperative was clear: prevent a recurrence of the opacity and fragility that had made the crisis so devastating.

One of the most defining changes was the move toward central clearing. Previously, OTC derivatives were traded bilaterally, relying on the creditworthiness and risk assessment of counterparties. This model proved catastrophically flawed when systemic counterparties defaulted, triggering a contagion of uncertainty. Central Counterparties (CCPs) emerged as mandated intermediaries, especially for standardized derivatives, following the G20 Pittsburgh Summit in 2009. Their purpose was to absorb and mutualize counterparty risk while increasing visibility into positions and exposures across the market. Duffie and Zhu (2011) underscore the value of CCPs in mitigating default risk but caution against the concentration of risk within these clearinghouses themselves.

Regulatory frameworks such as the Dodd-Frank Act in the United States and the European Market Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR) in the European Union institutionalized this shift. These reforms mandated not only central clearing for standardized products but also comprehensive trade reporting, margin requirements for

uncleared derivatives, and higher capital reserves for derivative exposures. As Heller and Vause (2012) argue, while these rules enhanced transparency and stability, they also introduced operational complexities and increased collateral demands that strained market participants, particularly smaller institutions.

Simultaneously, international standards like Basel III imposed more stringent capital and liquidity requirements on banks, especially regarding their derivative exposures. These adjustments fundamentally altered how banks manage trading desks, calculate counterparty credit risk, and allocate capital across business lines. The goal was to internalize the costs of systemic risk by ensuring that institutions hold enough capital to absorb losses, thereby breaking the "too big to fail" feedback loop. The effectiveness of these regulatory layers continues to be a subject of academic scrutiny, with debates centered on their long-term impact on market liquidity and innovation.

In Eastern European contexts, including Romania, similar dynamics unfolded in parallel with global regulatory trends. Studies such as Spulbar and Ene (2024) provide an empirical perspective on how macroeconomic variables interact with financial market dynamics in the region. Their findings reveal that while Romania's financial system did not mirror the complexity of global hubs, the country experienced notable shifts in derivative usage, market transparency, and risk pricing following the crisis. These structural adaptations reflected both external regulatory pressure and domestic efforts to align with EU-wide standards.

The legacy of under-regulated markets in post-communist countries meant that reforms had to address not only technical compliance but also institutional capacity and investor confidence. In this context, comparative banking analyses such as those by Spulbăr and Niţoi (2012) illustrate the heterogeneous nature of regulatory absorption across jurisdictions. Their work points to structural inefficiencies and differences in supervisory regimes that complicate the implementation of uniform standards, particularly in smaller financial markets.

A broader perspective on the evolution of financial systems post-crisis is offered by Stanciu and Spulbăr (2024), who emphasize that while reforms have enhanced financial system robustness, they have also introduced new challenges. Chief among these are compliance burdens, regulatory fragmentation, and unintended consequences such as reduced market-making capacity and increased costs of hedging. These trade-offs highlight the tension between market safety and market efficiency, a core dilemma in modern financial regulation.

Academic literature has also focused on how market behavior has adjusted to these reforms. For example, Acharya and Richardson (2009) explore the disincentives created by pre-crisis capital structures and contrast them with more disciplined post-crisis frameworks. Meanwhile, Gregory (2014) analyze the impact of mandatory clearing on liquidity and find mixed results, particularly in less liquid instruments where clearing fees and collateral costs can outweigh the benefits of centralization.

What emerges from this period is a transformed derivative market, one that is more transparent, better capitalized, and less reliant on opaque bilateral agreements. However, the price of this transformation includes heightened operational complexity, collateral scarcity, and a growing reliance on central institutions whose own resilience has yet to be tested under conditions of extreme systemic stress. While the regulatory scaffolding has undoubtedly reduced tail-risk events, the overall ecosystem remains exposed to new vulnerabilities born of interconnectivity, digitalization, and geopolitical instability.

The post-crisis reconstruction of derivative markets can thus be seen not as a final destination, but as an evolving process, a recalibration of market structure, regulatory philosophy, and technological integration that continues to unfold. In this new landscape, the challenge is not only to manage known risks, but to anticipate and adapt to those emerging from a financial system in constant flux.

3. Invariants and innovations: market function, FinTech, and digitalization

Despite the deep structural reforms and technological transformations that followed the 2008 financial crisis, the fundamental functions of derivative markets have shown remarkable continuity. Their role in hedging risk, facilitating price discovery, and enhancing market liquidity has endured across different regulatory regimes and market architectures. These core functions (often referred to as financial invariants) underscore the enduring economic rationale for derivatives, even in the face of volatility, uncertainty, and structural change.

In both pre- and post-crisis environments, derivatives have acted as crucial tools for managing exposure to interest rates, foreign exchange fluctuations, commodity price volatility, and credit risk. Their effectiveness in performing these functions lies in their flexibility, standardization in liquid markets, and customization in more complex OTC contexts. As Hull (2017) argues, while the instruments themselves have evolved, the foundational purpose of derivatives remains consistent: they offer market participants the means to transfer risk to those better equipped or more willing to bear it. This transference does not eliminate risk but redistributes it in ways that, when properly managed, can enhance systemic stability.

Even amid sweeping regulatory reforms, empirical studies have found that market participants have continued to rely on derivatives for hedging and speculation. According to Cecchetti, Gyntelberg, and Hollanders (2009), the economic necessity of derivatives as risk transfer mechanisms remained strong after the crisis, with market participants simply adjusting their strategies to align with new capital, margin, and transparency requirements. Thus, what changed was not the rationale for using derivatives but the infrastructure through which they were traded and managed.

However, the post-crisis environment also introduced a paradigm shift in how these invariants are executed. The integration of digital financial technologies, ranging from algorithmic trading systems to distributed ledger technologies (DLT), has significantly altered the operational landscape. New forms of financial instruments, particularly digital financial assets such as tokenized securities and crypto-derivatives, are increasingly woven into the broader derivatives ecosystem. These digital innovations not only offer new ways to express traditional financial exposures but also challenge the conventional boundaries of regulation and risk modeling.

Recent academic literature has begun to explore the implications of digital asset integration into portfolio and derivative management. Popescu and Spulbar (2025) present a rigorous analysis of how financial digital assets influence the modeling of financial risk, particularly in the context of diversified investment portfolios. Their study highlights that while digital assets introduce new forms of volatility, they also offer unique hedging opportunities when appropriately incorporated into structured financial products. The authors argue for enhanced risk models that reflect the hybrid nature of modern portfolios where traditional instruments coexist with blockchain-based assets under shared exposure frameworks.

This convergence of traditional and digital finance has important implications for derivatives. First, it expands the universe of underlying assets, enabling the creation of synthetic exposures to cryptocurrencies, tokenized commodities, and decentralized finance protocols. Second, it necessitates a rethinking of collateralization and settlement mechanisms. With smart contracts enabling real-time margin adjustments and decentralized clearing possibilities, the derivative market's operational foundation is undergoing a subtle but potentially revolutionary evolution.

Nonetheless, the adoption of digital technologies in derivatives is not without complications. As emphasized by Zetzsche, Buckley, and Arner (2020), regulatory fragmentation and uncertainty around digital asset classification pose significant challenges. Market infrastructure must evolve to ensure that innovations do not undermine the transparency and security gains achieved in the aftermath of the global financial crisis. Additionally, the increasing reliance on technology raises new operational risks cybersecurity threats, software vulnerabilities, and systemic dependencies on digital service providers that were largely absent from earlier regulatory frameworks.

Another key concern relates to the interoperability of regulatory regimes, particularly as digital asset derivatives are often traded across borders on platforms that escape national jurisdiction. This raises important questions about regulatory arbitrage, enforcement capability, and the integrity of global financial oversight. In a rapidly digitizing marketplace, the constancy of derivatives' economic purpose must be balanced against the fluidity of their technological execution and legal categorization.

The resilience of derivative market invariants through such a dynamic period reflects their deep entrenchment in financial logic. However, the arrival of digital finance especially in the form of blockchain-enabled instruments, has introduced an additional layer of complexity that future regulatory, technological, and theoretical frameworks must address. The preservation of these invariants amid digital transformation depends not only on the robustness of technological infrastructure but also on the clarity and coordination of global financial governance.

As derivative markets have evolved in the post-crisis era, automation and artificial intelligence (AI) have become increasingly embedded in the market's structural fabric. While the underlying purposes of derivatives (hedging, speculation, and risk transfer) have remained constant, the methods by which trades are executed, risks are assessed, and portfolios are managed have undergone a significant transformation. Automation and AI are no longer ancillary tools; they are central to the market's functioning, reshaping everything from pricing models and risk analytics to trade execution and regulatory compliance.

High-frequency trading (HFT) systems, algorithmic execution engines, and real-time data analytics have become standard components of modern derivative markets. These technologies enable traders to analyze massive datasets instantaneously, execute complex arbitrage strategies, and react to market signals in milliseconds. As Biais, Foucault, and Moinas (2015) note, algorithmic trading has contributed to increased market liquidity and pricing efficiency, especially in standardized derivatives. However, they also highlight the growing risks of market instability due to algorithmic interactions and feedback loops that can cause flash crashes or unexpected volatility bursts.

The rise of AI extends these capabilities by incorporating machine learning techniques for predictive modeling, adaptive strategy development, and behavioral pattern recognition. Financial institutions increasingly rely on AI for managing derivative portfolios, calibrating pricing models, and forecasting market movements with a level of

nuance that traditional statistical approaches struggle to achieve. According to Su et al. (2025), machine learning models have demonstrated superior performance in derivatives pricing, particularly for complex instruments with nonlinear payoff structures and high-dimensional input spaces.

Yet the deployment of AI in financial markets raises profound legal and ethical questions, particularly around accountability, transparency, and systemic risk. These concerns are explored in depth by Spulbar (2025), who analyzes the legal frameworks emerging around AI-driven financial markets. The study emphasizes that while AI offers efficiency gains and predictive precision, it also poses unique regulatory challenges. Traditional financial regulation assumes human agency and rational decision-making, but AI systems operate through probabilistic logic and data-driven inference, often in ways that are not easily interpretable or auditable.

One of the critical tensions in this space lies in the balance between innovation and oversight. The rapid deployment of AI systems in derivatives trading must be matched by regulatory frameworks capable of understanding and mitigating the new types of risk they introduce. As Spulbar and Mitrache (2025) argue, the integration of AI into decision-making systems requires a rethinking of human-machine collaboration. Their analysis suggests that rather than seeking to displace human oversight, AI should be embedded within a governance architecture that preserves human judgment, ethical reasoning, and institutional accountability.

From a market infrastructure perspective, automation has also changed the architecture of trading venues and clearing systems. Smart contracts and blockchain-based settlement protocols are being tested as alternatives to traditional post-trade processes. These technologies promise faster, more transparent, and tamper-resistant mechanisms for confirming and settling derivative contracts. According to Gatteschi et al. (2018), the use of distributed ledger technology (DLT) in derivatives clearing could significantly reduce counterparty risk and reconciliation costs, though operational scalability and regulatory harmonization remain open challenges.

However, reliance on automated systems introduces new forms of operational and cyber risk. The interconnectedness of digital platforms creates pathways for disruption, whether from software glitches, malicious attacks, or systemic dependencies on single points of failure. In the context of derivatives markets, where precision and timing are paramount, such disruptions can lead to large-scale market dislocations. As emphasized by IOSCO (2021), effective oversight of automated trading systems must include robust stress-testing protocols, audit trails, and incident response strategies that account for both technical and behavioral variables.

The transformation of derivative markets through automation and AI is not merely technological it is institutional and conceptual. It challenges long-held assumptions about market behavior, regulatory design, and the role of human judgment. As financial systems grow more algorithmically intensive, the capacity to understand, guide, and regulate these systems will become a defining task for both policymakers and market participants. The future of derivatives trading will likely hinge not just on technological advancement, but on the ability to harmonize speed, complexity, and accountability in a coherent regulatory and ethical framework.

4. Case studies

The post-crisis transformation of derivative markets cannot be fully grasped without examining how these systemic changes materialized in practice. While regulatory reforms, technological innovations, and structural shifts provide the framework, the operational reality of market adaptation emerges most clearly through empirical case studies. These cases reflect how specific instruments, regions, and institutional actors navigated the new financial terrain shaped by reform mandates, liquidity constraints, and digitization.

Among the most telling examples is the evolution of interest rate swaps (IRS), which prior to the crisis were predominantly traded in bilateral OTC markets. Following the implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act and EMIR, these instruments were among the first to be subjected to mandatory central clearing. The result was a profound shift in trade execution and post-trade infrastructure. According to a study by Loon and Zhong (2014), the introduction of clearing requirements improved price transparency and narrowed bid-ask spreads in cleared interest rate swaps, indicating enhanced liquidity and reduced information asymmetry. However, this came at the cost of increased collateral demands, affecting the capital efficiency of smaller market participants.

Similarly, credit default swaps (CDS) (a central villain in the 2008 narrative) underwent considerable changes. Prior to the crisis, CDS markets were characterized by opacity and a lack of standardized documentation, leading to cascading uncertainty when major institutions like Lehman Brothers defaulted. Post-crisis, centralized clearing for index CDS became widespread, and trade reporting was instituted to enhance transparency. Yet empirical evidence remains mixed. As observed by Markit data and studies such as those by Fontana and Scheicher (2016), while transparency has improved, liquidity in certain CDS segments has thinned due to the exit of smaller dealers and rising compliance burdens. The centralization of risk in clearinghouses also remains a point of concern, particularly in stress scenarios where CCPs themselves could become transmission mechanisms rather than shock absorbers.

Another pertinent example involves commodity derivatives, particularly in energy and agricultural markets. The regulatory push toward central clearing and standardized contracts has not always aligned well with the hedging needs of commercial participants, many of whom rely on customized OTC derivatives. Haigh, Hranaiova, and Overdahl (2012) observe that while exchange-traded futures have seen increased volumes post-crisis, the reduced availability of customized hedging tools has exposed end-users to basis risk and decreased risk-management precision. The challenge here lies in balancing systemic safety with the functional diversity that real-economy actors require.

More recently, the emergence of crypto-derivatives (such as bitcoin futures and options) has introduced a novel asset class into the derivatives landscape, testing both regulatory regimes and risk modeling frameworks. Platforms like CME and Binance now offer standardized derivatives on highly volatile digital assets, raising questions about their role in portfolio diversification, systemic stability, and regulatory perimeter expansion. Corbet, Lucey, and Yarovaya (2019) analyze the behavior of crypto-derivatives and find that their volatility profiles differ substantially from traditional assets, necessitating alternative approaches to margining and risk assessment. The lack of globally harmonized regulation in this space compounds operational risks, particularly given the 24/7 nature of crypto markets and their high sensitivity to news events and social sentiment.

The case of emerging markets, particularly in Eastern Europe, offers further insight into how national financial systems have integrated post-crisis reforms. Romania serves as a valuable case study, with its gradual alignment to European standards under

EMIR and Basel III, and the parallel development of local clearing infrastructure. As highlighted in the empirical work by Spulbar and Ene (2024), the Romanian financial market has seen increased derivative activity post-crisis, though challenges related to market depth, liquidity, and institutional capacity persist. Regulatory harmonization has improved systemic visibility, but the scale of the market still limits the extent to which global risk management tools can be applied locally with full effectiveness.

Case studies also reveal the unintended consequences of well-intentioned reforms. The compression of bank profitability due to higher capital requirements and stricter collateral rules has led some institutions to retreat from market-making functions in less liquid derivative segments. Duffie et al., (2011) points to a growing concern that liquidity, once assumed to be a natural byproduct of trading activity, is now more fragile and episodic. Market fragmentation has also become a critical issue, with global banks needing to navigate overlapping and sometimes conflicting regulatory obligations across jurisdictions.

Yet adaptation is not a one-way path of constraint. Many institutions have leveraged financial technology to overcome regulatory frictions. Smart order routing, collateral optimization algorithms, and real-time risk analytics have allowed major players to thrive even in this more constrained environment. Moreover, the integration of AI-driven systems into trade surveillance and compliance monitoring, as noted by Spulbar and Mitrache (2025), suggests that technology may not only enable regulatory compliance but may actively enhance the resilience and efficiency of derivative markets in the long term.

Ultimately, these case studies underscore the complexity of financial reform and adaptation. They reveal that while systemic risk has been mitigated through greater standardization, clearing, and oversight, the market has had to sacrifice some flexibility, diversity, and spontaneity in return. These examples also suggest that adaptation is uneven, shaped by regional infrastructure, institutional capacity, and the balance between global rules and local realities.

The evolution of derivative markets is thus best understood not solely through macro-level analysis but through these detailed vignettes, which reveal how institutions, instruments, and infrastructures have interacted with a shifting regulatory, technological, and economic landscape. From IRS to crypto-options, from emerging markets to clearinghouses, these case studies provide a granular view of resilience, constraint, and innovation in the post-crisis world.

5. Conculsion

The evolution of derivative markets in the post-crisis era tells a story of transformation, resilience, and recalibration. What began as a response to the systemic failures of 2008 has unfolded into a redefinition of how global finance understands and manages risk. Regulatory reforms, once seen as corrective measures, have now become embedded in the market's structure, shaping the behavior of participants and the architecture of transactions. Central clearing, heightened transparency, and stricter capital requirements have reoriented the landscape, not without cost, but with a clear intent to foster stability and trust.

Yet the enduring functions of derivatives (risk transfer, hedging, speculation) have not disappeared. Instead, they have been reshaped, retooled, and in some cases digitized. Technological innovation, especially through automation and artificial intelligence, has opened new avenues for efficiency and insight, even as it introduces fresh

challenges and vulnerabilities. The convergence of digital assets, smart contracts, and real-time analytics has extended the boundaries of what a derivative can represent and how it can operate, blurring the lines between traditional finance and emerging ecosystems.

Case studies across asset classes and regions reveal that adaptation has not been uniform. Some instruments have thrived under new conditions, while others have diminished in liquidity or accessibility. Institutions have innovated, restructured, or withdrawn, depending on their ability to absorb regulatory change and technological disruption. Even as global markets align around shared principles, fragmentation, complexity, and regional disparities remain part of the equation.

Despite all this evolution, one constant has persisted: the human drive to manage uncertainty through structured financial instruments. In that sense, the story of derivatives is not only about reform or innovation, it is about the deep and evolving relationship between finance and the future. Markets continue to adapt because the world continues to change, and the tools we use to navigate risk must reflect that.

So as the financial system continues to digitize, and as new instruments emerge with unprecedented speed, we might ask ourselves: in a world where algorithms negotiate risk and value in milliseconds, who, or what, will shape the next crisis before it begins?

References:

Acharya, V. V., & Richardson, M. P. (Eds.). (2009). *Restoring financial stability: how to repair a failed system*. John Wiley & Sons.

Biais, B., Foucault, T., & Moinas, S. (2015). Equilibrium fast trading. *Journal of Financial economics*, 116(2), 292-313.

Brunnermeier, M. K., & Pedersen, L. H. (2009). Market liquidity and funding liquidity. *The review of financial studies*, 22(6), 2201-2238.

Cecchetti, S. G., Gyntelberg, J., & Hollanders, M. (2009). Central counterparties for over-the-counter derivatives. *BIS Quarterly Review*, September.

Corbet, S., Lucey, B. M., & Yarovaya, L. (2019). The financial market effects of cryptocurrency energy usage. Available at SSRN 3412194.

Duffie, D., & Zhu, H. (2011). Does a central clearing counterparty reduce counterparty risk?. *The Review of Asset Pricing Studies*, 1(1), 74-95.

Fontana, A., & Scheicher, M. (2016). An analysis of euro area sovereign CDS and their relation with government bonds. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 62, 126-140.

Gatteschi, V., Lamberti, F., Demartini, C., Pranteda, C., & Santamaría, V. (2018). Blockchain and smart contracts for insurance: Is the technology mature enough?. *Future internet*, 10(2), 20.

Gorton, G., & Metrick, A. (2012). Securitized banking and the run on repo. *Journal of Financial economics*, 104(3), 425-451.

Gregory, J. (2014). *Central counterparties: mandatory central clearing and initial margin requirements for OTC derivatives*. John Wiley & Sons.

Haigh, M. S., Hranaiova, J., & Overdahl, J. A. (2005). Price dynamics, price discovery and large futures trader interactions in the energy complex.

Heller, D., & Vause, N. (2012). Collateral requirements for mandatory central clearing of over-the-counter derivatives.

Hull, J. C., & Basu, S. (2016). *Options, futures, and other derivatives*. Pearson Education India.

Loon, Y. C., & Zhong, Z. K. (2014). The impact of central clearing on counterparty risk, liquidity, and trading: Evidence from the credit default swap market. *Journal of*

Financial Economics, 112(1), 91-115.
Spulbar, C. (2006). Derivative Financial Instruments. Universitaria, Craiova, Romania.
Popescu, A., & Spulbar, C. (2025). Financial Digital Assets and the Financial Risk Modeling of Portfolio Investments. *IGI Global*, DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-8120-5
Spulbar, C., & Ene, C. C. (2024). The Empirical Approach of the Interplay of the Macroeconomic Variables and the Dynamics of the Financial Market in Romania. *Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques*, 82, 55–69.
Spulbar, C., & Nitoi, M. (2012). *Sisteme bancare comparate* [Comparative analysis of baking systems]. Sitech, Craiova, Romania.
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.
Spulbar, L. F., & Mitrache, L. A. (2025). How humans and AI can thrive together in the workplace? *Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques*, 86, 274–287.
Stanciu, C. V., & Spulbar, A. C. (2024). Characteristics of Modern Financial Systems. Evolutions and Challenges. *Young Economists Journal*, 21(43).
Stulz, R. M. (2010). "Credit Default Swaps and the Credit Crisis." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24(1), 73–92
Su, Y., Yin, D., Zhao, X., Hu, T., & Liu, L. (2025). Exploration of Advanced Applications of Triboelectric Nanogenerator-Based Self-Powered Sensors in the Era of Artificial Intelligence. *Sensors*, 25(8), 2520.
Zetzsche, D. A., Buckley, R. P., & Arner, D. W. (2019). *Regulating LIBRA: The transformative potential of Facebook's cryptocurrency and possible regulatory responses.*
*** - IOSCO (2021). Market Fragmentation & Cross-Border Regulation. International Organization of Securities Commissions: https://www.iosco.org/annual_reports/2021/pdf/annualReport2021.pdf

Article Info

Received: June 30 2025
Accepted: July 30 2025

How to cite this article:
Fulga, E.C., (2025). The evolution of derivative markets in the post-crisis era. *Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques,* no. 87/2025, pp. 98-109