Corporate Liquidity Management under Moral Hazard*

Barney Hartman-Glaser† Simon Mayer‡ Konstantin Milbradt§

May 3, 2019

Abstract

We present a model of liquidity management and financing decisions under moral hazard in which a firm accumulates cash to forestall liquidity default. When the cash balance is high, a tension arises between accumulating more cash to reduce the probability of default and providing incentives for the manager. When the cash balance is low, the firm hedges against liquidity default by transferring cash flow risk to the manager via high powered incentives. Under mild moral hazard, firms with more volatile cash flows tend to transfer less risk to the manager and hold more cash. In contrast, under severe moral hazard, an increase in cash-flow volatility exacerbates agency cost, thereby reducing firm value, overall hedging and in particular precautionary cash-holdings. Agency conflicts lead to endogenous, state-dependent refinancing costs related to the severity of the moral hazard problem. Financially constrained firms pay low wages and instead promise the manager large rewards in case of successful refinancing.

*We thank Simon Board, Sebastian Gryglewicz, Julien Hugonnier, Erwan Morellec, and Adriano Rampini for useful comments. We also thank seminar audiences at University of Houston, EPFL, Kellogg Northwestern, Toulouse School of Economics, and Copenhagen Business School. A previous version of this paper was circulated under the title "Cash and Dynamic Agency".

†UCLA Anderson. E-mail: bhglaser@anderson.ucla.edu

‡Erasmus University Rotterdam. E-mail: mayer@ese.eur.nl.

§Northwestern University and NBER. E-mail: milbradt@northwestern.edu

1 Introduction

When a firm has limited access to capital markets, it must accumulate liquidity, for example, a cash balance, to cover negative cash flow shocks. At the same time, such balances can exacerbate agency conflicts as they serve as a larger pool of cash from which management can divert (as argued in Jensen (1986)). We introduce a model in which a firm's shareholders face a trade-off between accumulating cash to prevent liquidity default and optimally providing incentives for the firm's risk-averse manager to return cash to shareholders accurately. These shareholders have limited liability, cannot transfer cash into the firm after inception, and have only occasional refinancing opportunities. As a consequence, they hedge against liquidity based default by optimally managing internal cash balances.

In our model, the manager of the firm can inefficiently divert from the firm's flow and stock of cash and therefore requires incentives. The manager has constant absolute risk averse (CARA) preferences, while the shareholders are risk neutral. Nevertheless, due to the potential for liquidity default, the shareholders are effectively risk averse over the cash stock of the firm. As such, the contracting problem between the shareholders and the manager features two forces that shape the sensitivity of the manager's pay to the performance of the firm. When the firm is far from liquidity default, the manager is more risk-averse than the shareholders, and incentive provision determines the manager's optimal exposure to cash flow shocks. When the firm is close to default, the shareholders are effectively more risk averse than the manager, and the optimal contract will give the manager high-powered incentives, that is incentives above what is required to prevent cash diversion. These high-powered incentives essentially hedge the risk of liquidity default.

Our assumption that investors cannot costlessly transfer cash into the firm introduces a novel restriction on the promise-keeping constraint in the standard dynamic principal-agent model (for example, DeMarzo and Sannikov (2006)). Specifically, only cash within the firm and incentive compatible promises of raising cash given the opportunity can be used to fulfill the promised value to the manager. Thus, the firm's cash balance is a commitment device that serves as collateral for the promise of future payments to the manager. In the extreme case where raising additional funds is impossible, only promises that are sufficiently collateralized by cash fulfill the promise-keeping constraint. As a consequence, our model suggests an interaction between moral hazard and optimal cash-holdings. Reminiscent of Jensen (1986), more cash exacerbates agency conflicts. This effect, in turn, requires stronger incentives, also using deferred compensation. However, in order to make a credible commitment to the deferred compensation package, the firm must hold even more cash, which again amplifies moral hazard.

Under the optimal contract, negative cash-flow shocks not only reduce the firm's cash position but also lower the present value of compensation the firm owes to the manager. While the manager requires some minimum level of incentives to abstain from cash flow diversion, the firm may *hedge through labor contracts* and transfer more than this minimum level of risk to the manager by providing strong incentives. Such risk-sharing or hedging demand by the firm dominates the agency problem for low cash balances. Risk-sharing is not costless; however, as increasing the variability of the manager's pay increases risk-premium the manager requires to bear such risk. When the firm's cash balance is large, the agency problem dominates hedging needs, and the optimal contract delivers the minimum cash-flow sensitivity required to keep the manager from cash flow diversion. Therefore, our *first key finding* is that the optimal contract provides weaker incentives when the firm holds more cash and in particular incentives decrease after positive cash-flow realizations, put differently, we find that firms with low cash-holdings provide more equity-like compensation.

In addition to hedging through labor contracts, the firm can hedge liquidity risks by delaying dividend payouts and therefore accumulating more cash. Under the optimal contract, the optimal payout policy calls for a dividend whenever the firm's cash balance exceeds a threshold which we call the dividend payout boundary. Our *second key finding* is that the optimal dividend payout boundary decreases in the severity of the moral hazard problem. In particular, the manager's ability to divert from the firm's cash balance means that some of her compensation must be deferred, which leads to an endogenous *carrying cost of cash* via the risk premium that the manager applies to deferred compensation. When the moral hazard problem is more severe, that is, when the manager can divert cash with greater efficiency, the carrying cost of cash increases and the optimal dividend payout boundary decreases.

Our *third key finding* is that under moderate moral hazard firms facing high cash-flow uncertainty do not pass on this uncertainty to management via employment contracts, but instead hedge liquidity risk by holding more cash.[1] In contrast, firms with low cash-flow uncertainty hedge more via labor contracts and provide stronger incentives to management. When moral hazard is sufficiently severe, target cash-holdings are non-monotonic in cash-flow volatility. This result arises because an increase in cash-flow volatility also increases the cost of incentive provision, thereby decreasing firm value and reducing the overall hedging demand.

[1] This is generally consistent with the findings of Bates et al. (2009).

Our model questions the widely held view that firms facing more severe agency conflicts should provide stronger managerial incentives. In particular, our *fourth key finding* is that the relationship between incentive pay and the level of moral hazard is state dependent. When the firm has a large cash balance, the strength of incentives is increasing in the severity of the moral hazard problem. This relationship reverses for firms with low cash holdings. Because more severe agency conflicts decrease the value of the firm as a going concern, liquidation becomes (relatively) less costly, decreasing a firm's hedging demand decreases to liquidity default. Consequently, the firm transfers less risk to the manager when its cash-balance is low, and the moral hazard problem is severe.

Refinancing in the presence of agency conflicts imposes an endogenous flotation cost to raising funds in the absence of physical refinancing costs. In our model, the firm's ability to refinance is constrained by search frictions in capital markets, as in, for example, Hugonnier et al. (2014), which lead to uncertain refinancing opportunities.[2] Under the assumption that the firm can commit to a refinancing policy ex-ante, we find that the implied refinancing costs are state-dependent, i.e., they depend on the current cash level of the firm. Our *fifth key finding* is that the firm, depending on its cash-holdings, either refinances to below the first best or refinances to the first best but raises more money than necessary to pay the manager a lump-sum wage payment above what incentive constraints would imply. In other words, the presence of agency *always* distorts the decision to raise cash away from the first-best. The key to understanding the latter effect is that large promises conditional on a state in which there is unlimited access to new cash lower the required wages in states in which cash is tight without violating promise keeping, thereby lowering the likelihood of liquidity default.

Furthermore, in contrast to Hugonnier et al. (2014), better refinancing opportunities do not reduce the firm's hedging of liquidity risk. On the one hand, increasing the firm's access to refinancing leads it to accumulate and raise less cash. On the other hand, it leads to increased hedging of liquidity risk through managerial incentive pay in low cash states. This later effect obtains because better refinancing opportunities make it less costly to defer the payments to the manager until the moment of refinancing, effectively lowering the cost of hedging liquidity risk through incentive pay.

Next, we find that when moral hazard is more severe, incentive compatibility demands high-powered incentives on average. Under these circumstances, employment contracts then absorb a large part of the liquidity risk, resulting in outside equity becoming less volatile on average. We also

[2] Since refinancing in practice involves cost, it occurs at infrequent times, as documented by Leary and Roberts (2005).

demonstrate that a firm's stock return volatility need not be decreasing in the firm's liquidity and can follow a hump-shaped pattern since a financially constrained firm hedges cash-flow risk through labor contracts to a greater extent, which in turn reduces stock return volatility. Depending on how much risk the firm transfers to the manager, we get a different relationship between liquidity and volatility of stock returns. These model predictions are novel and contrast with the findings of related models of cash-management such as that of Décamps et al. (2011)), who find the relationship between cash and equity return volatility to be unambiguously monotonic.

Finally, the technique we use to solve our model also represents a methodological contribution. Dynamic agency problems usually introduce the manager's promised future payments as a state variable to track the agency problem. At the same time, liquidity management problems use the firm's stock of cash as a state variable to track the liquidity of the firm. Our problem thus would appear to have two state variables. While dynamic stochastic optimization problems with more than two state variables are usually hard to solve, we show how a small expansion of the allowed wage space allows for the model to collapse to a one-dimensional optimization while maintaining the liquidity-agency trade-off. The critical observation is that allowing the manager to receive small negative wages, in conjunction with allowing the manager to have a savings contract that is not identically zero along the equilibrium path, relaxes the shareholders' problem. Shareholders prefer to manage liquidity, in the absence of refinancing, using costly small negative wages over holding cash-buffers in excess of the incentive constraints.[3] Cash net promised risk-adjusted future wage payments readily measure the firm's financial soundness and its distance to liquidity default.

Related Literature

We draw on two main strands of literature. First, there is a large literature on dynamic agency conflicts, such as DeMarzo and Sannikov (2006), DeMarzo et al. (2012), Biais et al. (2007, 2010), Zhu (2012) or Williams (2011). Similar to He (2011), He et al. (2017), Marinovic and Varas (2017) or Holmstrom and Milgrom (1987), we consider an agent with CARA-preferences. This specification allows the problem to be analytically tractable. Relatedly, Ai and Li (2015), Ai et al. (2013) and Bolton et al. (2017) study optimal executive compensation and investment under limited commitment. Their papers do not feature agency conflicts.

Second, our model is linked to the literature on optimal cash-management within firms (some-

[3]Importantly, this dimensionality reduction goes beyond the absence of wealth effects, as studied by related papers considering a CARA-manager endowed with a savings technology (compare e.g. He (2011), He et al. (2017) or Gryglewicz et al. (2017)), which usually focus without loss of generality on zero-savings contracts.

times referred to as optimal corporate cash management). Here, Bolton et al. (2011, 2013), Décamps and Villeneuve (2007), Décamps et al. (2011); Decamps et al. (2016), Rochet and Villeneuve (2011), Hugonnier et al. (2014), Gryglewicz (2011), Della Seta et al. (2017) and Hugonnier and Morellec (2017) are the closest references, as they show how a firm, owned by risk-neutral shareholders, that faces financing frictions optimally holds internal cash-balances, even if these balances (exogenously) return less than the risk-free rate. In contrast, in our model internal cash-balances are not inferior in returns to the risk-free rate, but rather are costly in terms of the agency problem.

Our paper is also related to the literature analyzing risk-sharing between firms and their workers, such as the theoretical studies of Berk et al. (2010) or Hartman-Glaser et al. (2017) or the empirical study of Guiso et al. (2005), who document that firms ensure their workers only partially against cash-flow risk.

2 Model Setup

In this section, we specify a model a liquidity management in the presence of moral hazard. The main agency problem in our model is that the manager of a firm can divert resources for her own consumption as in DeMarzo and Sannikov (2006).

2.1 The Firm's Operating Technology

Time is infinite, continuous, and indexed by t. A measure of risk-neutral shareholders own a firm operated by a risk-averse manager. The common discount rate employed by all agents in the model is given by r. The firm generates cash flow with mean μ and volatility σ

$$dX_t = \mu dt + \sigma dZ_t,$$

where Z_t is a standard Brownian Motion.

In this baseline specification of the model, the shareholders are unable to transfer cash into the firm or raise additional funds from new investors. Thus all payouts, that is operating losses, dividends $dDiv_t$, and wages to the manager dw_t, must be paid from the firm's internal cash balance, which we denote by M_t. In section 5, we allow the shareholders limited access to capital markets and derive optimal refinancing policies. Besides payouts, three other factors affect the accumulation of cash. First, the cash within the firm accrues interest at the rate r. Second, the firm is subject to catastrophic loss of all cash that occurs according to a Poisson process N_t with intensity δ.[4] Without loss of generality, we assume that the catastrophic shocks also destroys the firm's assets and therefore makes firm equity drop down to zero. And third, the manager can divert cash for her own private benefit, where db_t denotes cash diversion. Thus, the dynamics of M_t are given by

$$dM_t = (rM_t + \mu)dt + \sigma dZ_t - dDiv_t - dw_t - M_t dN_t - db_t \tag{1}$$

When the firm's cash balance is exhausted, that is at $\tau = \inf\{t : M_t = 0\}$, the shareholders must liquidate the firm and receive the liquidation value L where

$$L \leq \frac{\mu}{r + \delta} \tag{2}$$

so that there are dead-weight losses to liquidation. We also assume that the liquidation value of the firm is high enough, in a sense we make precise below, so that the shareholders would never sell the firm to the manager. Recall we normalized the recovery value after the catastrophic shock dN to zero.

Finally, we assume that the cash balance of the firm, dividends, wages, and catastrophic loss are publicly observable. However, the shareholders can not observe cash diversion by the manager. For convenience, we define the process $\hat{X}_t$ by

$$d\hat{X}_t = dM_t - rM_t dt + dDiv_t + M_t dN_t,$$

which represents cash flow shocks imputed from the dynamics of the cash balance of the firm assuming no diversion.

2.2 The Manager's Technology and Preferences

The manager can divert cash for her own use in one of two ways. First, she can divert cash flow and in doing so, appropriate a fraction $\lambda \leq 1$ per dollar diverted. Second, the manager can divert a lumpy amount of cash out of the firm's cash balance and, in particular, can abscond with an amount up to the entire cash balance M_t. The managers's benefit from diverting a lumpy amount of cash is a fraction κ per dollar diverted. Throughout the paper, we denote the amount of cash

[4] One example of such a shock can be a large lawsuit – for example, Purdue Pharma (the maker of OxyCotin) recently prepare to declare bankruptcy in response to a number of lawsuits related to the Opioid crisis.

diverted by the manager up to time t by b_t and the amount received by B_t, where B_t accounts losses given diversion. Formally, we can write $b_t = b_t^F + b_t^S$, where b_t^F is sample path continuous increasing process and b_t^S is an increasing jump process, so that

$$dB_t = \lambda db_t^F + \kappa db_t^S. \tag{3}$$

The manager can also maintain hidden savings and debt, denoted by S_t. Savings S accrue interest at rate r and are subject to changes induced by wage payments dw_t, diverted cash dB_t, and consumption c_t

$$dS_t = rS_t dt + dB_t + dw_t - c_t dt \tag{4}$$

Endowing the agent with the possibility to accumulate savings is needed to ensure consumption smoothing beyond any liquidation event. We normalize the manager's initial savings to be $S_0 = 0$

The manager discounts at the market rate r and is risk-averse with constant absolute risk averse (CARA) utility given by

$$u(c_t) = -\frac{1}{\rho}\exp(-\rho c_t),$$

per unit of time where $\rho > 0$ is the coefficient of absolute risk-aversion and c_t is instantaneous consumption. The manager cannot commit to continue operating the firm and possesses an outside option to receive utility $\bar{U}$.

2.3 The Contracting Problem.

At inception $t = 0$, the shareholders offer the manager a contract $\mathcal{C} = (\hat{c}, w, \hat{b})$. The contract $\mathcal{C}$ specifies the manager's recommended consumption $\hat{c}$, wage payments w and diversion $\hat{b}$. In addition to the wage contract, shareholders also control the dividend payout process Div_t. Because shareholders cannot inject cash into the firm, the dividend process must be increasing. However, shareholders can choose to liquidate at any time by paying out the entire cash balance of the firm. In other words, the shareholders cannot commit to conitnue to operate the firm. If shareholders liquidate the firm, the remaining cash balance of the firm is split between the shareholders and the manager according to Nash bargaining, where the shareholders have the Nash-bargaining weight θ. We call $\mathcal{C}$ *incentive compatible* if $c_t = \hat{c}_t$ and $\hat{b}_t = b_t = 0$, and *feasible* if the principal can commit to it. Throughout the paper, we focus on incentive compatible and feasible contracts and denote the set of these contracts by $\mathbf{C}$. We also impose the following assumption on the wage process dw.

Assumption 1. *Cumulative wages must satisfy* $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} w_{t+\varepsilon} - w_t \geq 0$. *That is, wages have to be either continuous or exhibit upward jumps (lumpy payments to the manager), but cannot exhibit downward jumps (lumpy cash infusions from the manager).*

Note that this assumption does not preclude negative flow wages. We discuss the above and alternative assumptions in more detail in Section 6.

We can now formally state the optimal contracting problem. The manager solves

$$U_0 = \max_{c,b} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-rt} u(c_t) dt\right] \tag{5}$$

such that dS_t is given by equation 4 for some initial savings S_0. The shareholders's problem is to choose and incentive compatible and feasible contract and a payout policy to maximize the total present value of dividends

$$V_0 = \max_{Div, \mathcal{C}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-rt} dDiv_t + e^{-r\tau} L\right], \tag{6}$$

such that $U_0 > \bar{U}$, $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{C}$, $dDiv_t \geq 0$, and dM_t is given by (1).

To ensure the problem is well-behaved, we impose that the agent's savings S must satisfy the transversality condition, sometimes referred to as the *No-Ponzi condition*:

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} e^{-rt} S_t \geq 0 \text{ almost surely wrt. } \mathbb{P} \tag{7}$$

and certain other regularity conditions, which are collectively gathered in Appendix A. If ever $S_\tau < 0$, the transversality condition requires negative consumption to make up the savings shortfall.

3 Model Solution

In this section, we solve the model and derive the optimal contract and payout policy. First, we analyze the manager's problem and characterize conditions for the contract to be incentive compatible. In particular, following the solution technique of He (2011), we introduce the certainty equivalent W_t of the manager's continuation utility. Second, we focus on the principal's problem and show the restriction on the state- and strategy-space the principal faces. In particular, due to the manager's CARA preferences, the principal faces a 2-dimensional dynamic optimization problem characterized by a partial differential equation (PDE). Third, we show that under Assumption 1, the model collapses to a 1-dimensional dynamic optimization problem characterized by an ordinary differential equation (ODE).

3.1 Incentive Compatibility and Promise Keeping

As is standard in the dynamic agency literature, let us define for any incentive compatible contract $\mathcal{C}$ the agent's continuation value at time t

$$U_t := \mathbb{E}_t\left[\int_t^{\infty} e^{-r(s-t)}u(c_s)ds\right] \tag{8}$$

and denote the agent's savings by S_t. By the martingale representation theorem, there exists progressively measurable processes α_t and β_t such that dynamics of U follow

$$dU_t = rU_tdt - u(c_t)dt + \beta_t(-\rho rU_t)(d\hat{X}_t - \mu dt) - \alpha_t(-\rho rU_t)(dN_t - \delta dt). \tag{9}$$

The process α_t captures the manager's exposure to disaster risk dN_t and the process β_t captures the her exposure to cash-flow shocks.

While the manager's continuation utility captures her incentives, it is convenient to change variables as follows. First, note that in order to ensure that the agent does not deviate from the recommended consumption path, the optimal contract has to respect the agent's Euler equation, in that marginal utility has to follow a martingale. Next, as shown in the appendix, the manager's first order condition with respect to consumption given the access to a savings account implies that $u'(c_t) = -\rho rU_t > 0$. This in turn implies that U_t is a martingale. Further, let us define the certainty equivalent W_t as the amount of wealth needed that would result in utility U_t if the agent only consumed interest rW_t, that is,

$$W(U) := \frac{-\ln(-\rho rU)}{\rho r}. \tag{10}$$

Here, W_t is the agent's continuation value in *monetary terms* while U_t is the agent's continuation value in *utility terms*.

By Ito's Lemma, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
dW_t = \quad & \underbrace{\frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta_t \sigma)^2}_{\text{BM Risk-Premium}} \quad dt + \beta_t (dX_t - \mu dt) \\
& + \underbrace{\delta \left(\alpha_t - \frac{\ln(1 + \rho r \alpha_t)}{\rho r} \right)}_{\text{Poisson Risk-Premium}>0} dt - \frac{\ln(1 + \rho r \alpha_t)}{\rho r} (dN_t - \delta dt).
\end{aligned} \tag{11}
$$

Because her compensation package is exposed to cash-flow shocks dX_t and productivity shocks dN_t, the agent demands a risk premium, so that W_t has a positive drift. In other words, as U_t is a martingale, $W_t = W(U_t)$ has a positive drift due to the convexity of $W(U)$ and Jensen's inequality. Essentially, (9) or equivalently (11) constitutes the so-called *promise-keeping* constraint. That is, shareholders promise the agent's continuation value W (resp. U) evolves according to (11) (resp. (9)).

We can now characterize the incentive compatibility conditions that guarantee zero cash flow diversion. First, consider the manager's incentive to divert cash flow, that is, set $db_t^F > 0$. In this case, the manager gains $\lambda u'(c_t)$ in utility and loses $\beta_t(-\rho r U_t)$ in continuation utility. Recall that $-\rho r U_t = u'(c_t)$, so that it is optimal for the manager to choose $db_t^F = 0$ if and only if

$$
\beta_t \geq \lambda. \tag{12}
$$

Likewise, the manager does not find it optimal to boost cash-flow – i.e., to set $db_t^F < 0$ – as long as $\beta_t \leq 1$.

Now consider the manager's incentive to divert a lumpy amount of cash from the firm. In that case, that is, if $db_t^S > 0$, the shareholders can immediately observe the managers action and can reduce her future compensation accordingly. Let $Y_t = W_t - S_t$. We can interpret Y_t as the present value of the manager's deferred compensation adjusted for risk. If the manager diverts a lump of cash flow, she gains at most κM_t in cash and loses at most Y_t in the present value of future wages.[5]

[5] It is straightforward to show $Y_t = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_t^\infty e^{-r(s-t)} \big(dw_s - \zeta_s ds \big) \right]$ where $\zeta_t := \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta_t \sigma)^2 + \delta \left(\alpha_t - \frac{\ln(1+\rho r \alpha_t)}{\rho r} \right)$ is the agent's required risk premium.

As such, setting $db_t^F = 0$ is incentive compatible if and only if[6]

$$\varphi_t := \frac{Y_t}{M_t} \geq \kappa. \tag{13}$$

While deferring compensation is necessary to provide the manager with incentives to refrain from diverting a lump of cash from the firm, doing so imposes a cost. This is because during any time interval $[t, t+dt]$ the firm can lose its entire cash balance, that is if $dN_t = 1$. In this case, the firm is liquidated and, due to the shareholders' limited liability, the manager looses the previously promised amount Y_t. By definition, at time of termination τ, the manager's certainty equivalent W_τ must equal her savings S_τ, i.e., $Y_{\tau+} = 0$. Hence, upon the arrival of a shock $dN_t = 1$, it follows that the manager's continuation value jumps down immediately by Y_t, that is: $dW_t/dN_t = -Y_t$. Matching coefficients in equation (11), this pins down the manager's exposure to disaster risk in terms of Y_t

$$\alpha_t = A(Y_t) := \frac{\exp(\rho r Y_t) - 1}{\rho r} \geq 0. \tag{14}$$

Hence, deferring compensation exposes the manager to Poisson shocks, for which she requires a risk-premium to be paid by the firm. Consequently, increasing Y_t is costly for shareholders as $A(\cdot)$ is increasing and convex in its argument. Higher cash-holdings M_t require greater deferred compensation Y_t and therefore a higher risk-compensation $\delta A(Y_t)$ and flow wage for the manager, we obtain an endogenous *carry-cost* for internal cash-holdings.

We summarize our findings so far in the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *If $\mathcal{C}$ solves (6), then*

i) The agent's continuation value U, defined in (8) solves the SDE (9) for some $\mathbb{F}$-progressive processes (α, β) and W solves the SDE (11).

ii) Given a process Y the process α satisfies (14).

iii) The process β satisfies $\beta_t \in [\lambda, 1]$ for all $t \geq 0$ and the process α is given through (14).

[6] In case the agent were able to enjoy an additional outside option $\mathcal{O}$ in monetary terms after leaving the firm, e.g., through finding a job at another firm or through extracting some of the liquidation value of the assets, the constraint (13) would change to $Y_{t-} \geq \kappa M_{t-} + \mathcal{O}$. Throughout our analysis, we consider without loss $\mathcal{O} = 0$ and we normalize the agent's outside option to zero.

3.2 The Optimal Contract

3.2.1 Reduction of the State Space

The shareholders' problem depends on three state variables. The managers's continuation value U_t, or equivalently, W_t, the agent's savings S_t, and the firm's cash-holdings M_t. Thus, the value of the firm at time t, or equivalently the shareholders' continuation value, is given by a function $\hat{V}(M_t, W_t, S_t)$. Due to the manager's CARA preferences and the absence of wealth effects, the values of W_t and S_t are irrelevant for the shareholders problem, and only the difference $Y_t = W_t - S_t$ matters. Thus, we are left with the two state variables (M_t, Y_t), and the shareholders value can be written in the form $\hat{V}(M_t, W_t, S_t) = V(M_t, Y_t)$.

Next, we argue that in the absence of refinancing opportunities, promised payments to the manager must be fully collateralized. Put differently, any uncollateralized promise $Y_t > M_t$ is an empty promise. To see this note that, sufficiently negative cash-flow shocks can wipe out the firm's cash-balance within a short amount of time $(t, t + dt)$, thereby leading to $Y_{t+dt} > M_{t+dt} = 0$. Under these circumstances, shareholders either renege on the promise Y_{t+dt} and default or ask the manager to fully absorb cash-flow risk through $\beta = 1$, in order avoid liquidation. In the first case, *promise keeping* is violated.[7] In the second case, the manager must cover consumption needs $c_t = rW_t$ and operating losses, until the firm is liquid again and financial distress is resolved. Because the manager's consumption rW_t strictly exceeds the interest earned on savings, rS_t, and financial distress may prevail for an arbitrarily long time-span, she accumulates excessive debt (with positive probability), which results in a violation of the no-Ponzi condition. We conclude that the only way for promise-keeping and No-Ponzi condition to hold is to liquidate as soon as $Y_t = M_t$. Thus, the principal's optimization is subject to the following state constraint

$$(Y, M) \in \mathcal{B} = \{(Y, M) : 0 \leq \kappa M \leq Y \leq M\}. \tag{15}$$

Next, we consider the dynamics of (Y, M) that can obtain if we relax Assumption 1 to allow for negative and positive wages in any amount. While these variables are subject to exogenous shocks, the shareholders can at any time reduce (increase) Y by withdrawing (depositing) an equal amount from the firm's cash account M and paying a positive (negative) wage to the manager. These dynamics are depicted in Panel A of Figure 1. Consider starting at the point O. A positive

[7] That is, the evolution of W is inconsistent with (11). This is because default at time $t + dt$ leads to an immediate jump of payments $Y_{t+dt} > 0$, the manager expects to receive, down to zero. Equivalently, W_{t+dt} jumps down in absence of a Poisson shock, contradicting (11).



Figure 1: **Schematic Representation** of the state- and strategy space

cash flow shock moves the state vector to the point A. At this point, the shareholder's can move to any point within $\mathcal{B}$ along a 45-degree line through A by adjusting Y and M one-for-one, for example by paying the manager a lump sum to move to point A'. A negative cash flow shock moves the state vector to the point B. Staying at point B results into a violation of the incentive constraint $Y \geq \kappa M$ and is therefore not an option. Thus, at point B, shareholders must either pay dividends, in order to reduce cash and to move from B to B'', or increase the manager's deferred compensation and thus move along a 45 degree line to the point B'. Because it is always possible to change M and Y one-for-one, the value function must satisfy:

$$V(Y, M) = V(Y + w, M + w) \tag{16}$$

for all $(Y, M) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $w \geq -\frac{Y - \kappa M}{1 - \kappa}$.

Consider the change of variables

$$\varphi = \frac{Y}{M} \tag{17}$$

$$C = M - Y. \tag{18}$$

We can interpret C as the net cash position of the firm in that it is equal to the firms cash balance less the amount the firm would need to pay to retire the maintain promise keeping. Importantly, net cash C keeps track of the firm's actual level of liquidity, in that the firm defaults if and only $C = 0$, which turns out to happen if and only if $M = 0$. Panel B of Figure 1 depicts the dynamics of (φ, C)

that correspond to the dynamics for (Y, M) in Panel A. Note that moving along a 45-degree line in (Y, M)-space is equivalent to moving along a verticle line in (φ, C) space. That is, a one-for-one change in both (Y, M) changes the ratio of Y to M, but does not change the net liquidity C.

We now argue that the firm's net cash position is a sufficient statistic for the state of the firm, and thereby reduce the problem to a single state variable. Let $\hat{v}(\varphi, C) = V(Y, M)$. Using equation (16), we then have

$$\hat{v}(\varphi, C) = V\left(\frac{\varphi C}{1-\varphi}, \frac{C}{1-\varphi}\right) = V\left(\frac{\varphi' C}{1-\varphi'}, \frac{C}{1-\varphi'}\right) = \hat{v}(\varphi', C). \tag{19}$$

For all $\kappa \leq \varphi, \varphi' \leq 1$. As a result, there exists $v(C)$ such that $v(C) = V(Y, M)$ for all $(Y, M) \in \mathcal{B}$.

Thus, we recast the principal's problem as a maximization over the controls β and φ with the one-dimensional state C. Utilizing (11), (4), $dB_t = 0$, $c_t = rW_t$, and $Y = \frac{\varphi}{1-\varphi}C$, for any IC and implementable contract we have

$$dC_t = rC_{t^-}dt - \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta_t \sigma)^2 dt - \delta A\left(\frac{\varphi_{t^-}}{1-\varphi_{t^-}}C_{t^-}\right)dt + \mu dt + (1-\beta_t)\sigma dZ_t - dDiv_t - C_{t^-}dN_t. \tag{20}$$

Since cash-flow shocks affect both cash-holdings and the present value of the manager's compensation, the firm's actual liquidity is less sensitive to cash-flow shocks than cash M_t, in that

$$0 < \frac{dC_t}{dX_t} = 1 - \beta_t < 1 = \frac{dM_t}{dX_t}.$$

Note that so far dw has not been explicitly specified – it will be defined as the *residual* that implements the optimal choice of φ.

We note that the arguments above assume a relaxed version of Assumption 1. Specifically, we assumed above that is was possible to implement lumpy negative wages for the manager. We show below that that at the optimum, the relaxed problem respects Assumption 1.

3.2.2 The Optimal Contract and Liquidity Policy

We can now derive a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation for the value of the firm and use it to solve for the optimal contract and liquidity policy. We conjecture that dividend payouts only occur at an upper boundary $\overline{C}$. On the conjectured continuation region $C \in (0, \overline{C})$, an application of the Ito's formula and the dynamic programming principle gives the following HJB equation

$$(r+\delta)v(C) = \max_{\beta\geq\lambda,\varphi\geq\kappa}\left\{v'(C)\left(rC - \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta\sigma)^2 - \delta A\left(\frac{\varphi C}{1-\varphi}\right)+\mu\right)+\frac{\sigma^2(1-\beta)^2}{2}v''(C)\right\}. \quad (21)$$

First, we maximize with respect to φ. Since $v'(C) > 0$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}A\left(\frac{\varphi C}{1-\varphi}\right) > 0$, it is costly to give the manager excess deferred compensation and it is optimal to set

$$\varphi(C) = \kappa, \quad (22)$$

that is, the optimal level of deferred compensation is minimum level that implements no-stealing from the cash balance of the firm. As a result, with φ continuous, the solution to the relaxed problem satisfies Assumpion 1.

Second, we maximize with respect to β. The first-order conditions and the IC constraint imply that

$$\beta(C) = \max\{\lambda, \beta^*(C)\} \text{ with } \beta^*(C) := \frac{-v''(C)}{\rho r v'(C) - v''(C)} < 1. \quad (23)$$

Raising incentives β transfers risk to the agent and reduces the volatility of C, thereby lowering the likelihood of liquidation. Consequently, it can be optimal to provide more incentives β than required by incentive compatibility when C is low, as discussed in more detail in the next subsection.

Note that the solutions to φ and β imply that the firm never experiences *agency-based* default, i.e., default triggered by $C = 0$ with $M = Y > 0$.

The standard boundary conditions of value-matching at default $C = 0$ and smooth-pasting at the dividend payout boundary $C = \overline{C}$ are given by[8]

$$v(0) = L \text{ and } v'(\overline{C}) = 1. \quad (24)$$

Recall that shareholders are not able to fully commit to their promises, and may decide to trigger liquidation if it is beneficial to them. Liquidating yields a cash payout of $\theta M = \frac{1}{1-\kappa}C$ in addition to the liquidation value L to the principal. Thus, for any feasible contract, we must have[9]

$$v(\overline{C}) \geq \frac{1}{1-\kappa}\overline{C} + L. \quad (25)$$

[8]Observe that a positive unit cash-flow shock to M at $C = \overline{C}$ leads to an increase in C of $(1-\beta)$, and unit payouts of $(1-\beta)$ as dividends and β as wages. Re-norming, a unit shock to C then leads to a unit dividend payout.

[9]Strictly speaking, we must have $v(C) \geq \frac{1}{1-\kappa}C + L$ for all $C \in [0, \overline{C}]$, but from $v'(C) \geq 1 \geq 0 \geq v''(C)$ it is sufficient to check this condition at $C = \overline{C}$.

If constraint (25) is slack, the payout boundary satisfies the optimality or *super-contact condition*

$$v''(\overline{C}) = 0 \tag{26}$$

In other words, if payouts are optimally made at $C = \overline{C}$ with (25) slack, then the shareholders' *effective* risk-aversion vanishes at $\overline{C}$.

Thus, whenever (25) holds with equality and $v''(\overline{C}) < 0$, the shareholders' limited commitment combined with moral hazard κ constrain the firm in optimally managing liquidity risks. Note that constraint (25) is always slack if $\frac{\theta}{1-\kappa} < 1$, which is the case when a liquidation would not violate promise keeping, as $(1-\theta)M < Y \iff 1 < \frac{\theta}{1-\kappa}$.[10] For $\frac{\theta}{1-\kappa} > 1$, we simply check condition (25) at the *candidate* payout boundary $\overline{C}^*$ defined by (26).

Proposition 2. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ solve (6). Then, the following holds true:*

i) The shareholders' value function $V(\cdot)$ satisfies $V(\cdot) = v(C)$, where the function $v(\cdot)$ is twice continuously differentiable, i.e., $v \in C^2$.

ii) The principal's payoff is given by a function v, that solves the HJB-equation (21) subject to $v(0) - L = v'(\overline{C}) - 1 = 0$ and either $v''(\overline{C}) = 0$ or $v(\overline{C}) = \theta\overline{C}/(1-\kappa) + L$.

iii) The value function v is strictly concave $[0, \overline{C})$ with $v'''(C) > 0$.

4 Analysis

In this section we analyze the optimal contract and liquidation policies. Unless specified otherwise, we assume that parameters are such that the payout boundary is optimally determined by the super-contact condition, i.e., $v''(\overline{C}) = 0$.[11]

4.1 Performance Pay and Hedging Through Labour Contracts

In this section, we analyze the pay-performance sensitivity β. For clarity of exposition, let us for the time being assume that $\lambda = \theta = 0$, so that $\beta = \beta^*$. The assumption $\lambda = 0$ is equivalent to the absence of the agency problem in terms of stealing out of cash-flow, but does not preclude stealing from cash-stock, i.e., $\kappa > 0$.

[10] This is because $v(\bar{C}) - L = v(\bar{C}) - v(0) > \bar{C}$, as $v'(C) \geq 1$ with the inequality being strict for some C. Hence, the super contact condition holds if $\theta\bar{C} \geq \frac{\bar{C}\theta}{1-\kappa}$.

[11] As mentioned in the preceding footnote, a sufficient condition for this is $\theta < 1 - \kappa$.



Figure 2: **Benchmark value function**: The parameters are $\mu = 0.25, r = 0.1, \delta = 0.25$, $\lambda = \kappa = 0.4$, $\sigma = 0.75$, $\theta = 0$ and $\rho = 7$.

Absent liquidity concerns, it is optimal for the principal not to expose the risk-averse manager to any cash-flow shocks, i.e., to set $\beta^* = \lambda = 0$. However, in the *presence* of liquidity concerns, shareholders become increasingly risk-averse as cash-reserves dwindle and would optimally like to hedge liquidity risk through *labour contracts* by setting incentive pay $\beta^* > 0$.

Incentive pay transfers risk to the agent, in that the volatility of the liquidity reserves, $dC/dX = \sigma(1-\beta)$, decreases in β for $\beta < 1$. Consider the benefit of increasing β:

$$\frac{\partial v(C)}{\partial \beta} \propto \underbrace{-v'(C)\rho r \beta \sigma^2}_{\text{Risk-Compensation;}<0} + \underbrace{(1-\beta)\sigma^2(-v''(C))}_{\text{Reduction in Cash-Flow volatility;}>0}.$$

Increasing β makes C less volatile and reduces the likelihood that the firm runs out of cash but also requires a risk-compensation to the agent, as her wage has become more volatile. When the firm has low cash holdings, a reduction in volatility is particularly beneficial, since $-v''(C)$ is large. On the other hand, the marginal value of cash of the firm $v'(C)$ is pronounced under distress, so that the drift of promised wages required as risk-compensation is also very costly.

Intuitively, the optimal β^* implements a risk-sharing solution that balances the agent's constant absolute risk-aversion ρ against the shareholders' state-dependent absolute risk-aversion $-v''(C)/v'(C)$. The firm hedges more strongly through labour contracts for low net-cash positions, i.e., $\beta^*(C) > 0$ for $C > 0$, whereas it absorbs all risk at the payout boundary, $\beta^*(\overline{C}) = 0$. That is, compensation becomes more equity like when the firm undergoes financial distress and has little cash. In practice, firms with little cash often are start-ups and young firms, where it is indeed well documented that their employees are often rewarded with stock.

When $\lambda > 0$, the firm's risk-sharing is constrained by $\beta \geq \lambda$. Thus, risk-sharing is constrained for high levels of C in that due to IC constraint the principal can never fully insure the agent, even at the payout boundary as $\beta^*(\overline{C}) = \lambda$.

Wages are defined as the residual that keeps $\varphi = \kappa$. Imposing $0 = d\varphi = d(Y/M)$ and $\varphi = \kappa$, we have wages $dw = \mu_w dt + \sigma_w dZ$ with

$$\mu_w = \frac{1}{1-\kappa}\left[\frac{\rho r}{2}\left\{\beta\left(C\right)\sigma\right\}^2 + \delta A\left(\frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}C\right) - \kappa\mu\right] \tag{27}$$

$$\sigma_w = \frac{\beta\left(C\right)-\kappa}{1-\kappa}\sigma \tag{28}$$

Thus, the model predicts an increased propensity of managers to pledge private assets in response to *negative* cash-flow shocks $dZ < 0$ for low liquidity firms, something that is common in both start-ups and firms in financial distress. In the special case of $\lambda = \kappa$, we have $\sigma_w = \frac{\beta(C)-\kappa}{1-\kappa}\sigma \geq 0$. Therefore, negative wages in response to cash-flow shocks occur exactly when the risk-sharing considerations outweigh the agency issues. Further, we see that for small enough μ and/or large enough ρ, r, σ, λ, we have always positive dt-level flow wages $\mu_w > 0$.[12]

We summarize our findings in the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ solve (6). Then, the following holds true:*

i) There exists $C' \in [0, \overline{C})$, so that the pay-performance sensitivity β^* (weakly) decreases in on $[C', \overline{C}]$. In particular, $\frac{\partial\beta^*(C)}{\partial C} < 0$ on $[C', \overline{C}]$. If σ is sufficiently low, then $C' = 0$

ii) There exists a unique value $\hat{C} \in [0, \overline{C}]$, such that $\beta(C) > \lambda$ for $C < \hat{C}$. If λ is sufficiently small, it follows that $\hat{C} > 0$.

iii) The loading of wages on the cash-flow shocks is given by $\frac{\beta(C)-\kappa}{1-\kappa}\sigma$ and thus negative wages are more prevalent for low-cash firms.

[12] To measure how much an agent will have to contribute, set $Y_0 = \kappa M_0$ and consider a *rapid* sequence of negative CF shocks that bankrupt the firm. Thus, we can ignore dt-level variables (interest, consumption, etc.), and have

$$S_\tau - S_0 = -\int_0^{C_0} dw\left(C\right) \approx -\int_0^{C_0}\frac{\beta\left(C\right)-\kappa}{1-\kappa}\sigma dC = \sigma\left[\frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}C_0 - \frac{\lambda}{1-\kappa}\left(C_0 - \hat{C}\right) - \frac{1}{1-\kappa}\int_0^{\hat{C}}\beta^*\left(C\right)dC\right] \tag{29}$$

where $\hat{C}$ is point at which $\beta \geq \lambda$ becomes binding, i.e. $\beta^*\left(\hat{C}\right) = \lambda$. Using $\beta^*(C) \leq 1$, we have the bound $S_\tau - S_0 \geq \sigma\left[\frac{\kappa-\lambda}{1-\kappa}C_0 + \frac{\lambda-1}{1-\kappa}\hat{C}\right]$. For $\lambda = \kappa$, this yields the bound $S_\tau - S_0 \geq -\sigma\hat{C}$. More drawn-out sequences of shocks with gyrations can lead to a lower bound as the agent's consumption is higher in high C than in low C states.

	$d\beta/$	$d\overline{C}/$
$d\kappa$	$-$	$-$ (κ sufficiently large)
$d\sigma$	$-$	$+$ (λ sufficiently low), $-$ otherwise
$d\mu$	$+$	
$d\rho$	$-$ (low ρ), 0 (otherwise)	$-$ (low ρ), $+$ (high ρ)
$d\lambda$	$-$ (low λ), $+$ (otherwise)	$-$ (low & high $d\lambda$)
$d\delta$	$-$	$-$ (κ sufficiently large)
$d\theta$	$-$ (high θ, κ), 0 (otherwise)	$-$ (high θ, κ), 0 (otherwise)

Table 1: Comparative statics. The comparative statics for β assume $C \approx 0$.

4.2 Risk-sharing vs retained earnings as liquidity management tools

In our setting, the firm has two distinct but connected tools to manage liquidity risks:

- The firm can hedge liquidity risk through labour contracts and provide particularly high-powered incentives β during financial distress when C is close to zero.
- The firm can increase retained earnings accumulation, as proxied by the dividend boundary $\overline{C}$. All else equal, a higher payout boundary $\overline{C}$ implies higher average net-cash holdings.

Let us first establish the following analytic results regarding comparative statics:

Corollary 2 (Hedging through high powered incentives)**.** *For a firm under distress, i.e., $C \simeq 0$, $\beta(C)$, the analytic comparative statics are summarized in the first row of Table 1.*

Corollary 3 (Hedging through cash reserves)**.** *For the target cash-holdings $\bar{C}$, the analytic comparative statics are summarized in the second row of Table 1.*

Next, we will show numerically that these two liquidity management tools are substitutes by analyzing the following experiments: consider constraining the principal to a sub-optimal strategy in one of the two liquidity management tools – (i) an *exogenously* too high $\beta(C)$, or (ii) an *exogenously* too low $\overline{C}$. From our previous discussions, a situation in which the IC constraint (23) is binding is essentially experiment (i) and can thus be proxied for by comparative statics with respect to λ, whereas a situation in which the commitment constraint (25) is binding is essentially experiment (ii) and can thus be proxied for by comparative statics with respect to θ. In our discussion below, "avg β" refers to the equal-weighted integral $\int_0^{\overline{C}} \beta(C)dC/\overline{C}$.



Figure 3: **Comparative statics** with respect to $\lambda = \kappa$ (Column 1), with respect to θ (Column 2), with respect to σ (Column 3), top row $\overline{C}$, bottom row σ-scaled avg β. The solid black lines depict the object described on the y-axis, the dashed red line depicts the IC constraint (23), the thin vertical dashed red line depicts the parameter value in our benchmark.

Changing $\lambda = \kappa$. Let us consider varying the degree of agency friction as measured by the stealing efficiency $\lambda = \kappa$. Column 1 of Figure 3 shows the behaviour of $\overline{C}$ and avg β (solid black lines) when varying $\lambda = \kappa$. The avg β increases mechanically as we are raising the floor on $\beta(C)$ (dashed red line) via the IC constraint. In response to this increased risk-sharing through labor contracts, the need for retained earnings decreases and $\overline{C}$ optimally shrinks. Moreover, more severe moral hazard reduces firm value and thereby also overall hedging demand. Not shown here is that numerically there is almost no movement in $\beta(0)$.

Changing θ. Let us consider varying the degree of commitment by the manager as measured by the bargaining weight θ. As long as (25) is slack changes in θ have no impact on any of the principal's choices. However, once θ is high enough and (25) starts binding the firm has to use an inefficiently low payout boundary $\overline{C}$. Column 2 in Figure 3 illustrates. Constraint (25) starts binding at $\theta \approx .85$, and any further increase in θ reduces the payout-boundary $\overline{C}$. To counteract this deterioration in liquidity management via retained earnings, the principal increases hedging through labor contracts by increasing the pay-performance sensitivity of wages, as indicated by an increase in avg β.

Changing σ. Let us discuss changing the dynamics of the cash-flow generating process. Here, the effects are more complex in that some non-monotonicity appears. First, consider an increase in σ. A higher σ in a pure risk-sharing model, that is with $\lambda = 0$, will lead to a higher payout boundary $\overline{C}$ as default has now become more likely, holding everything else constant. Non-monotonicity can only arise when the commitment constraint (25) starts binding and then follows closely the explanations in the discussion regarding θ. Column 1 in Figure 9 shows the situation in which $\lambda > 0$. We see that $\overline{C}$ is non-monotone even in the absence of (25) binding. The intuition is as follows: higher σ raises the risk of liquidation and requires more intense risk-management, so that $\overline{C}$ and avg β increase. However, due to agency conflicts, the agent must be provided costly incentives $\beta \geq \lambda$, even if this is not optimal from a pure risk-management perspective. Consequently, severe agency conflicts drain the firm value and reduce the overall hedging demand. The latter effect dominates, when σ and λ are sufficiently large and the agent requires a high risk-premium in response to performance-pay.

Changing ρ, δ and μ. The comparative statics of ρ, δ and μ are relegated to appendix E. Since δ essentially captures carry-cost of cash, $\overline{C}$ not surprisingly decreases in δ. Moreover, when the agent is more risk-averse, incentive-pay and therefore hedging through labour contracts becomes more costly, so that the firm hedges more through retained earnings instead, in that $\overline{C}$ increases in ρ. On the other hand, moral hazard has more bite for larger ρ, which in turn implies that overall firm value decreases in ρ. As a result, liquidation gets less inefficient, which calls for less hedging of liquidity risks. This leads to non-monotonic comparative statics of $\overline{C}$ wrt. ρ.

4.3 Cash-holdings and Agency Conflicts

Reminiscent of Jensen (1986), free cash induces moral hazard on the firm level, since it gives the manager more leeway to misuse resources for her own benefit. As a consequence, carry cost of cash related to the severity of moral hazard arise, so that cash-holding determine the extent of moral hazard. This suggests – all else equal – that firms, more prone to agency conflicts (i.e., firms with higher $\lambda = \kappa$), hold less cash.

In light of our model, this line of arguments is incomplete. In fact, more severe agency conflicts κ call for stronger incentives, also by means of deferred compensation Y. In order to credibly promise a deferred compensation package, additional cash is needed as commitment device. However, additional cash again exacerbates moral hazard, thereby requiring even stronger incentives and even more cash for commitment purposes.[13] Consequently, the relationship between optimal cash-holding $\overline{M} = \overline{C}/(1-\kappa)$ and the agency parameter κ is ambiguous, in that $\overline{M}$ increases in $\lambda = \kappa$ for low values of $\lambda = \kappa$ and decreases for larger values (compare figure 4). Additional cash-holdings owing to more severe moral hazard are only held for incentive purposes and not in order to accumulate more liquid resources. Put differently, the additional cash-holdings are entirely committed to the agent, in that the target level of actual liquidity $\overline{C}$ unambiguously decreases in $\lambda = \kappa$.

5 The Model with Refinancing

In this section, we introduce the possibility of refinancing. Similar to Hugonnier et al. (2014), we assume that there are search frictions in capital markets, in that finding new outside investors requires some time and search effort. In particular, conditional on seeking refinancing, the firm finds investors willing to contribute funds with probability πdt during a short-period of time $[t, t + dt]$,

[13] This dynamic feedback between cash and moral hazard can be seen in:

$$M = \frac{C}{1-\kappa} = C(1 + \kappa + \kappa^2 + \kappa^3 ...).$$



Figure 4: **Target cash holdings** $\overline{M}$ are non-monotonic in $\lambda = \kappa$ (left panel). In contrast, **target net cash holdings** $\overline{C}$ decrease (right panel). The Parameters are $\mu = 0.25, r = 0.1, \delta = 0.05$, $\theta = 0$, $\rho = 7$, $L = 0$.

so that a financing opportunity arrives according to some jump process $d\Pi$ with intensity $\pi \geq 0$.

Upon finding investors, we assume without loss of generality that there are no further cost to refinancing – the firm can issue equity at a fair price to raise cash and therefore appropriates all generated surplus.[14] In particular, when the firm raises an amount Δ of cash from outside investors, these outside investors obtain equity worth exactly Δ. For simplicity, looking for investors is costless and not subject to moral hazard, and for technical reasons we suppose that $d\Pi_t = 0$ with probability one at all times t, where the firm chooses $\Delta_t = 0$.[15]

Since refinancing raises the amount of cash the manager can steal from, the optimal contract must align her incentives during the refinancing event. This alignment of incentives could in principle be reached via three mechanisms: (1) rewarding the manager with a (lumpy) increase in future promised payments Γ (sometimes referred to as "payment for luck"), (2) rewarding the manager with a (lumpy) wage payment, and (3) requiring the agent to contribute a prescribed amount of funds. Recall that Assumption 1 restricts cumulative wages to $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} w_{t+\varepsilon} - w_t \geq 0$, which leads to two outcomes: it rules out (3) and make φ a state-variable in the refinancing event as it cannot be adjusted freely anymore.[16] For the following discussion, let us briefly ignore (2), the lumpy wage payments.

[14]If outside investors and existing shareholder were to split the surplus according to the Nash-Bargaining protocol with respective weights $\eta, 1-\eta$, then the problem were isomorphic to one where the arrival rate is altered from π to $\eta\pi$, so that the choice $\eta = 1$ is indeed wlog.

[15]This means that either shareholders look for new investors or the manager does so, in which case her search activity is observable and contractible to shareholders. Furthermore, it is straightforward to incorporate monetary search cost but as endogenous cost due to agency arise, this modification is unlikely to alter our findings.

[16]Without this Assumption 1 there would be a complete separation between φ, the variable controlling cash-holding in the firm, and (Δ, Γ), the amount of cash raised and the payment for luck required. This difference does not matter as for most of our analysis $\varphi \geq \kappa$ holds with equality.

Let us now consider a firm at time t cash-holdings M_t and $C_t = M_t - Y_t$. Assume for the moment that the firm is not refinancing all the way to the payout boundary so that $dDiv = dw = 0$. When a refinancing opportunity arises over $[t, t+dt]$, i.e., $d\Pi_t = 1$, the agent can potentially abscond with the total cash-balance just after outside investors put in amount Δ_t. From doing so, she receives $\kappa M_{t+dt} = \kappa(M_t + \Delta_t)$ but loses her deferred compensation $Y_{t+dt} = Y_t + \Gamma_t$, so that stealing is not optimal if

$$\kappa(M_t + \Delta_t) \leq Y_t + \Gamma_t = Y_{t+dt} \tag{30}$$

or equivalently

$$\Gamma_t \geq \frac{\kappa\Delta(1-\varphi_t) - (\varphi_t - \kappa)C_t}{1-\varphi_t}. \tag{31}$$

Hence, in order to align incentives during a financing round, the principal must either give the agent a high reward Γ_t or must have chosen higher deferred compensation $Y_t > \kappa M_t$ beforehand, resulting in $\varphi_t > \kappa$, both of which are costly. Since the incentive constraint (30) tightens when more funds Δ_t are raised, the firm might decide to raise less funds due to agency conflicts. At the optimum, inequalities (30) and (31) hold as equalities, which essentially means that the principal – ceteris paribus – designs the contract to minimize carry cost of cash and flotation cost of refinancing.

Because the manager is paid for luck $\Gamma \geq 0$ upon refinancing, she requires a lower flow wage and W_t features a lower required drift by $\frac{\pi(1-e^{-\rho r \Gamma_t})}{\rho r} > 0$. Essentially, $\Gamma > 0$ shifts part of the manager's compensation from distress states towards states, in which the firm is flush with liquidity. While this is beneficial from a risk-management point of view, it comes at the cost of exposing the agent to jump risk $d\Pi$.

The dynamics of C then follow

$$dC = \mu_C dt + (1-\beta)dZ + (\Delta - \Gamma)d\Pi - dDiv \tag{32}$$

with

$$\mu_C := rC + \mu - \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta\sigma)^2 - \delta A\left(\frac{\varphi C}{1-\varphi}\right) + \frac{\pi(1-e^{-\rho r\Gamma})}{\rho r}. \tag{33}$$

We again consider the relaxed problem (allowing φ to be freely chosen on $[\kappa, 1]$ *outside* a refinancing event) via the following HJB equation:

$$(r+\delta)v(C) = \max_{\beta\geq\lambda,\varphi,\Gamma,\Delta}\left\{v'(C)\mu_C + \pi\big[v(C+\Delta-\Gamma) - v(C) - \Delta\big] + \frac{v''(C)(1-\beta)^2}{2}\right\} \tag{34}$$

subject to

$$\varphi \geq \max\left\{\kappa, \frac{\kappa(C+\Delta)-\Gamma_t}{C+\kappa\Delta-\Gamma}\right\}.$$

Define

$$C^*(C) := C + \Delta(C) - \Gamma(C), \tag{35}$$

A firm's *refinancing policy* is then given by two of $C^*(C), \Delta(C), \Gamma(C)$. Next, we have to consider two scenarios: (1) shareholders can ex-ante commit to a refinancing policy or (2) shareholders cannot commit ex-ante, but instead maximize their refinancing policy *conditional* on a refinancing opportunity arising. We will discuss these scenarios in turn. Importantly, in the discussions we maintain the counter-factual assumption that the same $\overline{C}$ applies in all considered scenarios for ease of comparison. Of course, once fully solved, different payout thresholds apply in different scenarios.

Lastly, it is during the refinancing event that our restriction on the wage process, Assumption 1, possibly has bite: A slack $\varphi > \kappa$ helps the firm raise more Δ for the same amount of pay-for-luck Γ by relaxing constraint (31), as the firm cannot freely adjust φ during the refinancing event. For expositional clarity, however, we assume parameters that result in $\varphi = \kappa$ for all $C \in [0, \overline{C}]$ in our discussion below.

5.1 No ex-ante commitment and constant proportional flotation costs

Suppose shareholders cannot ex-ante commit to any refinancing policy. This means that upon finding outside investors, i.e., $d\Pi_t = 1$, the firm raises the *ex-post* optimal amount Δ rather than the *ex-ante* one. More specifically, inspecting the HJB, it is as if the shareholders ignore the impact that the optimal Γ has on the drift of C, i.e., they ignore $\frac{\partial \mu_{Ct}}{\partial \Gamma}$, and maximize the *static* problem

$$\max_{\Delta \geq 0, \Gamma}\left\{v(C+\Delta-\Gamma) - v(C) - \Delta\right\} \text{ s.t. (31).}$$

Inspecting the FOC, we see that this results in an implied *constant* proportional flotation cost

$$v'(\underbrace{C+\Delta-\Gamma}_{=:C^*_{LC}}) = 1 + \underbrace{\frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}}_{\text{Flotation Cost}}. \tag{36}$$

Further, the firm refinances to the *same* target cash-level $C^*_{LC} < \overline{C}$ regardless of current C, and there is no lumpy wage payment. Consider $\kappa = 0$. The FOC implies $v'(C^*_{FB}) = 1$, which in turn implies $C^*_{FB} = \overline{C} > C^*_{LC}$. Absent agency conflicts, the firm refinances to the payout boundary.

5.2 Ex-ante commitment and state-dependent flotation costs

In the ex-ante commitment case, the principal optimally takes into account that any choice of (Δ, Γ) via Γ affects increases the drift μ_{Ct}. Let $\hat{C}^*(C)$ solve the resulting FOC:

$$v'(\hat{C}^*(C)) = 1 + \underbrace{\frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}\left[1 - v'(C)e^{-\rho r \frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}[\hat{C}^*(C)-C]}\right]}_{\text{State-Dependent Flotation Cost}}. \tag{37}$$

The shareholders essentially commit to act as if they are facing an endogenously *lower* state-dependent flotation cost than in the static optimization problem above. Note that (marginal) flotation cost ceteris paribus decrease in $\hat{C}^*(C)$. If $\hat{C}^*(C)$ is strictly lower than $\overline{C}$, then it is the optimal refinancing level, i.e., $C^*(C) = \hat{C}^*(C)$. In this case, flotation cost are strictly positive but less than in the ex-ante commitment case, and the marginal value of cash after refinancing equals marginal cost of raising funds.

If however, $\hat{C}^*(C) > \overline{C}$, we have *negative* flotation cost, which occurs exactly when

$$\ln(v'(C)) \times \frac{(1-\kappa)}{\rho r \kappa} + C \geq \overline{C}, \tag{38}$$

This is more likely to for low C firms, as then $v'(C)$ is high. Consider refinancing all the way to $\hat{C}^*(C) > \overline{C}$. This would trigger *immediate* dividend and wage payouts to reset to $\overline{C}$. The key observation now is that such dividend payouts would be a wash[17] but the required jump in managerial compensation, $\Gamma + dw_{refi}$, is not. Consequently, define

$$C^*(C) := \min\{\hat{C}^*(C), \overline{C}\}. \tag{39}$$

The jump in managerial compensation in a refinancing event, $\Gamma + dw_{refi}$, is then given by

$$\Gamma = \frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}[C^*(C) - C] \geq 0 \text{ as well as } dw_{refi} = 1_{\{\hat{C}^*(C) > \overline{C}\}}\left[\frac{\ln(v'(C))}{\rho r} - \frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}(\overline{C} - C)\right] \geq 0, \tag{40}$$

there is no dividend payments, and the firm raises an amount of cash of

$$\Delta(C) = C^*(C) - C + \Gamma + dw_{refi} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-\kappa}[\hat{C}^*(C) - C] & \hat{C}^*(C) \leq \overline{C} \\ \frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}[\hat{C}^*(C) - \overline{C}] + \frac{1}{1-\kappa}[\overline{C} - C] & \hat{C}^*(C) > \overline{C} \end{cases}. \tag{41}$$

[17] Any dollar raised to be used for an *immediate* dividend payment is paid for by shareholders themselves. Thus, a small *exogenous* refinancing cost would eliminate any part of refinancing used for such immediate dividend payouts.



Figure 5: **Optimal Refinancing** under full ex-ante commitment w.r.t. the refinancing strategy. Parameters are $\mu = 0.25, r = 0.1, \kappa = \lambda \in \{0.4, 0.5\}$, $\theta = 0$, $L = 0$, $\sigma = 0.8$, $\delta = 0.25$, $\pi = 0.2$ and $\rho = 7.$. The upper three panels use $\lambda = \kappa = 0.4$, the lower three panels $\lambda = \kappa = 0.5$.

We note that pay-for-luck is *excessive*, as it is more — by $\frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}[\hat{C}^*(C) - \overline{C}]$ — than the amount of cash needed to reset to $\overline{C}$ while simultaneously preserving incentive compatibility.

Figure 5 demonstrates that the refinancing threshold $C^*(C)$ can be non-monotonic in C. While the target refinancing level follows a U-shaped pattern, the amount raised within a financing round, $\Delta(C)$, unambiguously decreases in C.

Corollary 4. *Under full ex-ante commitment to a refinancing strategy:*

i) The amount raised Δ and Γ decrease in C

ii) The target level $C^*(C)$ increases in a neighbourhood of $\overline{C}$

iii) The target level $C^*(C)$ decreases in a neighbourhood of zero, provided κ or ρ is sufficiently small.

Setting $\kappa = 0$ implies the first-best $C^*_{FB} = \overline{C}$. In the ex-ante commitment scenario, $v'(C) > 0$ and holding the payout boundary constant, the principal commits to more aggressive refinancing than implied by the static problem, i.e., $C^*_{FB} \geq C^*(C) \geq C^*_{LC}$. Committing to *over*-refinancing and even *excessive* pay-per-luck, the firm increases the drift of C and thus relaxes the liquidity problem at the cost of larger than statically optimal payments to agent in the event of refinancing. However, as the marginal utility of cash to the shareholders is higher pre- than post-refinancing due to $v''(C) \leq 0$, this is a beneficial trade-off.

5.3 Capital Market Access and Hedging

How does the possibility to raise funds in capital markets impact the firm's risk-management? Intuitively, one could argue that better refinancing opportunities render altogether less hedging needed, as demonstrated in e.g. Hugonnier et al. (2014). However, our model yields a different prediction. Under less frictional capital markets, finding outside investors becomes easier and liquidation less likely, so that there is less need to hold large liquidity reserves, in that $\overline{C}$ decreases in π. In addition, the access to outside funds boosts the firm's going concern value and liquidation becomes more inefficient. Thus, *conditional* in being in a low C state, shareholders have more incentives to avert termination when π is high, in which case it becomes optimal to hedge more intensely via labour contracts. Furthermore, surviving the next instant $[t, t+dt]$ entails the additional benefit of possibly having a refinancing opportunity, which happens with probability πdt, further increasing the hedging demand. Inspecting the first-order conditions for both the ex-ante commitment and no commitment case, we see that π only indirectly affects the choice of $C^*(C)$ via $v(\cdot)$, but does not directly enter either (36) or (37).

Therefore, firms with better access to capital markets tend to hedge *less* through internal cash but *more* through labor contracts. This holds true regardless of the commitment structure. When shareholders cannot commit to a refinancing policy, they also raise less cash during a single financing round, when financing opportunities arrive more frequently, i.e., C^* decreases in π. We summarize these findings in the following corollary.

Corollary 5. *For a firm under distress, i.e., $C \simeq 0$, $\beta(C)$ increases in π. Target cash-holdings $\bar{C}$ decrease in π. In the limited commitment case, the refinancing target C^* decreases in π.*

6 Further Results and Robustness

6.1 Stock Return Volatility and Agency Conflicts

In this section, we discuss how firm agency conflicts impact the firm's stock returns:

$$dR_t = \frac{dDiv_t + dv(C_{t-})}{v(C_{t-})} = r + \delta + \frac{dDiv_t}{v(C_{t-})} + \Sigma_t dZ_t. \tag{42}$$

Of particular interest is the stock-return volatility $\Sigma_t = \Sigma(C_t)$ where

$$\Sigma(C) = \sigma(1 - \beta(C)) \times \frac{v'(C)}{v(C)}. \tag{43}$$

Recall our assumption that the firm is 100% equity financed and that we do not take a stance on the implementation of the manager's contract. In case the contract is implemented via stock, vesting stock or stock options, dR_t is best interpreted as the return on *outside* equity, owned by shareholders, rather than *inside* equity, owned by management.

First, contrary to the existing literature on dynamic cash-management (compare e.g. Décamps et al. (2011)) the firm's stock return volatility does not necessarily decrease in the firm's level of financial slack.[18] In fact, we find that firms with relatively low levels of cash can have less volatile stock returns than otherwise comparable firms with high cash-levels. The reason is that in our model firms hedge liquidity risk intensely through labor contracts under financial distress. Under these circumstances, the agent's compensation package is highly contingent on cash-flow realizations and firm performance, so that a substantial amount of risk is absorbed through labor contracts. This in turn lowers the stock return volatility Σ_t of *outside* equity owned by shareholders. Especially when cash-flow uncertainty σ is low, the agent's compensation scheme is exposed to a considerable amount of cash-flow risk, so that stock-return volatility may follow a hump-shaped pattern in C. As a consequence of intense hedging through labour contracts, stock-return volatility is then even lowest under financial distress.

Second, we find that the nature of agency conflicts determines its impact on the firm's stock return volatility. Severe moral hazard λ over cash-*flows* requires the manager to be sufficiently exposed to cash-flow realizations dX by means of high-powered incentives β, thereby leading to a low stock-return volatility. In contrast, severe moral hazard κ over cash-*holdings* or high δ imply

[18] In dynamic liquidity management models without labor contracts, stock return volatility is given by $\frac{v'(C)}{v(C)}\sigma$ where C is the firm's cash stock. Since the value function is regardless of labor contracts strictly increasing and concave, stock return volatility *always* decreases in financial slack.



Figure 6: **Stock Return Volatility** is non-monotonic in C and increases in λ. The left panel depicts the case of low volatility, $\sigma = 0.8$, and the right panel the case of high volatility, $\sigma = 0.9$. The Parameters are $\mu = 0.25, r = 0.1, \delta = \kappa = 0.25$, $\theta = 0$, $L = 0.25$, $\lambda_{Low} = 0.5 < 0.75 = \lambda_{High}$ and $\rho = 7$.

large carry cost of cash. This leads to little hedging of liquidity risks and thereby a high stock-return volatility.

Corollary 6. *Stock return volatility $\Sigma(C)$ decreases in a neighbourhood of $\overline{C}$, and also decreases for low levels of C when L is sufficiently low. Further, we have the following comparative statics:*

i) *More severe moral hazard λ reduces the stock return volatility:*

  - *For any C, $\Sigma(C)$ decreases in moral hazard, provided λ is sufficiently large. That is, for all $C \geq 0$ there exists $\bar{\lambda} \in (0,1)$, such that $\frac{\partial \Sigma(C)}{\partial \lambda} < 0$ for $\lambda \geq \bar{\lambda}$.*
  - *For ρ or λ sufficiently small, $\Sigma(C)$ decreases in λ for C close to $\overline{C}$.*

ii) *More severe moral hazard κ increases the stock return volatility. For C close to $\overline{C}$, $\Sigma(C)$ increases in κ.*

6.2 Restrictions on the manager's savings and wages

Let us now discuss two natural restrictions one would consider imposing on the control problem:

- Consider restricting the agent savings to be non-negative, i.e., $S \geq 0$. This, destroys the first reduction in the state space, as S now has to be separably tracked. In other words, the problem with $(S, W, M) = (0, W_0, M_0)$ is now different from the problem $(S, W, M) = (Z, W_0 + Z, M_0)$ for any $Z > 0$. Consequently, the principal now faces a true 3-D optimization in the (S, W, M) with an additional state-constraint.

- Consider restricting wages to be non-negative, i.e., $dw \geq 0$, to keep the first dimensionality reduction intact. This requires dividend payments after any shocks push (M, Y) below the $Y = \kappa M$ ray. This can be seen in Panel A in Figure 1 as moving from point B to point B'' – after a negative shift pushes O below the $Y = \kappa M$ ray to B, only dividend payments are effective in returning (Y, M) to within the wedge $\mathcal{B}$. Such a dividend payout magnifies cash outflows, amplifying the specter of liquidity-based default. The firm will therefore want to consider building up a cash-buffer to stay away from the $Y = \kappa M$ ray. Consequently, the optimization is taking place on the full 2-D space (M, Y) with a non-standard, as non-perpendicular, reflection at $Y = \kappa M$.

Thus, either of these restrictions leads to a relatively intractable problem requiring a numerical solution. We will next show how Assumption 1 makes the problem tractable while maintaining the key economic mechanism between liquidity and agency that we are after.

7 Conclusion

We present a model of liquidity management and financing decisions under moral hazard in which a firm accumulates cash to forestall liquidity default. When the cash balance is high, a tension arises between accumulating more cash to reduce the probability of default and providing incentives for the manager. When the cash balance is low, the firm hedges against liquidity default by transferring cash flow risk to the manager via high powered incentives. This risk transfer occurs even though the manager is risk averse and the firm's owners are risk neutral because default is costly. Firms with more volatile cash flows transfer less risk to the manager and hold more cash. Agency conflicts lead to endogenous flotation costs related to the severity of the moral hazard problem, even in a market with no physical cost of raising financing. These flotation costs are state-dependent, lead to raising more than a static optimization would imply, and sometimes even lead to large cash-payouts to the agent in case of successful refinancing. Finally, because the manager's incentive-pay absorbs part of the liquidity risk, the firm's stock return volatility can be non-monotonic in the level of cash and decreases in the severity of moral hazard.

References

Ai, H., Kiku, D., and Li, R. (2013). A mechanism design model of firm dynamics: The case of limited commitment. *Available at SSRN 2347821*.

Ai, H. and Li, R. (2015). Investment and ceo compensation under limited commitment. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 116(3):452–472.

Bates, T. W., Kahle, K. M., and Stulz, R. M. (2009). Why do us firms hold so much more cash than they used to? *The journal of finance*, 64(5):1985–2021.

Berk, J. B., Stanton, R., and Zechner, J. (2010). Human capital, bankruptcy, and capital structure. *The Journal of Finance*, 65(3):891–926.

Biais, B., Mariotti, T., Plantin, G., and Rochet, J.-C. (2007). Dynamic security design: Convergence to continuous time and asset pricing implications. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 74(2):345–390.

Biais, B., Mariotti, T., Rochet, J.-C., and Villeneuve, S. (2010). Large risks, limited liability, and dynamic moral hazard. *Econometrica*, 78(1):73–118.

Bolton, P., Chen, H., and Wang, N. (2011). A unified theory of tobin's q, corporate investment, financing, and risk management. *The journal of Finance*, 66(5):1545–1578.

Bolton, P., Chen, H., and Wang, N. (2013). Market timing, investment, and risk management. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 109(1):40–62.

Bolton, P., Wang, N., and Yang, J. (2017). *Liquidity and Risk Management: Coordinating Investment and Compensation Policies*.

Decamps, J.-P., Gryglewicz, S., Morellec, E., and Villeneuve, S. (2016). Corporate policies with permanent and transitory shocks. *The Review of Financial Studies*, page hhw078.

Décamps, J.-P., Mariotti, T., Rochet, J.-C., and Villeneuve, S. (2011). Free cash flow, issuance costs, and stock prices. *The Journal of Finance*, 66(5):1501–1544.

Décamps, J.-P. and Villeneuve, S. (2007). Optimal dividend policy and growth option. *Finance and Stochastics*, 11(1):3–27.

Della Seta, M., Morellec, E., and Zucchi, F. (2017). Short-term debt and incentives for risk-taking.

DeMarzo, P. M., Fishman, M. J., He, Z., and Wang, N. (2012). Dynamic agency and the q theory of investment. *The Journal of Finance*, 67(6):2295–2340.

DeMarzo, P. M. and Sannikov, Y. (2006). Optimal security design and dynamic capital structure in a continuous-time agency model. *The Journal of Finance*, 61(6):2681–2724.

Gryglewicz, S. (2011). A theory of corporate financial decisions with liquidity and solvency concerns. *Journal of financial economics*, 99(2):365–384.

Gryglewicz, S., Hartman-Glaser, B., and Zheng, G. (2017). Growth options, incentives, and pay-for-performance: Theory and evidence. Working paper, Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Guiso, L., Pistaferri, L., and Schivardi, F. (2005). Insurance within the firm. *Journal of Political Economy*, 113(5):1054–1087.

Hartman-Glaser, B., Lustig, H. N., and Zhang, M. X. (2017). Capital share dynamics when firms insure managers. *Unpublished working paper. University of California, Los Angeles.*

He, Z. (2011). A model of dynamic compensation and capital structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 100(2):351–366.

He, Z., Wei, B., Yu, J., and Gao, F. (2017). Optimal long-term contracting with learning. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 30(6):2006–2065.

Holmstrom, B. and Milgrom, P. (1987). Aggregation and linearity in the provision of intertemporal incentives. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 303–328.

Hugonnier, J., Malamud, S., and Morellec, E. (2014). Capital supply uncertainty, cash holdings, and investment. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 28(2):391–445.

Hugonnier, J. and Morellec, E. (2017). Bank capital, liquid reserves, and insolvency risk. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 125(2):266–285.

Jensen, M. C. (1986). Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance, and takeovers. *The American economic review*, 76(2):323–329.

Leary, M. T. and Roberts, M. R. (2005). Do firms rebalance their capital structures? *The journal of finance*, 60(6):2575–2619.

Marinovic, I. and Varas, F. (2017). Ceo horizon, optimal pay duration, and the escalation of short-termism. Technical report, Working Paper, Stanford University.

Rochet, J.-C. and Villeneuve, S. (2011). Liquidity management and corporate demand for hedging and insurance. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 20(3):303–323.

Williams, N. (2011). Persistent private information. *Econometrica*, 79(4):1233–1275.

Williams, N. (2015). A solvable continuous time dynamic principal–agent model. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 159:989–1015.

Zhu, J. Y. (2012). Optimal contracts with shirking. *Review of Economic Studies*, 80(2):812–839.

Appendix

A Preliminaries

A.1 Regularity Conditions

Uncertainty is modelled via a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with filtration $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t : t \geq 0\}$, generated by X and N. For any process $\mathcal{Y}$, adapted to $\mathbb{F}$, we also consider the left limit:

$$\mathcal{Y}_{t^-} := \lim_{s \uparrow t} \mathcal{Y}_s.$$

The process $\{\mathcal{Y}_{t^-}\}$ is $\mathbb{F}$ predictable. Intuitively, $\mathcal{Y}_{t^-}$ represents the value of the process $\mathcal{Y}$, just before the random event $dN_t \in \{0, 1\}$ realizes. We further write:

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot|\mathcal{F}_x] \ \forall\, t \geq 0 \ \wedge \ x \in \{t, t^-\},$$

where $\mathbb{E}_x[\cdot] =: \mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ for $x \in \{0, 0^-\}$.

Throughout the paper and for all problems, we impose finite utility for any consumption process c

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-rt}|u(c_t)|dt\right] < \infty$$

and square integrability conditions of dividend payouts Div and payments w:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-rt} dDiv_t\right]^2 < \infty \text{ and } \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-rt} dw_t\right]^2 < \infty. \tag{A.1}$$

Finite utility implies that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt} U_t(\cdot) \equiv \lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt}\mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^\infty e^{-r(s-t)} u(c_s) ds\right] = 0, \tag{A.2}$$

where $U_t(\cdot)$ represents the agent's continuation value under any, admissible strategy, suppressed for convenience. Condition (A.2) is also known as the *transversality condition* for the co-state, when solving the contracting problem by means of Pontryagin's maximum principle (compare e.g. Williams (2015)).

Next, note that

$$\hat{S}_t = \int_0^t e^{r(t-s)} dw_s - \int_0^t e^{r(t-s)} \hat{c}_s ds + \hat{S}_0 e^{rt}$$

for the consumption process $\hat{c}$ specified by contract $\mathcal{C}$, while c is the agent's actual consumption. Savings $\hat{S}$ corresponds to consumption $\hat{c}$ and savings S to consumption c.

We impose the no-Ponzi condition for all feasible consumption processes $c, \hat{c}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt} S_t \geq 0) = \mathbb{P}(\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt} \hat{S}_t \geq 0) = 1.$$

Further, $c, \hat{c}$ must satisfy the transversality condition:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt}\mathbb{E}u'(c_t)S_t = 0 = \lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt}\mathbb{E}u'(c_t)S_t = 0$$

Due to finite utility it follows that marginal utility – which is proportional to flow utility – must also be finite $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely, so that one can disregard $u'(c_t)$ in the transversality condition, which leads to

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt}\mathbb{E}S_t = \lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt}\mathbb{E}\hat{S}_t = 0.$$

Combined with the no-Ponzi condition, it follows after invoking Fatou's Lemma in fact that

$$\mathbb{P}(\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt}S_t = 0) = \mathbb{P}(\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt}\hat{S}_t = 0) = 1,$$

which we refer to as the *transversality condition*, even though it emerges as a combination of transversality and No-Ponzi condition. By the triangle inequality:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt}|S_t - \hat{S}_t| = 0 \ \mathbb{P} - a.s. \Longrightarrow \lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt}|\hat{c}_t - c_t| = 0 \ \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

For technical reasons, we postulate that the processes β, α are almost surely bounded, so that $|\beta_t|, |\alpha_t| < M$ almost surely, i.e. $\mathbb{P}\big(|\psi_t| < M\big) = 1$ for $\psi \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$, for any t. The equivalence of the measures $\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}^b$ (to be discussed in the next paragraph) ensures that the sensitivities are almost surely bounded under each probability measure used throughout the paper. We assume $M \in \mathbb{R}_+$ to be sufficiently large, so that this imposed constraint actually never binds in optimum:

Assumption 2. *The processes α, β from (9) are almost surely bounded by some sufficiently large constant M and are furthermore of bounded variation.*

In fact, the expression $\ln(1 + \gamma r \alpha_t)$ already implies the natural lower bound $\alpha \geq -1/(\gamma r)$.

Last, Let us further impose the following parameter assumption.

Assumption 3. *The shareholders' liquidation value L exceeds the agent's private valuation of full firm ownership. That is:*

$$L \geq \frac{\mu - \rho r \sigma^2/2}{r + \delta} =: \hat{L}. \tag{A.3}$$

If assumption 3 were to fail, shareholders would prefer to sell the firm to the agent instead of liquidating. Under these circumstances, $v_\tau = \hat{L}$ for $\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 : M_{t-} = 0\}$ and the whole analysis would go through with (effective) liquidation value $\hat{L}$ instead of L. Put differently:

$$v_\tau = \max\left\{L, \frac{\mu - \rho r \sigma^2/2}{r + \delta}\right\},$$

so that the firm undergoes de-facto liquidation, regardless of assumption 3.

A.2 Change of Measure

To start with, fix a probability measure $\mathbb{P}$, such that $dX_t = \mu dt + \sigma dZ_t$ with a $\mathbb{F}$-progressive standard Brownian Motion Z under the measure $\mathbb{P}$. Take a progressive process b, that is absolutely continuous and one can write $db_t = b_t^0 dt$ for some process b^0. Define the process χ via $\chi_t = \frac{db_t}{\sigma dt}$ for all $t \geq 0$, almost surely. Further, let

$$\Gamma_t = \Gamma_t(b) = \exp\Big(\int_0^t \chi_u dZ_u - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \chi_u^2 du\Big).$$

Assuming that the so-called Novikov condition is satisfied, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\int_0^\tau \chi_t^2 dt\right)\right] < \infty,$$

it follows that Γ follows a martingale. Given our restriction of bounded sensitivities, the Novikov-Condition is evidently met. Due to $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_0] = 1$, it is evident that Γ is a progressive density process and defines a probability measure $\mathbb{P}^b$ via the Radon-Nikodym derivative

$$\left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}^b}{d\mathbb{P}}\right)\bigg|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \Gamma_t = \Gamma_t(b).$$

Under the probability measure $\mathbb{P}^b$, the process Z^b with

$$Z_t^b = Z_t - \int_0^t \chi_u du = \frac{X_t - \mu t - \int_0^t b_u^0 du}{\sigma}$$

follows a standard Brownian Motion up to the stopping time τ. All measures $\{\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}^b : b\}$ are equivalent for suitable absolutely continuous processes b, that satisfy the above stated conditions, such that the measures share the same null sets.

Girsanov's theorem is only applicable if b is absolutely continuous $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely, in which case Z^b follows a Brownian Motion under $\mathbb{P}^b$.

B The Agent's Problem: Proof of Proposition 1

We split up the proof in two parts. First, we establish the representation of U by means of a stochastic differential equation, given a contract $\mathcal{C}$. From there, we proceed to show the claim regarding incentive compatibility.

B.1 Martingale Representation: Proof of Proposition 1 i)

Proof. Let in the following $\mathcal{C} = (\hat{c}, w, \hat{b})$ represent the manager's contract with $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{C}$. We denote the manager's continuation value by

$$U_t = U_t(\mathcal{C}) = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_t^\infty e^{-r(s-t)} u(\hat{c}_s)) ds \right],$$

where $\hat{c}$ is prescribed consumption, which might differ from actual consumption c. Define

$$A_t \equiv \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-rt} u(\hat{c}_s) ds \right] = \int_0^t e^{-rs} u(\hat{c}_s) ds + e^{-rt} U_t(\mathcal{C}) \tag{B.1}$$

By construction, $\{A_t : 0 \leq t \leq \infty\}$ is a square integrable martingale, progressive with respect to $\mathbb{F}$ under $\mathbb{P}$. By the martingale representation theorem, there exist now $\mathbb{F}$-predictable processes $\alpha, \beta, \hat{\Gamma}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{rt} dA_t = &(-\rho r U_{t-}) \beta_t \big(dX_t - \mu dt \big) - (-\rho r U_{t-}) \alpha_t \big(dN_t - \delta dt \big) \\ &+ (-\rho r U_{t-}) \Gamma_t (d\Pi_t - \pi dt) \mathbf{1}_{\{C_{t-} < C^*\}}. \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} dU_t = &r U_{t-} dt - u(\hat{c}_t) dt + (-\rho r U_{t-}) \beta_t \big(dX_t - \mu dt \big) - (-\rho r U_{t-}) \alpha_t \big(dN_t - \delta dt \big) \\ &+ (-\rho r U_{t-}) \Gamma (d\Pi_t - \pi dt) \mathbf{1}_{\{C_{t-} < C^*\}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

B.2 Incentive Compatibility: Proof of Proposition 1 ii) and iii)

We consider for brevity the case $\pi = 0$. It is straightforward to adapt the proof for $\pi > 0$.

Proof. We prove first the following auxiliary Lemma

Lemma 1. *Fix a $\mathbb{F}$-predictable process $\hat{c}$ and let $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{R}$. Consider the problem*

$$U_t = \max_{\{c_s\}_{s \geq t}} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_t^\infty e^{-r(s-t)} u(c_s) ds \right]$$
$$\text{subject to } d\Delta_s = r\Delta_s ds + d\hat{c}_s ds - c_s ds, \Delta_t = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{s \to \infty} e^{-r(s-t)} |\Delta_t - \Delta_s| = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

Next consider the problem

$$U_t' = \max_{\{\tilde{c}_s\}_{s \geq t}} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_t^\infty e^{-r(s-t)} u(\tilde{c}_s) ds \right]$$
$$\text{subject to } d\Delta_s = r\Delta_s ds + d\hat{c}_s ds - \tilde{c}_s ds, \Delta_t = \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \lim_{s \to \infty} e^{-r(s-t)} |\Delta_t - \Delta_s| = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

Then, $c_t + r\mathcal{S} = \tilde{c}_t$ and $U_t' = e^{-\rho r \mathcal{S}} U_t$.

Proof. Suppose that there exists a process $c' \neq \tilde{c}$, which satisfies the transversality condition, such that

$$U_t'(c') > U_t'(\tilde{c}) = e^{-\theta r \mathcal{S}} U_t.$$

Define the process c'' via $c_t'' = c_t' - r\mathcal{S}$. Then c'' satisfies the transversality condition and

$$\mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_t^\infty e^{-r(s-t)} u(c_s'') ds \right] = e^{\rho r \mathcal{S}} U_t'(\{c'\}) > U_t,$$

a contradiction. □

Next, we provide necessary and sufficient conditions for $\mathcal{C}$ to be incentive-compatible, in that $\hat{S}_t = S_t$ and $\hat{b}_t = b_t = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ holds almost surely.

For this sake write, $db_t = (b_t^0 - b_t^2)dt + db_t^1$, where b^0 and b^2 are absolutely continuous and almost surely positive, i.e, write $db_t = \hat{b}_t dt + db_t^1$, where $b_t^0 = \max\{0, \hat{b}_t\}$ and $b_t^2 = -\min\{0, \hat{b}_t\}$. Here, b^0 corresponds to cash-flow diverted, while b^2 is the amount by which cash-flow is boosted by means of the agent's savings account. Define $\Delta_t \equiv S_t - \hat{S}_t$ the deviation state with $\Delta_0 = 0$ and note that

$$d\Delta_t = r\Delta_t dt + \hat{c}_t dt - c_t dt + \lambda b_t^0 dt + \kappa db_t^1 - b_t^2 dt,$$

where $\hat{c}$ is the prescribed consumption and is such that $S_t = \hat{S}_t$, i.e. $\Delta_t = 0$ for all t. Note that $dZ_t^b \equiv (dX_t - \mu dt + b_t^0 dt)/\sigma$ is the increment of a standard Brownian Motion under the measure $\mathbb{P}^b$. We rewrite for $t < \tau$:

$$dU_t = rU_{t^-} dt - u(\hat{c}_t^M) dt + (-\rho r U_{t^-}) \beta_t \big(dZ_t^b + b_t^0 dt \big) - (-\rho r U_{t^-}) \alpha_t \big(dN_t - \delta dt \big).$$

Let $\hat{U}$ the agent's actual continuation value, so that

$$\hat{U}_t(c) = \hat{U}_t \equiv \mathbb{E}_t^b \left[\int_t^\infty e^{-r(s-t)} u(c_s) ds \right],$$

where the expectation $\mathbb{E}_t^b$ is taken under the measure $\mathbb{P}^b$, induced by the choice of b.

Define the agent's certainty equivalent $W_t = \frac{-\ln(-\rho r U_t)}{\rho r}$ and $Y_t \equiv W_t - S_t$.

First, let us consider the agent deviates at time t^- through specifying $M_{t^-} \geq db_t^1 > 0$, so that $db_t \notin o(dt)$. The principal can detect this deviation and accordingly punish the agent through reducing her certainty equivalent by the same amount. The agent can either leave the firm and avoid the punishment or take the punishment and stay, in which case the deviation does not yield any profit for her. In case she leaves the firm, her savings equal $S_t = S_{t^-} + \kappa db_t^1$, yielding continuation value by Lemma 1:

$$\int_t^\infty e^{-r(s-t)} u(c_s) ds = \frac{u[r(S_{t-} + \kappa db_t^1)]}{r},$$

as the agent perfectly smoothes consumption after contract termination and consumes at each time flow interest of savings. The continuation value is maximized for $db_t^1 = M_{t-}$. The deviation is not profitable, if and only if

$$\frac{u[(r(S_{t-} + \kappa db_t^1)]}{r} \le U_{t-} \Longleftrightarrow Y_{t-} \ge \kappa M_{t-}.$$

Hence, a necessary condition for the contract $\mathcal{C}$ to be incentive compatible is that $Y_{t-} \ge \kappa M_{t-}$ with probability one for all times $t \ge 0$.

Second, let us turn to strategies where $db_t^1 = 0$ for all $t \ge 0$. Let $t > 0$ and suppose the manager follows the recommended policy from time t onwards, in that $b_s^0 = 0$ and $c_s = \hat{c}_s + r\Delta_t$ for all $s \ge t$ by Lemma 1. The payoff from following this strategy is represented by the auxiliary gain process

$$G_t^M \equiv G_t^M(c, b) = \int_0^t e^{-rs} u(c_s) ds + e^{-\rho r \Delta_t} e^{-rt} U_t$$

and by means of Lemma 1, it suffices to consider deviations of this type, which yield weakly higher payoff than deviations of any other type. In addition, $\hat{U}_s = e^{-\rho r \Delta_t} U_s$ for $s \ge t$.

Next, note that the transversality condition and finite utility imply that $e^{-\rho r \Delta} U_t < \infty$ for all $t \ge 0$, so that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{E}^b e^{-\rho r \Delta_t} e^{-rt} U_t = 0$ for any possible strategy of the manager. which implies that the manager's actual payoff equals

$$\hat{U}_{0-} = \max_{c,b^0} \mathbb{E}^b \int_0^\infty e^{-rs} u(c_s) ds = \max_{c,b^0} \mathbb{E}^b G_\infty^M = \max_{c,b^0} \mathbb{E}^b \lim_{t\to\infty} G_t^M.$$

By Itô's Lemma:

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{\rho r \Delta_t} e^{rt} dG_t^M \\
&= \left(u(c_t) e^{\rho r \Delta_t} - u(\hat{c}_t) - \rho r U_{t-} (r\Delta_t + \hat{c}_t - c_t + \lambda b_t^0 - b_t^2) - (-\rho r U_{t-}) \beta_t b_t^0 \right) dt \\
&+ (-\rho r U_{t-}) \beta_t dZ_t^b - (-\theta r U_{t-}) \alpha_t (dN_t - \delta dt) \\
&\equiv \mu_{tG}^M(\cdot) dt + (-\rho r U_{t-}) \beta_t dZ_t^b - (-\rho r U_{t-}) \alpha_t (dN_t - \delta dt)
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that, because α, β are bounded and finite utility is imposed, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^b \left(\int_0^t e^{-rs} \beta_s (-\rho r U_{s-}) dZ_s^b \right) = \mathbb{E}^b \left(\int_0^t e^{-rs} \alpha_s (-\rho r U_{s-}) (dN_s - \delta ds) \right) = 0,$$

for any absolutely continuous b. It is then evident that by choosing $b_t^0 = 0$, $c_t = \hat{c}_t$, the manager can ensure that $\Delta_t = \mu_{tG}^M(\cdot) = 0$ for all $t \ge 0$, in which case $\{G^M(\hat{c}, 0)\}$ follows a martingale under $\mathbb{P}$ with last element $G_\infty^M(\cdot)$, such that $\mathbb{E}|G_\infty^M(\hat{c}, 0)| < \infty$ due to the regularity conditions we impose. Hence, by optional sampling

$$\hat{U}_{0-} = \max_{c,b^0} \mathbb{E}^b G_\infty^M(c, b^0) \ge \mathbb{E} G_\infty^M(\hat{c}, 0) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{E} G_t^M(\hat{c}, 0) = U_{0-}.$$

Next, observe that the highest value that $\mu_{tG}^M(\cdot)$ can obtain given Δ_t is given by the maximization over c_t and b_t^0, where the solution satisfies the following FOC:

$$u'(c_t)e^{r\rho\Delta_t} = -\rho r U_{t-},$$

which implies

$$u(c_t + r\Delta_t) = rU_{t-},$$

and $b_t^0 = b_t^2 = 0$ if and only if:

$$\lambda\Delta\rho ru(c_t)e^{\rho r\Delta_t} - \lambda\rho rU_{t-} + (\rho rU_{t-})\beta_t \leq 0 \text{ and } \Delta\rho ru(c_t)e^{\rho r\Delta_t} + \rho rU_{t-} + (\rho rU_{t-})\beta_t \leq 0.$$

If $\mathcal{C}$ is such that $rU_{t-}e^{-\rho r\Delta_t} = u(\hat{c}_t)$ and $1 \geq \beta_t \geq \lambda$ hold for all $t \geq 0$, it follows $c_t = \hat{c}_t$ and $b_t^0 = b_t^1 = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, in which case $\Delta_t = \mu_{tG}^M(\cdot) = 0$. Indeed, because the deviation gains are concave in the state Δ, the first order conditions are sufficient.

Hence, any other strategy tuple (c, b^0) makes the process $G^M(c, b^0)$ a supermartingale under the measure $\mathbb{P}^b$, i.e.

$$U_{0-} = G_0^M(\hat{c}, 0) \geq \mathbb{E}^b G_t^M(c, b^0)$$

Because our regularity conditions ensure that $G^M(c, b^0)$ is bounded from below, we can thus take limits on both sides and apply optional sampling to obtain

$$U_{0-} \geq \lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{E}^b G_t^M(c, b^0) = \mathbb{E}^b \lim_{t\to\infty} G_t^M(c, b^0) = \mathbb{E}^b G_\infty^M(c, b^0)$$

and in particular

$$U_{0-} \geq \max_{c,b^0} \mathbb{E}^b G_\infty^M(c, b^0) = \hat{U}_{0-}.$$

While we focused on strategies $(c, 0, b^0)$ and $(\hat{c}, b^1, 0)$ separately, it follows immediately – as there is no persistent deviation state and $db_t^1 > 0 \Rightarrow t = \tau$ – that

$$U_{0-} \geq \max_{c,b^0} \mathbb{E}^b G_\infty^M(c, 0, b^0) \text{ and } U_{0-} \geq \max_{b^1} \mathbb{E}^b G_\infty^M(\hat{c}, b^1, 0) \Longrightarrow U_{0-} \geq \max_{c,b^1,b^0} \mathbb{E}^b G_\infty^M(c, b^1, b^0).$$

This is because the maximal utility the agent can obtain at time t equals $e^{-\rho r\Delta_t}U_{t-}$ under any consumption c, while the deviation utility is given by

$$e^{-\rho r\Delta_t}\frac{u[(r(S_{t-} + \kappa db_t^1)]}{r},$$

which is smaller than $e^{-\rho r\Delta_t}U_{t-}$ if and only $Y_{t-} \geq \kappa M_{t-}$.

Therefore, $U_{0-} = \hat{U}_{0-}$ and $(c_t, b_t) = (\hat{c}_t, 0)$ for all $t \geq 0$ is the optimal strategy for the agent if and only if $1 \geq \beta_t \geq \lambda, rU_{t-} = u(\hat{c}_t), Y_{t-} \geq \kappa M_{t-}$ are satisfied for all $t \geq 0$ with probability one. In this case, the contract $\mathcal{C}$ is incentive compatible. □

C The Principal's Problem: Proof of Proposition 2

C.1 Reduction of the State Space: Proof of Proposition 6 i)

C.1.1 Part I

Per se, the state space is three dimensional and we have to keep track of three state M, W, S. Standard dynamic programming arguments yield the general HJB-equation:

$$(r+\delta)\,\hat{V}\,(W, M, S)\,dt = \max_{\beta\geq\lambda, dw\in\mathcal{I}, dDiv\geq 0} dDiv + \mathbb{E}[d\hat{V}(M, W, S)] \tag{C.1}$$

which must hold in the interior of the state space $\mathcal{M}^*$, to be specified. To save on notation we write the HJB-equation in differential form. The term $d\hat{V}(M,W,S)$ can be expanded by Ito's Lemma. Here, wages are subject to an arbitrary constraint $\mathcal{I}$. Given shareholders' risk-neutrality, it is natural to conjecture that payouts $dDiv$ follow a bang-bang policy and reflect states into the interior of the state space $\mathcal{M}^*$. The optimality of such a policy will be verified ex-post after reducing the state space. Thus, in the interior of $\mathcal{M}^*$ the following HJB-equation holds:

$$(r+\delta)\,\hat{V}\,(W,M,S) = \max_{\beta\geq\lambda, dw\in\mathcal{I}} \frac{\mathbb{E}[d\hat{V}(M,W,S)]}{dt}. \tag{C.2}$$

It is beyond the scope of the paper to provide a formal existence and uniqueness proof for a solution to (C.2). Therefore, we assume throughout the remainder:

Assumption 4 (Existence & Uniqueness)**.** *The PDE (C.2) admits a unique solution $\hat{V}\in C^2$.*

Due to the absence of wealth effects, one can show that the value function takes the form $V(M,Y) = V(M,W-S) = \hat{V}(M,W,S)$. This relationship is established in the below Lemma:

Lemma 2. *Let $\hat{V}(M,W,S)\in C^2$ the principal's value function, solving (C.2). Then $\hat{V}(M,W,S) = V(M,W-S) = V(M,Y)$ for some function $V\in C^2$. Thus, the payoff relevant state space $\mathcal{M}\subset\mathbb{R}^2$ is two-dimensional. Formally, there exists a surjective mapping $\mathcal{R}:\mathcal{M}^*\mapsto\mathcal{M}$ with the property:*

$$\hat{V}(x) = V(\mathcal{R}(x))\ \forall\ x\in\mathcal{M}^* \tag{C.3}$$

Proof. The proof proceeds by a guess and verify approach. Let us merely conjecture $\hat{V}(M,W,S) = V(M,Y)$ and show that such a function solves (C.2). By postulated uniqueness, this completes the proof.

In the following, a subscript denotes the partial derivative wrt. to the respective variable and we omit the argument of the function $\hat{V}(\cdot)$ to avoid clutter. Note that

$$\hat{V}_W = -\hat{V}_S = V_Y. \tag{C.4}$$

As this is an identity in the interior of the state space $\mathcal{M}$, we can differentiate, so as to obtain:

$$\hat{V}_{WS} = -\hat{V}_{SS} = -V_{YY} \tag{C.5}$$

$$\hat{V}_{WW} = -\hat{V}_{WS} = V_{YY}. \tag{C.6}$$

To get a better overview, let us review the SDEs that determine the law of motion of (M,W,S) under an incentive compatible and in the interior of the state space, i.e., $db = dB = dDiv = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
dM &= (rM+\mu)dt + \sigma dZ - dw \\
dS &= rSdt + dw - cdt, \quad c = rW \\
dW &= \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta\sigma)^2 dt + \beta\sigma dZ + \delta\alpha dt \\
dY &= dW - dS = \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta\sigma)^2 dt + \beta\sigma dZ + \delta\alpha dt - dw - rY dt.
\end{aligned}$$

We omit the jump terms, as the HJB-equation (C.2) already accounts for the post-liquidation value. Rewriting:

$$dS = rYdt + dw$$

and expanding in (C.2), evaluated under the optimal controls, the term $\mathbb{E}d\hat{V}$ by virtue of Ito's

Lemma yields:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(r+\delta)\hat{V} &= \hat{V}_W\left[\frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta\sigma)^2+\delta\alpha\right]+\hat{V}_S\left[rY+\frac{\mathbb{E}dw}{dt}\right]+\hat{V}_M\left[rM+\mu-\frac{\mathbb{E}dw}{dt}\right]\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\times\left\{\hat{V}_{WW}(\beta\sigma)^2+\hat{V}_{SS}\frac{<dw,dw>}{dt}+\hat{V}_{MM}\left[\sigma^2-\frac{\sigma<dw,dZ>}{dt}\right]\right\}\\
&+\hat{V}_{MS}\frac{-<dw,dw>+\sigma<dZ,dw>}{dt}+\hat{V}_{MW}\beta\sigma^2+\hat{V}_{WS}\frac{<dw,dZ>\beta\sigma}{dt},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $<\cdot,\cdot>$ denotes the quadratic variation of two processes (e.g., $<dZ,dZ>=dt$).

Note that controls dw and β depend on the value function and its derivatives by the HJB-equation (C.2). By the hypothesis $\hat{V}(M,W,S)=V(M,Y)$, it follows that dw and β therefore only depend on (M,Y). After substituting higher order derivatives of $\hat{V}$ by higher order derivatives of V by means of (C.4) and (C.5), one observes that the right-hand-side of the HJB-equation does not depend on (W,S) but on Y only. Thus, also the left-hand-side also is only a function of (M,Y) only, thereby confirming the guess that V solves (C.2), which concludes the proof. $\square$

In the following, we show that the state space is in fact a one-dimensional manifold, i.e., is one-dimensional.

C.1.2 Part II

We go on now to demonstrate that the state space $\mathcal{M}$ within an optimal contract must be one-dimensional, as long as we do not impose constraints on wages, beyond the feasibility constraint $dw\le M$. Thus, in the following we impose:

Assumption 5. *Wages w must satisfy $dw_t\le M_{t^-}$.*

Let us for simplicity assume that $\pi=0$. We start with the following auxiliary Lemma, which analyzes the value function $V(M,Y)$.

Lemma 3. *Let $V(M,Y)=V$ the principal's value function and define $\hat{\tau}=\inf\{t\ge 0: M_{t^-}<Y_{t^-}\}$ and assume there are no constraints on wage payments beyond feasability $dw\le M$. Then, under the optimal contract $\mathcal{C}$ the space of states $\mathcal{M}\subset\mathbb{R}^2$, which are reached with positive probability before time $\hat{\tau}$, must be one-dimensional, i.e., a one dimensional manifold. In particular, there exists a mapping φ so that $Y=\varphi(M)M$ for $M>0$.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary the state space $\mathcal{M}$ is two-dimensional. In order to maintain incentive compatibility, it must be that $Y\ge\kappa M\ge 0$ for all $(M,Y)\in\mathcal{M}$. Owing to $M\ge Y$, it is possible to freely move from state (M,Y) to state $(M-\varepsilon,Y-\varepsilon)$ by means of wage payouts $dw=-\varepsilon$, as long as:

$$Y-\varepsilon\ge(M-\varepsilon)\kappa\ge 0.$$

For any interior point $(M,Y)\in\mathcal{M}$ with $M>Y>\kappa M$, the firm's value function is given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(r+\delta)V=\max_{dw\le M,\beta}\Bigg\{\Bigg[&V_M\Big(\mu+rM-\frac{\mathbb{E}dw}{dt}\Big)+\frac{V_{MM}}{2}\left[\sigma^2+\frac{<dw,dw>-\sigma<dw,dZ>}{dt}\right]\\
&+V_Y\Big(rY+\frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta\sigma)^2dt+\delta A(Y)-\frac{\mathbb{E}dw}{dt}\Big)\\
&+\frac{V_{YY}}{2}\left[\frac{<dw,dw>-\beta\sigma<dw,dZ>}{dt}+(\beta\sigma)^2\right]+V_{MY}\frac{<dw,dw>}{dt}\Bigg\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $M > Y \geq \kappa M > 0$, the IC-constraint does not bind, it must be that

$$V_M + V_Y = 0. \tag{C.7}$$

Otherwise, the principal would optimally move from state (M, Y) to state $(M - \varepsilon, Y - \varepsilon)$ through setting some non-infinitesimal adjustment $dw = -\varepsilon$ for some ε. The adjustment dw is feasible, as long as the constraint $Y \geq \kappa M$ does not bind and $M \geq Y$.

The relation $V_M + V_Y = 0$ must hold for any interior point over the whole state space, when the state space $\mathcal{M}$ is a two-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^2$. Differentiating on this space the identity $V_M + V_Y = 0$ yields:

$$V_{MM} + V_{MY} = V_{YY} + V_{MY} \Longrightarrow V_{MM} = V_{YY} = -V_{MY}. \tag{C.8}$$

This already implies that all terms in the HJB-equation with $< dw, dw >$ and $\mathbb{E}dw$ cancel out.

Clearly, if $V(M, Y) = v(M - Y)$ the identities (C.7) and (C.8) hold. In fact, (C.7) and (C.8) require $V(M, Y) = v(M - Y)$ for some function $v \in C^2$.

Therefore with $C \equiv M - Y$ straightforward calculations yield:

$$(r + \delta)v(C) = \max_{\beta} \left\{ v'(C) \left(rC - \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta\sigma)^2 dt - \delta A\left(Y\right) + \mu \right) + \frac{\sigma^2(1-\beta)^2}{2} v''(C) \right\}.$$

As dividend payouts $dDiv > 0$ are always possible but not necessarily optimal, the marginal value of cash must satisfy $V_M = v' \geq 1$. However, for $\delta > 0$ and due to $A' > 0$ it follows that

$$V(M - \varepsilon, Y - \varepsilon) - V(M, Y) = v'(C)\delta(A(Y) - A(Y - \varepsilon)) > 0$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$ with $M - \varepsilon > 0$, which contradicts $V_M + V_Y = 0$. Hence, within the optimal contract (M, Y) cannot be an interior point of $\mathcal{M}$ and in particular $\mathcal{M}$ cannot have interior points, so that this set must be one-dimensional. This also implies that Y is a function of M. $\square$

The previous Lemma shows that the state space is one-dimensional as long as $Y \leq M$ and therefore can be parameterized by

$$\mathcal{M} = \{(M, \varphi(M)M) : M \geq 0\}$$

for some function φ, determined by the optimal contract. The Lemma may fail to hold, if $Y > M$. We show in the following Lemma that $Y_{t^-} \leq M_{t^-}$ or equivalently $\varphi(M_{t^-}) \leq 1$ must hold for all $t \geq 0$.

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ a contract and Div a dividend process. Further, define $t_F = \inf\{t \geq 0 : M_{t^-} < Y_{t^-}\}$. The contract is feasible, only if $\mathbb{P}(t_F = \infty) = 1$ and in particular $\mathbb{P}(\tau < t_F) = 1$. Hence, the event $\{Y_t > M_t\}$ must have zero probability.*

Proof. Fix the dividend process Div. Take a contract $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{C}$ and assume to the contrary that there exists a time $t_F < \tau$ with $\mathbb{P}(t_F < \infty) > 0$ and $Y_{t_F^-} > M_{t_F^-}$.

If the principal terminates the firm at time t_F, i.e., $\tau = t_F$, and sets optimally $dw_t = 0$ for $t \geq t^F$, the manager receives due to Nash-Bargaining amount $(1-\theta)M_{t_F^-} < Y_{t_F^-}$ and promise keeping is violated as $Y_\tau > 0$, evidently contradicting $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{C}$.

If the principal does not terminate, set $\tau_F = \inf\{t \geq t_F : M_t = Y_t\}$ and note that a contract $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{C}$ must satisfy $\mathbb{P}(\tau_F \leq \tau) = 1$, i.e., promise-keeping and in particular $Y_\tau = M_\tau = 0$. We consider now different cases.

i) First, let us assume that $M_{t_F^-} = 0 < Y_{t_F^-}$ and the principal would not like to specify $dw_{t_F^-} = -\varepsilon$, in order to continue at state $(\varepsilon, Y_{t_F^-} + \varepsilon)$ for some non-infinitesimal $\varepsilon > 0$ with $\varepsilon \notin o_p(dt)$. The other case will be – among others – analyzed in part ii) of the proof. Note that $t_F < \tau$, which requires $\beta_{t_F} = 1$, as a termination policy $\tau > t_F$ implies the agent must cover potential operating losses. Next, define $\tau_0 = \inf\{t \geq t_F : M_t > 0\}$. For all $t < \tau_0 \wedge \tau$, it must be $\beta_t = 1$ and as the agent covers operating losses:

$$\frac{dY_t}{dX_t} = \frac{dW_t}{dX_t} - \frac{dS_t}{dX_t} = 0,$$

so that Y_t has zero volatility for $t < \tau_0 \wedge \tau$. Furthermore, under contract $\mathcal{C}$, the agent consumes rW_t while earning interest $rS_t < rW_t$, so that the agent must borrow amount $-r(S_t - W_t) = -rY_t >$ and therefore $\mathbb{E}dS_t < 0$, while $\mathbb{E}dW_t > 0$ owing to the risk-premia earned. Hence, $\mathbb{E}dY_t \geq rY_t dt > 0$. Since Y_t grows at least at rate r, also the growth rate of the agent's borrowings is bounded from below by r, so that savings S_t shrink at least at rate r for $t_F \leq t \leq \tau_0$. In particular, $S_t = S_{t^F} - \int_{t_F}^t e^{r(t-s)} rY_s ds$. However, with positive probability there is a sample path of shocks $\{Z\}_{t \geq t_F}$, in which case $\tau_0 = \infty$. Then, either $\tau_0 > \tau$ promise keeping is violated with $Y_\tau > 0$ or

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt} S_t \leq \lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt} \left(- \int_{t_F}^t e^{r(t-s)} rY_s ds \right) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \left(- \int_{t_F}^t e^{-rs} rY_s ds \right) < 0$$

with positive probability, so that the no-Ponzi condition (7) is violated. Hence, $\mathcal{C} \notin \mathbf{C}$, a contradiction.

ii) Let us now consider $M_{t_F^-} > 0$. Define now $t_0 = \inf\{t \geq t_F : Y_{t^-} > M_{t^-} = 0\}$. Since $C_{t_F} < 0$ and $vol(dC_t) = \sigma(1 - \beta_t)$, there must exist a random time $\tau_1 < t_0$ a.s. and $\mathbb{P}(\tau_1 < \tau) > 0$ such that $\beta_{\tau_1} > 1$, in order to ensure that $\mathbb{P}(t_0 > \tau) = 1$. However, when $\beta_{\tau_1} > 1$ the agent would like to boost cash-flow and incentive compatibility is violated. Since τ_1 is reached with positive probability (before time τ), it follows that $\mathcal{C} \notin \mathbf{C}$.

Hence, continuing from time t_F, it must be that t_0 is reached with positive probability. By step i), we get either a violation of the no-Ponzi condition, in which case $\mathcal{C} \notin \mathbb{C}$, or the principal asks the agent to put in money into the firm through setting $dw_{t_0} = -\varepsilon_0 < 0$, in which case the game continues at state $(\varepsilon_0, Y_{t_0} + \varepsilon_0)$. The principal has then cash-reserves compensate the agent for her lack of interest earned rY_{t^-}, so that we may consider that the principal does so. Moreover, we may now without loss of generality assume, that at each time the firm runs out of cash, the principal asks the manager to put in some strictly positive amount of cash.

However, then there exists a sequence of random times $(t_n)_{n\geq 1}$ and discrete amount $(\varepsilon_n)_{n\geq 0}$, defined via

$$t_n = \inf\{t \geq t_{n-1} : 0 = M_{t^-} < Y_{t^-}\} \text{ and } \varepsilon_n = -dw_{t_n} > 0.$$

All t_n are reached with positive probability before time $\tau_F \leq \tau$, so that $\mathbb{P}_{t_F}(t_n < \tau_F) > 0$ for all $n \geq 0$. With positive probability for any chosen sequence $(\varepsilon_n)_{n\geq 0}$, we get

$$\mathcal{O}_t \equiv \int_{t_0}^{\tau\wedge t} e^{r(t-s)} \sum_{t_i \leq s} \varepsilon_{t_i} ds \notin o(e^{rt})$$

or equivalently $\mathcal{O}_t \notin o_p(e^{rt})$, in that the manager puts cash into the firm on a rate higher than r with positive probability. As a consequence

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt} S_t \leq \lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-rt}(-\mathcal{O}_t) < 0$$

with positive probability and the no-Ponzi condition is violated.

□

C.1.3 Part III

By the previous Lemma, $\{Y_t > M_t\}$ must be a zero probability event. Hence, the firm must be terminated at time $\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 : M_{t^-} = Y_{t^-}\} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : C_{t^-} = 0\}$ or the principal eliminates volatility through setting $vol(dC_\tau) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \beta_\tau = 1$, in order to prohibit that a state with $C_t < 0$ is reached with positive probability.

We show now in the following Lemma that the principal never would like to refinance by the agent when it runs out of cash, in that it does not ask the agent to put in any non-infinitesimal amount $-dw_{\tau_0}$ at any time τ_0 with $M_{\tau_0^-} = 0$ and in fact the equivalence $M_{t^-} = 0 \Leftrightarrow C_{t^-} = 0$.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ the optimal contract. Then, at any time $t_F = \inf\{t \geq 0 : C_{t^-} = 0\}$ it follows that dw_t is infinitesimal, that is, $dw_t \in o_p(dt)$, and the principal does not raise any strictly positive amount of debt from the agent. Moreover, $M_{t^-} = 0 \Leftrightarrow C_{t^-} = 0$.*

Proof. We prove now that once $C = M - Y = 0$ with $M = Y = 0$, the principal cannot profitably switch to a state (M, M) with $M > 0$. Let us assume the principal sets $\tau > t_F$ with $M_{t_F} = Y_{t_F} = 0$ and in particular $dw_{t_F} = \Delta^w \notin o_p(dt)$ and let payoff under this strategy be $v(\Delta^w, \Delta^w)$ with dividend payouts Div.

Let $\tau_F > t_F$ a stopping time, as follows. The principal can improve upon setting $dw_{t_F} = -\Delta_w + \varepsilon > 0$ and setting $dw_{\tau_F} = -\varepsilon < 0$, where $\tau_F = \inf\{t \geq t_F : M_{t^-} = \Delta^w - \delta\}$ for some arbitrary $\delta > 0$. Then, $\mathbb{P}(\tau_F > t_F) = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}(\tau_F - t_F > \delta') > 0$ for some arbitrary $\delta' > 0$. Setting payouts under the new strategy for $t_F \leq t \leq \tau_F$ according to $d\hat{D}iv_t = \delta(A(Y_t) - A(Y_t - \varepsilon))dt + dDiv_t$. All other features of the previous strategy will be mimicked. Then, the payoff under the modified strategy equals

$$v(\Delta^w, \Delta^w) + \mathbb{E}_{t_F}\left(\int_{t_F}^{\tau \wedge \tau_F} \delta(A(Y_t) - A(Y_t - \varepsilon))dt\right) > v(\Delta^w, \Delta^w).$$

As this holds for any $\varepsilon < \Delta^w$, it follows that the best the principal can do is to just raise the amount needed, that is set $\beta_t = 1$ and $dw_t \in o_p(dt)$ for $t_F \leq t \leq \tau_0$ with $\tau_0 = \inf\{t \geq 0 : C_{t^-} > 0\}$, in case $\tau > t_F$ is indeed optimal.

The second claim of the Lemma is immediate by the previous arguments. This is because being at state (M, M), the principal prefers to set payouts $dw = M$ and switch to state $(0, 0)$. Because $Y > M$ is not feasible, this implies the equivalence $M_{t^-} = 0 \Leftrightarrow C_{t^-} = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. □

As a consequence, we obtain $M = 0 \Leftrightarrow C = 0$, so that C indeed summarizes the whole contract relevant history and serves as the only relevant state-variable. Hence, firm value – i.e., the principal's payoff – can be written as a function $v = v(C)$ of the state C only. The state space by means of C is contained in $\mathbb{R}_+$, i.e., C exceeds zero.

Either the firm defaults if and only if it runs out of cash and therefore $\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 : C_{t^-} = M_{t^-} = 0\}$. Or there is an absorbing state, so that $\beta_t = 1$ whenever $C_{t^-} = c \geq 0$ for some constant c. As we verify, in the next section, there will not be an absorbing state, in that $\beta_t < 1$ for all $t \geq 0$ with probability one, as long as:

$$L \geq \frac{\mu - 0.5\rho r \sigma^2}{r + \delta},$$

where the RHS is the agent's valuation for the firm.

C.1.4 Part IV

To conclude the proof, let us argue that the state space reduction also goes through under the more strict assumption 1. However, this is obvious as wages are determined by the identity:

$$0 = d\varphi(C), \tag{C.9}$$

where the optimal control is obtained from instantaneous maximization, thereby being continuous. Thus, wages w are also optimally continuous, which means that assumption 1 is met. More specifically, wages follow:

$$dw = \mu_w dt + \sigma_w dZ + J d\Pi,$$

where $J \geq 0$, so that assumption 1 is satisfied. The coefficients are given in appendix D.1.2.

C.2 Verification: Proof of Proposition 6 ii)

Proof. A formal existence proof of the solution is beyond the scope of the paper and therefore omitted. Therefore, we assume $v(\cdot)$ is twice continuously differentiable and solves uniquely (34).

We verify that $v(C_{t-})$ indeed represents shareholders' profit in optimum.

Let $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{C}$ the optimal contract and Div the optimal payout policy, solving the principal's problem and consider any other contract $\hat{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbf{C}$ and any other payout policy $\hat{Div}$.

For convenience, let the contract contain the optimal refinancing sum Δ. We denote the n'th refinancing time by τ^n. Ex-post optimality owing to the shareholders' limited commitment pins down at time τ^n for each $n \geq 1$:

$$\max_{\Delta,\Gamma} \Big(v(C + \Delta - \Gamma) - v(C) - \Delta \Big) \text{ s.t. } (31),$$

given the solution v. If there is fully commitment, then the first-order optimality condition $\frac{\partial v(C)}{\partial \Delta} = 0$ is satisfied.

We show now that the value function $v(\cdot)$ solving (21) represents the principal's optimal profit, in that the contracts $\mathcal{C}$, the payout policy Div and the refinancing quantity Δ outlined in the Proposition are indeed optimal.

Let us for brevity write:

$$dC_t = \mu_{Ct} dt + \sigma_{tC} dZ_t + (\Delta_t - \Gamma_t) d\Pi_t - dDiv_t$$

with

$$\mu_{Ct} \equiv rC_{t-} + \mu - \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta_t \sigma)^2 - \delta A \left(\frac{\varphi_t C_{t-}}{1 - \varphi_t} \right) + \pi \frac{1 - e^{-\rho r \Gamma_t}}{\rho r} \text{ and } \sigma_{tC} = (1 - \beta_t)\sigma,$$

where we suppress the dependence of drift and volatility on controls and model parameters. Introduce the linear functional $\mathcal{L}$, operating on functions dependent on $C \geq 0$ with $\mathcal{L}f(C) = f'(C)\mu_C + \frac{\sigma_C^2 f''(C)}{2}$. Define for $t < \tau$ the auxiliary gain process upon following an arbitrary strategy $(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div})$ up to time t and then switching to $(\mathcal{C}, Div)$

$$G_t^P = G_t^P(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div}) = \int_0^t e^{-rs} d\hat{Div}_s + e^{-rt} v(C_{t-}).$$

By Itô's Lemma:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{rt} dG_t^P = & \Big\{ -(r + \delta + \pi) v(C_{t-}) + \mathcal{L}v(C_{t-}) + \pi \big[v(C_{t-} + \Delta_t - \Gamma_t) - \Delta_t \big] \Big\} dt \\ & + \big(1 - v'(C_{t-})\big) d\hat{Div} + \sigma_{tC} v'(C_{t-}) dZ_t - v(C_{t-})(dN_t - \delta dt) \\ \equiv & \ \mu_t^G(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div}) dt + \big(1 - v'(C_{t-})\big) d\hat{Div} + \sigma_{tC} v'(C_{t-}) dZ_t - v(C_{t-}(dN_t - \delta dt). \end{aligned}$$

By the HJB equation (34), the drift term in curly brackets is zero under the optimal controls under contract $\mathcal{C}$ and optimal dividend payout Div, while each other strategy/contract will make this term (weakly) negative, i.e $\mu_t^G(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div}) \leq 0$. Because the process $\hat{Div}$ is almost surely increasing and the fact that $v'(C_{t-}) \geq 1$, the term $\big(1 - v'(C_{t-})\big)$ is (weakly) negative under any dividend payout policy $\hat{Div}$ and zero under the payout policy Div.

Next, our regularity conditions ensure that α, β are bounded and so is σ_C. Further, v' and v must be bounded over $(0, \infty)$. Evidently, $v < \mu/r$. If now v' were not bounded, then v could not be bounded either. Hence, there exists $\infty > K > 0$ with $v, v' < K$. Hence:

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_0^t e^{-rs}\sigma_{tC}v'(C_{t-})dZ_s\bigg) = \mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_0^t e^{-rs}v(C_{t-})(dN_s - \delta ds)\bigg) = 0$$

for all $t < \tau$. Therefore, $G^P(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div})$ follows a supermartingale, while $G^P(\mathcal{C}, Div)$ follows a martingale under the measure $\mathbb{P}$ and so do the stopped processes $\{G^P(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div})_{t\wedge\tau}\}$ and $\{G^P(\mathcal{C}, Div)_{t\wedge\tau}\}$. Hence, the payoff under strategy $(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div})$ satisfies

$$\hat{v}(C_{0-}) \equiv G^P_{0-}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div}) \geq \mathbb{E}G^P_{t\wedge\tau^I}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div})$$

Then it follows for any t:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{v}(C_{0-}) &= \mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_0^\tau e^{-rs}d\hat{Div}_s + e^{-r\tau}L\bigg) = \mathbb{E}G^P_\tau(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div}) + e^{-r\tau}L \\
&= \mathbb{E}\bigg(G^P_{t\wedge\tau^I}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div}) + \mathbf{1}_{t\leq\tau}\Big[\int_t^\tau e^{-rs}d\hat{Div}_s + e^{-r\tau}L - e^{-rt}v(C_{t-})\Big]\bigg) \\
&= \mathbb{E}G^P_{t\wedge\tau}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}, \hat{Div}) + e^{-rt}\mathbb{E}_t\mathbf{1}_{t\leq\tau}\bigg(\int_t^\tau e^{-r(s-t)}d\hat{Div}_s + e^{-r(\tau-t)}L - v(C_{t-})\bigg) \\
&\leq v(C_{0-}) + e^{-rt}\big(v^{FB} - L\big),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the supermartingale property and the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}_t\bigg(\int_t^\tau e^{-r(s-t)}d\hat{Div}_s + e^{-r(\tau-t)}L\bigg) \leq v^{FB} \equiv \frac{\mu}{r}$$

and $v(C_{t-}) \geq L$.

From the above arguments, we readily obtain $\hat{v}(C_{0-}) \leq v(C_{0-})$ for any contract $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ and any payout policy $\hat{Div}$. On the other hand, under $(\mathcal{C}, Div)$ the principal's payoff $\hat{v}(C_{0-})$ achieves $v(C_{0-})$, as the above weak inequality holds in equality when $t \to \infty$. This concludes the proof. □

C.3 Concavity of value function: Proof of Proposition 2 iii)

Proof. Wlog, we prove the claim only under limited commitment w.r.t. a refinancing strategy. The proof for full commitment works analogously. Note that in optimum $C + \Delta - \Gamma = C^*$ for a constant C^*. Differentiating the above identity yields

$$0 = 1 + \frac{\partial\Delta}{\partial C} - \frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial C} = 1 + \frac{\partial\Delta}{\partial C} - \frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial\Delta}\frac{\partial\Delta}{\partial C} \Longrightarrow \frac{\partial\Delta}{\partial C} = -\frac{1}{1-\kappa},$$

because by (31) – which is tight in optimum – it follows that $\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial\Delta} = \kappa$. By the envelope theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}
v'''(C) &= \frac{2}{(1-\beta)^2\sigma^2} \\
&\times \bigg\{\bigg[\delta + \pi + \frac{\delta\varphi\mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi=\kappa\}}}{(1-\varphi)}A'\left(\frac{\varphi C}{1-\varphi}\right) + \frac{\pi\kappa e^{-\rho r\Gamma}}{1-\kappa}\mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi=\kappa\}}\mathbf{1}_{\{\Delta>0\}}\bigg]v'(C) - v''(C)\mu_C - \frac{\pi}{1-\kappa}\mathbf{1}_{\{\Delta>0\}}\bigg\}
\end{aligned}$$

Let us evaluate $v'''(\cdot)$ at the boundary, in which case $\Delta = 0$ due to $\kappa > 0$ and therefore $\varphi = \kappa$.

First, assume that $v''(\bar{C}) = 0$ and the super-contact condition holds. Due to $A' \geq 1$, $v''(\bar{C}) =$

$v'(\bar{C})-1=0$ and $\beta=\lambda$, it is immediate that $v'''(\bar{C})>0$. Hence, by continuity, there exists $\varepsilon>0$, so that $v''<0$ on an interval $(\bar{C}-\varepsilon,\bar{C})$. Second, assume $v''(\bar{C})\neq 0$. If $v''(\bar{C})>0$, there exists a point $C'<\bar{C}$ with $v'(C')<1$, a contradiction to $\bar{C}$ being the payout boundary. Hence, also in this case $v''<0$ on an interval $(\bar{C}-\varepsilon,\bar{C})$.

Let us assume that v is not strictly concave on $[0,\bar{C})$ and define $C'\equiv\sup\{C\in[0,\bar{C}]:v''(C)>0\}$. By assumption, the set over which we take the supremum is non-empty, so that $C'<\infty$. As $v''<0$ in a left-neighbourhood of $\bar{C}$, we also have that $C'<\bar{C}$. Due to continuity, $v''(C')=0$. As $\Delta>0$ implies $v'(C)\geq 1/(1-\kappa)$, it follows that $v'''(C')>0$, so that there exists $C''>C'$ with $v''(C'')>0$, a contradiction to the definition of C'. Hence, $v''<0$ on $[0,\bar{C})$. In addition, strict concavity of v implies $v'''>0$ on $[0,\bar{C}]$, thereby concluding the proof. □

D Additional Analytic Results

D.1 Proof of Corollary 1

D.1.1 Claims i) and ii)

Proof. Differentiating the expression for $\hat{\beta}$ w.r.t. C yields

$$\partial_C\beta^*(C)=\frac{\partial\beta^*(C)}{\partial C}\propto -v'(C)v'''(C)+v''(C)v''(C),$$

so that there exists $C':=\inf\{C\geq 0:\partial_C\beta^*(C)<0\}<\bar{C}$ with $\partial_C\beta^*(C)<0$ on $[C',\bar{C})$ and β^* strictly decreases in an open left neighbourhood of $\bar{C}$. Further, it is immediate to verify that

$$\partial_C\left(\frac{-v''(C)}{v'(C)}\right)\propto(\beta^*)'(C).$$

As $\sigma\to 0$, clearly $\bar{C}\to 0$. By the super-contact condition, $v''(C)=o(\bar{C})$, while $v'(C)v'''(C)\neq o(\bar{C})$. Hence, $C'\uparrow 0$ as $\sigma\to 0$, which proves that for σ sufficiently low β^* decreases on $[0,\bar{C})$.

Let $\hat{C}=\inf\{C\in[0,\bar{C}:\beta^*(C)\geq\lambda\}$. It is obvious that $\hat{C}\leq\bar{C}$. Since $\beta^*(C)>0$ for all $C<\bar{C}$ and $\bar{C}\to\bar{C}'>0$ as $\lambda\to 0$, it follows that $\hat{C}\to 0$. Thus, for λ sufficiently small, it must be that $\hat{C}<\bar{C}$ and there exists exactly one value solving the equation $\beta(C)=\lambda$, which completes the proof. □

D.1.2 Claim iii)

Proof. Let us postulate that wages w follow a continuous Ito process, when there is no refinancing:

$$dw_t=\mu_{wt}dt+\sigma_{wt}dZ_t+J_{t^-}d\Pi_t.$$

The manager receives strictly positive payouts only in case of refinancing $d\Pi_t=1$, so that by virtue of section 5:

$$J_{t^-}=\frac{\varphi_t}{1-\varphi_t}\left(\hat{C}^*-\overline{C}\right).$$

In the following we may ignore the jump term and wlog assume $\pi=\frac{\mathbb{E}d\Pi_t}{dt}=0$.

It remains to determine the drift μ_{wt} and volatility σ_{wt} under the assumption $\varphi_t=\kappa\ \forall\ t\geq 0$ with probability one. By definition: $Y_t=\frac{\varphi_t C_t}{1-\varphi_t}$. Using (11):

$$\begin{aligned}dW_t=&\frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta_t\sigma)^2dt+\beta_t(dX_t-\mu dt)\\&+\delta\left(\alpha_t-\frac{\ln(1+\rho r\alpha_t)}{\rho r}\right)dt-\frac{\ln(1+\rho r\alpha_t)}{\rho r}(dN_t-\delta dt).\end{aligned}$$

and (4):

$$dS_t = rS_{t^-}dt + dB_t + dw_t - c_t dt \text{ with } c_t = rW_t,$$

it is straightforward calculate:

$$dY_t = rY_{t^-}dt - Y_{t^-}dN + \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta_t\sigma)^2 dt + \delta A(Y_{t^-})dt + \beta_t\sigma dZ_t - dw_t.$$

On the other hand, because $\varphi = \kappa$ is constant:

$$dY_t = \frac{\varphi_t dC_t}{1-\varphi_t}.$$

Taking (20):

$$dC_t = rC_{t^-}dt - \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta_t\sigma)^2 dt - \delta A\left(\frac{\varphi_{t^-}}{1-\varphi_{t^-}}C_{t^-}\right)dt + \mu dt + (1-\beta_t)\sigma dZ_t - dDiv_t - C_{t^-}dN_t,$$

we obtain after rearranging and collecting terms:

$$dw_t = \underbrace{\frac{1}{1-\varphi_t} \times \left[\frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta_t\sigma)^2 + \delta A\left(\frac{\varphi_{t^-}}{1-\varphi_{t^-}}C_{t^-}\right) - \varphi_t\mu\right]}_{=\mu_{wt}} dt + \underbrace{\frac{\beta_t - \varphi_t}{1-\varphi}\sigma}_{=\sigma_{wt}} dZ_t.$$

Wages dw_t are almost surely positive at all times t if and only if:

$$\sigma_{wt} = 0 \ \forall\ t \geq 0 \iff \beta_t = \varphi_t \ \forall t \geq 0$$
$$\mu_{wt} \geq 0 \ \forall\ t \geq 0 \Longleftarrow \rho r(\lambda\sigma)^2 \geq \kappa\mu,$$

because $A, A', A'' \geq 0$. These conditions can be satisfied without enlarging the state space, only if $\kappa = \lambda$. In this case, wages are almost surely positive, provided ρ or σ is sufficiently large. □

D.2 Proof of Corollaries 2 and 3

Here, η is an arbitrary model parameter and define $\partial_\eta(\cdot) \equiv \frac{\partial(\cdot)}{\partial\eta}$. Throughout, let us consider the limit case $\theta \to 0$, so that shareholders cannot profitably deviate by paying out the entire cash-balance and the payout threshold satisfies the satisfies the smooth-pasting condition.

We start with an auxiliary lemma:

Lemma 6. *For $\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 : M_t = 0\}$ the following holds:*

$$\frac{\partial v(C)}{\partial\eta} \propto \mathbb{E}\Bigg[\int_0^\tau e^{-(r+\delta)t}\Bigg(v'(C_t)\Big(\partial_\eta rC_t - \partial_\eta\frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta_t\sigma)^2 dt - \partial_\eta\delta A\left(\frac{\varphi_t C_t}{1-\varphi_t}\right) + \partial_\eta\mu\Big)$$
$$+ \partial_\eta\frac{\sigma^2(1-\beta_t)^2}{2}v''(C_t) + \partial_\eta\delta L\Bigg)dt + \partial_\eta e^{-(r+\delta)\tau}L\,\Bigg|\,C_0 = C\Bigg]$$

Proof. Let η a model parameter and β, φ the optimal controls in optimum. Let $C \in [0, \bar{C}]$ and take the derivative

$$\frac{dv(C)}{d\eta} = \partial_\eta v(C) + \partial_{\bar{C}}v(C) \times \partial_\eta\bar{C} = \partial_\eta v(C),$$

where $\partial_{\bar{C}}v(C) = 0$ by means of the envelope theorem, provided the super-contact condition $v''(\bar{C}) =$

0 holds. Accordingly, differentiating (21) w.r.t. η yields:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\eta (r+\delta)v(C) = &-(r+\delta)v_\eta(C) + v'(C_t)\left[\partial_\eta(\mu + rC) - \partial_\eta \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta\sigma)^2 - \partial_\eta \delta A\left(\frac{\varphi_t C_t}{1-\varphi_t}\right)\right] \\ &+ v'_\eta(C)\left[rC + \mu - \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta\sigma)^2 - -\partial_\eta \delta A\left(\frac{\varphi_t C_t}{1-\varphi_t}\right)\right] \\ &+ \frac{\sigma^2(1-\beta)^2}{2}v''_\eta(C) + \partial_\eta \frac{\sigma^2(1-\beta)^2}{2}v''(C)\end{aligned}$$

where $\partial_\beta v(C) = \partial_\varphi v(C) = 0$ by the envelope theorem. The boundary conditions are $v'_\eta(\bar{C}) = v''_\eta(\bar{C}) = 0$ and $v_\eta(0) = \partial_\eta L$. Provided our smoothness conditions, we can interchange the order of differentiation, such that:

$$v'_\eta(C) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta}\frac{\partial v(C)}{\partial C} = \frac{\partial}{\partial C}\frac{\partial v(C)}{\partial \eta} \text{ and } v''_\eta(C) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta}\frac{\partial^2 v(C)}{\partial C^2} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial C^2}\frac{\partial v(C)}{\partial \eta}.$$

Invoking the Feynman-Kac formula and integrating yields the desired expression. □

Next, note that

$$\beta_\eta \propto -v'(C)v''_\eta(C) + v''(C)v'_\eta(C), \tag{D.1}$$

so that $sign(\beta_\eta(C)) = sign(RA_\eta(C))$ for $RA(C) = -v''(C)/v'(C)$. Provided the super-contact condition $v''(\bar{C}) = 0$ holds, we evaluate the HJB-equation at the boundary $C = \bar{C}$:

$$(r+\delta)v(\bar{C}) = \left(r\bar{C} - \frac{\rho r}{2}(\lambda\sigma)^2 - \delta A\left(\frac{\varphi \bar{C}}{1-\varphi}\right) + \mu\right) \tag{D.2}$$

In the following, we derive our comparative statics for various model parameters. In each of the following subsections, we prove *all* claims regarding *one* particular parameters, so that one of the following subsections then proves one part of corollary 3 and 2 simultaneously. When deriving comparative statics for β with C close to zero, we implicitly assume $\beta(C) \geq \lambda$ does not bind for low values of C, unless otherwise mentioned.

D.2.1 Volatility: σ

Proof. To start with, invoke the implicit function theorem to differentiate (D.2), which yields

$$(r+\delta)v_\sigma(\bar{C}) + (\delta + r)\bar{C}_\sigma + \rho r\sigma\lambda^2 = r\bar{C}_\sigma - \frac{\delta\kappa\bar{C}_\sigma}{1-\kappa}A'\left(\frac{\kappa\bar{C}}{1-\kappa}\right),$$

which can be rewritten as:

$$\overline{C}_\sigma \propto -(r+\delta)v_\sigma(\overline{C}) - \rho r\sigma\lambda^2 - \frac{\delta\kappa\bar{C}_\sigma}{1-\kappa}A'\left(\frac{\kappa\bar{C}}{1-\kappa}\right).$$

Next,

$$v_\sigma(C) = \partial_\sigma v(C) = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)t}\Big(-\rho r\beta_t^2\sigma v'(C_t) + \sigma(1-\beta_t)^2 v''(C_t)\Big)dt\,\Big|\,C_0 = C\right]$$

As the integrand is almost everywhere negative, it follows that $v_\sigma(C) < 0$ and therefore $\bar{C}_\sigma > 0$, provided the smooth pasting condition holds and λ or ρ are sufficiently small.

Because zero is an absorbing state it must further be that $v'_\sigma(C) < 0$ in a neighbourhood of zero. Next, let us evaluate the HJB-equation at some value C, in order to obtain:

$$RA(C) = \frac{-v''(C)}{v'(C)} = \frac{2}{(1-\beta(C))^2\sigma^2} \times \underbrace{\left(\frac{-(r+\delta)v(C)}{v'(C)} + \left(\mu - \rho r\frac{\beta(C)^2\sigma^2}{2} + o(C)\right)\right)}_{\equiv \mathcal{E}>0}. \tag{D.3}$$

By the envelope theorem, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} RA_\sigma(C) = &- \frac{4}{(1-\beta(C))^2\sigma^3}\mathcal{E} - \frac{2\rho r\beta(C)^2}{(1-\beta(C))^2\sigma}v'(C) \\ &+ \frac{2}{(1-\beta(C))^2\sigma^2} \times (r+\delta)\frac{-v'(C)v_\sigma(C) + v(C)v'_\sigma C()}{(v'(C)^2} \end{aligned}$$

The first two terms are unambiguously negative. To sign the third term, note that $v_\sigma(C) = v_\sigma(0) + v'_\sigma(C)C + o(C^2) = o(C)$, as $v(0) = L$ is an identity. The third term is then also negative for C sufficiently small, as $v'_\sigma(C) < 0$ in a neighbourhood of zero. As a consequence, it must be that $RA_\sigma(C) < 0$ in a neighbourhood of zero and therefore $\beta_\sigma(C) < 0$, which completes the proof. $\square$

D.2.2 Moral Hazard: κ

Proof. Note that the incentive constraint $\varphi \geq \kappa$ binds everywhere, provided $\pi = 0$. Let us differentiate (D.2), to obtain

$$-(r+\delta)v_\kappa(\bar{C}) = \delta\left(\frac{\kappa\bar{C}_\kappa}{1-\kappa} + \frac{\bar{C}}{(1-\kappa)^2}\right)A'\left(\frac{\kappa\bar{C}}{1-\kappa}\right) + \delta\bar{C}_\kappa, \tag{D.4}$$

so that

$$\bar{C}_\kappa \propto -(r+\delta)v_\kappa(\bar{C}) - A'\left(\frac{\kappa\bar{C}}{1-\kappa}\right)\frac{\bar{C}}{(1-\kappa)^2}.$$

Moreover:

$$v_\kappa(C) = \partial_\kappa v(C) = -\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)t}\Big(A'(D_t)v'(C_t)\frac{C_t\delta}{(1-\kappa)^2}\Big)dt\middle|C_0 = C\right] \tag{D.5}$$

and therefore $v_\kappa(C) < 0$. Next, note that the integrand of (D.5) possesses derivative w.r.t. C:

$$\begin{aligned} &- A'\left(\frac{\kappa C}{1-\kappa}\right)v''(C)\frac{C}{(1-\kappa)^2} - \frac{C^2\kappa}{(1-\kappa)^3}\rho r e^{\rho r\kappa C/(1-\kappa)}v'(C) - \frac{A'(D)v'(C)}{(1-\kappa)^2} \\ &\propto -v''(C)C - \frac{C^2\kappa\rho r v'(C)}{1-\kappa} - v'(C) = -v'(C) + o(C) \end{aligned}$$

For $C \simeq 0$, the third term dominates and the integrand of (D.5) decreases in C. For $C > 0$, and κ sufficiently large, the second term dominates. Thus, there exists $\bar{\kappa} \in [0,1)$, such that the integrand of (D.5) decreases in κ for $\kappa \geq \bar{\kappa}$ for all $C \geq 0$. This readily implies that $-(r+\delta)v_\kappa(\bar{C}) < A'\left(\frac{\kappa\bar{C}}{1-\kappa}\right)\frac{\bar{C}}{(1-\kappa)^2}$ and it follows that $\bar{C}_\kappa < 0$ for $\kappa \geq \bar{\kappa}$.

Next, let us rewrite the HJB-equation:

$$RA(C) = \frac{-v''(C)}{v'(C)} = \frac{2}{(1-\beta(C))^2\sigma^2} \times \underbrace{\left(\frac{-(r+\delta)v(C)}{v'(C)} + \left(\mu - \rho r\frac{\beta(C)^2\sigma^2}{2} + o(C)\right)\right)}_{\equiv \mathcal{E}>0}.$$

The envelope theorem yields then after some simplifications:

$$\begin{aligned} sign(RA_\kappa(C)) &= sign\Big((-v'(C)v_\kappa(C) + v(C)v'_\kappa(C) + o(C)\Big) \\ &= sign\Big(- v'(C)(v_\kappa(0) + v'_\kappa(C)C + o(C^2)) + v(C)v'_\kappa(C) + o(C)\Big) \end{aligned}$$

For C in a neighbourhood of zero, it is then immediate that $sign(RA_\kappa(C)) = sign(v(C)v'_\kappa(C))$. Since $v_\kappa(C) < 0$ and $v(0) = L$ is an identity independent of κ, it must also be that $v'_\kappa(C) < 0$, which implies $RA_\sigma(C)$ for $C \simeq 0$. Hence, $\beta_\kappa(C) < 0$ in a neighbourhood of zero, i.e., for $C \simeq 0$, which concludes the proof. □

D.2.3 Cash-Flow Rate: μ

Proof. Observe that

$$v_\mu(C) = \partial_\mu v(C) \propto \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)t} v'(C_t)dt \middle| C_0 = C\right] > 0$$

and upon differentiating (D.2) it follows that

$$\bar{C}_\mu \propto -(r+\delta)v_\mu(\bar{C}) - 1.$$

Differentiating

$$RA(C) = \frac{-v''(C)}{v'(C)} = \frac{2}{(1-\beta(C))^2\sigma^2} \times \underbrace{\left(\frac{-(r+\delta)v(C)}{v'(C)} + \left(\mu - \rho r \frac{\beta(C)^2\sigma^2}{2} + o(C)\right)\right)}_{\equiv \mathcal{E} > 0}$$

w.r.t. μ yields after simplifications:

$$sign(RA_\mu(C)) = sign\big(1 + v(C)v'_\mu(C) + o(C)\big).$$

Since $v_\mu(C) > 0$, it is clear that $v'_\mu(C) > 0$ close to zero and therefore $RA(C)$ and $\beta(C)$ must increase in a neighbourhood of zero, i.e., for $C \simeq 0$, which concludes the proof. □

D.2.4 Risk-aversion: ρ

Proof. Note that

$$v_\rho(C) = \partial_\rho v(C) \propto \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)t} v'(C_t)\left[-r/2(\beta_t\sigma)^2 - \delta A_\rho(D_t)\right] dt \middle| C_0 = C\right],$$

where $A_\rho(\cdot) = \partial_\rho A(\cdot) > 0$. Clearly, $v_\rho(C) < 0$. Differentiating (D.2) yields that

$$\bar{C}_\rho \propto -(r+\delta)v_\rho(\bar{C}) - \frac{r(\lambda\sigma)^2}{2} - \delta A_\rho(\bar{D}) = -(r+\delta)v_\rho(\bar{C}) - \frac{r(\lambda\sigma)^2}{2} - \delta$$

For λ and δ sufficiently small, it follows that $\bar{C}_\rho > 0$. Further, for ρ sufficiently large, the term A_ρ explodes for any argument and owing to $\bar{D} \geq D_t$ with the inequality being strict on a set with positive measure, it must be that $\bar{C}_\rho < 0$ for $\rho \geq \bar{\rho}$ for some value $\bar{\rho} > 0$ Moreover, in the limit case $\rho \to 0$, it is clear that all risk is shared with the agent, in that $\bar{C} \to 0$ for $\rho \to 0$. Hence, there exists $\underline{\rho} > 0$ with $\bar{C}_\rho < 0$ for $\rho < \underline{\rho}$.

Taking C with $\beta(C) > \lambda$, differentiating (D.3) and doing some algebra, we get that

$$sign(\beta_\rho(C)) = sign(RA_\rho(C)) = sign\left(-r(\beta(C)\sigma)^2/2 + v(C)v'_\rho(C) + o(C)\right).$$

For C sufficiently close to zero, it follows that $v'_\rho(C) < 0$, so that $\beta(C)$ must decrease in ρ in a neighbourhood of zero, i.e., for $C \simeq 0$. Since $\beta(C) = \lambda$ for all C for high values of ρ, it follows that $\beta(C)$ is constant in ρ for large values of ρ or λ and decreases otherwise. □

D.2.5 Moral Hazard: λ

Proof. Observe that

$$v_\lambda(C) = \partial_\lambda v(C) = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)t}\left[-r\rho\lambda\sigma^2 v'(C_t) - (1-\lambda)\sigma^2 v''(C_t)\right]\mathbf{1}_{\beta_t=\lambda}dt \middle| C_0 = C\right],$$

Whenever

$$-r\rho\lambda v'(C) - (1-\lambda)v''(C) > 0,$$

it is clear that $\beta(C) > \lambda$, so that $v_\lambda(C) \leq 0$. Next, because β decreases it must be that also $v_\lambda(C)$ decreases, so that $v'_\lambda(C) < 0$. Implicitly differentiate (D.2) to obtain

$$\bar{C}_\lambda \propto -(r+\delta)v_\lambda(\bar{C}) - \rho r\lambda\sigma^2$$

For $\lambda = 0$, it follows that $\beta_t \geq \lambda$ for all t with equality if and only if $\bar{C} = C_t$, so that $v_\lambda(C) = 0$. Furthermore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\lambda \in o(\varepsilon)$ such that $\beta(C) = \lambda$ exactly for all $C \in (\bar{C} - \varepsilon, \bar{C}]$. On the interval $(\bar{C} - \varepsilon, \bar{C}]$, we have that $v'(C) = 1 + o(\varepsilon)$ and $v''(C) = o(\varepsilon)$. Thus,

$$v_\lambda(C) = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)t}\left[-r\rho\lambda\sigma^2\right]\mathbf{1}_{\{\beta_t=\lambda\}}dt \middle| C_0 = C\right] + o(\varepsilon),$$

so that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\bar{C}_\lambda < 0$, which also means owing $\lambda \in o(\varepsilon)$, that $\bar{C}$ decreases in λ for λ sufficiently small. Taking the extreme case $\lambda = 1$, we immediately see that $\bar{C} = 0$, so that $\bar{C}$ must decrease in λ when λ is sufficiently large.

Next, we show the claim regarding β. First, assume that $\beta \geq \lambda$ does not bind in a neighbourhood of zero, which is the case for ρ or λ sufficiently low. Differentiating (D.3) and doing some algebra, we get that

$$sign(\beta_\lambda(C)) = sign(RA_\lambda(C)) = sign\left(v(C)v'_\lambda(C) + o(C)\right).$$

For C sufficiently close to zero, it follows that $v'_\lambda(C) < 0$, so that $\beta(C)$ must decrease in ρ in a neighbourhood of zero, i.e., for $C \simeq 0$, which concludes the proof. Second, assume that $\beta = \lambda$ everywhere, which is the case for ρ or λ sufficiently large. Under these circumstances, $\beta(C)$ mechanically increases in λ. □

D.2.6 Disaster Risk: δ

Proof. Differentiating boundary yields

$$\bar{C}_\delta \propto -(r+\delta)v_\delta(\bar{C}) - v(\bar{C}) - A(\bar{D}).$$

Next, observe that

$$v_\delta(C) = \partial_\delta v(C) \propto -\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)t}\Big((v(C_t) - L) + v'(C_t)(D_t)\Big)dt \middle| C_0 = C\right] - e^{-(r+\delta)\tau}L,$$

so that $v_\delta(C) < 0$, which readily implies $v'_\delta(C) < 0$ for C close to zero. Let us wlog assume $L = 0$. It is clear that

$$(r+\delta)\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)t} v(C_t)dt \middle| C_0 = C\right] < v(\bar{C}),$$

as $C = 0$ is an absorbing state, that is reached at an $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely finite time, and v is monotonically increasing. Next, let us consider the derivative of $A(D)v'(C)$ with respect to C:

$$\frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa} v'(C) e^{\rho r D} + v''(C)A(D).$$

For κ sufficiently large, the first term must dominate owing to $v' \geq 1$. Under this condition:

$$\frac{A(\bar{D})}{r+\delta} \geq E\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)t} v'(C_t)A(D_t)dt\right] \text{ for } \bar{D} = \frac{\kappa \bar{C}}{1-\kappa}.$$

From there, it follows that for κ sufficiently large the payout boundary must decrease in δ, i.e., $\bar{C}_\delta < 0$. Furthermore, we know that for sufficiently large κ, the absolute value of the integrand increases and since the integrand is negative, this means that $v'_\delta(C) < 0$.

To prove the claim regarding β we differentiate (D.3) and simplify, to get:

$$sign(RA_\delta(C)) = sign\Big((r+\delta)v(C)v'_\delta(C) - v(C)v'(C) + o(C)\Big).$$

For $C \simeq 0$, it follows that $sign(RA_\delta(C)) < 0$, so that $\beta(C)$ decreases in δ for $C \simeq 0$, provided a loose IC-condition $\beta(C) > \lambda$. □

D.2.7 Commitment θ

Proof. It is evident that $\frac{\partial \overline{C}}{\partial \theta} = 0$ as well as $\frac{\partial v(C)}{\partial \theta} = 0$, whenever $v(\overline{C}) > \frac{\theta \overline{C}}{1-\kappa} + L$. The latter inequality is always satisfied if $\theta < 1 - \kappa$. Let us therefore consider the case $\theta \geq 1 - \kappa$ and $v(\overline{C}) = \frac{\theta \overline{C}}{1-\kappa} + L$. Differentiating this identity wrt. θ yields:

$$v'(\overline{C})\frac{\partial \overline{C}}{\partial \theta} + v_\theta(\overline{C}) = \frac{\overline{C}}{1-\kappa} + \frac{\theta}{1-\kappa}\frac{\partial \overline{C}}{\partial \theta}.$$

Since θ affects firm value only through the boundary conditions: $v_\theta(\overline{C}) = 0$. Owing to $v'(\overline{C}) = 1$:

$$\frac{\partial \overline{C}}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\overline{C}}{1-\kappa} \times \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{1-\kappa}\right)^{-1} \leq 0$$

with the inequality being strict if $\theta > 1 - \kappa$. We take the risk-aversion:

$$RA(C) = \frac{-v''(C)}{v'(C)} = \frac{2}{(1-\beta(C))^2\sigma^2} \times \underbrace{\left(\frac{-(r+\delta)v(C)}{v'(C)} + \left(\mu - \rho r \frac{\beta(C)^2\sigma^2}{2} + o(C)\right)\right)}_{\equiv \mathcal{E} > 0}.$$

Close to zero $v(C) \simeq L$. Moreover, it must be that $\frac{dv(C)}{d\theta}) < 0$ for C in a neighbourhood of zero, while $\frac{dv(0)}{d\theta} = 0$ as the identity $v(0) = L$ holds. Therefore: $\frac{dv'(C)}{d\theta} < 0$ in neighbourhood of zero, so that $RA(C)$ and therefore also $\beta(0)$ decrease in θ for $C \simeq 0$. □

D.3 Stock-Return Volatility

The formula for the stock-returns follows upon invoking Ito's Lemma:

$$\begin{aligned}
dR_t &= \frac{dDiv_t + dv(C_{t^-})}{v(C_{t^-})} \\
&= \frac{dDiv_t + \mathcal{L}v(C_{t^-}) + v'(C_{t^-})\sigma_{Ct} dZ_t + \big[v(C^*) - \Delta - v(C_{t^-})\big] d\Pi_t \mathbf{1}_{\{C_{t^-} < C^*\}}}{v(C_{t^-})} \\
&= r + \delta + \mathbf{1}_{\{C_{t^-} < C^*\}} \left(\pi - \frac{\pi(v(C^*) - \Delta_t)}{v(C_{t^-})}\right) + \frac{dDiv_t}{v(C_{t^-})} \\
&+ \underbrace{\frac{v'(C_{t^-})}{v(C_{t^-})} \times \sigma(1 - \beta_t)}_{\equiv \Sigma_t = \Sigma(C_{t^-})} dZ_t + \frac{\big[v(C^*) - \Delta - v(C_{t^-})\big] d\Pi_t}{v(C_{t^-})} \mathbf{1}_{\{C_{t^-} < C^*\}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the HJB-equation under the optimal controls:

$$(r + \delta)v(C_{t^-}) = dDiv_t + \mathcal{L}v(C_{t^-}) + \pi\big[v(C^*) - \Delta - v(C_{t^-})\big]\mathbf{1}_{\{C_{t^-} < C^*\}}.$$

D.3.1 Proof of Corollary 6

i) *Proof.* To start with, for all C with $\beta(C)$ we rewrite:

$$\Sigma(C) = (1 - \beta)\sigma \frac{v'(C)}{v(C)} = \sigma\rho r \times \frac{(v'(C))^2}{v(C)\big(\rho r v'(C) - v''(C)\big)},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma'(C) &\propto 2v(C)\big(\rho r v'(C) - v''(C)\big)v'(C)v''(C) \\
&- (v'(C))^2 \times \Big[v'(C)\big(\rho r v'(C) - v''(C)\big) + v(C)\big(\rho r v''(C) - v'''(C)\big)\Big] \\
&= -(v'(C))^3 \times \big(\rho r v'(C) - v''(C)\big) + o\big(v(C)\big)
\end{aligned}$$

It follows then that $\Sigma'(C) < 0$ in a neighbourhood of zero, provided the scrap value $L \geq 0$ is sufficiently low.

Next, note that in a neighbourhood of $\bar{C}$, we have that $\beta(C) = \lambda$, provided $\lambda > 0$, in which case it is clear that

$$\Sigma(C) = (1 - \lambda)\sigma \frac{v'(C)}{v(C)}$$

decreases in this neighbourhood of $\bar{C}$.

□

ii-1) *Proof.* Note that in the limit $\lambda \to 1$, the firm value converges to,

$$\frac{\mu - \rho r/2\sigma^2}{r + \delta} + M_{0^-},$$

where all cash (the firm is born with) is paid out immediately as dividends to shareholders and continuation value from time 0 onwards is deterministic, as the agent absorbs all cash-flow risk. Hence, for $\lambda \to 1$, it follows that $\Sigma(C) \to 0$ for any C, so that by continuity, there exists $\bar{\lambda} \in (0, 1)$, so that $\Sigma(C)$ decreases in λ for $\lambda > \bar{\lambda}$, thereby concluding the proof. □

ii-2) *Proof.* Fix $\lambda \in (0,1)$. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ we can pick $\rho > 0$ small enough such that $\beta(C) = \lambda$ exactly for all $C \in (\bar{C} - \varepsilon, \bar{C}]$. On the interval $(\bar{C} - \varepsilon, \bar{C}]$, we have that $v'(C) = 1 + o(\varepsilon)$ and $v''(C) = o(\varepsilon)$. As a consequence:

$$v_\lambda(C) = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)t}\left[-r\rho\lambda\sigma^2\right]\mathbf{1}_{\beta_t=\lambda}dt\middle|C_0 = C\right] + o(\varepsilon) < \frac{-r\rho\lambda\sigma^2}{r+\delta} + o(\varepsilon).$$

On the interval $(\bar{C} - \varepsilon, \bar{C}]$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma(C) &= \frac{1 + o(\varepsilon)}{v(C)} \times (1-\lambda)\sigma \\ &\implies \Sigma_\lambda(C) \propto o(\varepsilon) - v(C) - v_\lambda(C)(1-\lambda) > o(\varepsilon) + \frac{-r\rho\lambda\sigma^2(1-\lambda)}{r+\delta} - v(C).\end{aligned}$$

Note that we can pick ρ or λ arbitrarily small, so as to achieve $\Sigma_\lambda(C) < 0$, which concludes the proof. □

iii) *Proof.* For $\lambda > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, so that on $(\bar{C} - \varepsilon, \bar{C}]$:

$$\Sigma(C) = (1-\lambda)\sigma\frac{v'(C)}{v(C)} + o(\varepsilon) = (1-\lambda)\sigma\frac{1+o(\varepsilon)}{v(C)} + o(\varepsilon),$$

so that

$$\frac{\partial\Sigma(C)}{\partial\kappa} \propto o(\varepsilon) - v_\kappa(C)(1 + o(\varepsilon)) > 0$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, thereby concluding the proof. □

D.4 Proof of Corollary 5

We split the proof in three parts. The first part proves the claims regarding $\overline{C}$. The second part proves the claims regarding $\beta(0)$ and the third part the claim regarding C^*. We will not introduce additional notation, so that C^* is a constant under limited commitment w.r.t. refinancing strategy and a function of C under full commitment w.r.t. the refinancing strategy/

D.4.1 Part 1

Proof. First, obtain

$$v_\pi(C) = \partial_\pi v(C) = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)t}\Big(v'(C_{t^-})\frac{1-e^{-\rho r\Gamma_t}}{\rho r} + \underbrace{\left[v(C_{t^-} + \Delta_t - \Gamma_t) - v(C_{t^-}) - \Delta_t\right]}_{>0}\Big)dt\middle|C_{0^-} = C\right],$$

from where it is obvious that $v_\pi(C) > 0$ for any $C > 0$. Continuity and the identity $v(0) = L$ imply then that $v'_\pi(C)$ for C in a neighbourhood of zero. Let us differentiate the HJB-equation at the boundary w.r.t. π (i.e., (D.3)), which yields:

$$0 = (r+\delta)v_\pi(\bar{C}) + \delta\bar{C}_\pi + \frac{\delta\kappa\bar{C}_\pi}{1-\kappa}A'\left(\frac{\kappa\bar{C}}{1-\kappa}\right) \implies \bar{C}_\pi \propto -v_\pi(\bar{C}) < 0.$$

Note that the argument did not make use of any assumed commitment structure, so that the claim holds true regardless of the commitment structure. □

D.4.2 Part 2

Proof. Second, denoting the fixed value $C^* = C_{t^-} + \Delta_t - \Gamma_t$, let us rewrite the HJB-equation:

$$RA(C) = \frac{-v''(C)}{v'(C)} = \frac{2}{(1-\beta(C))^2\sigma^2} \times \underbrace{\left(\frac{-(r+\delta)v(C)}{v'(C)} + \mu_C + \pi[v(C^*) - v(C) - \Delta]\right)}_{\equiv \mathcal{E} > 0}.$$

One can show that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \pi}\frac{-(r+\delta)v(C)}{v'(C)} \propto v(C)v'_\pi(C) + o(C),$$

which is strictly positive for C in a neighbourhood of zero.

Let us assume now limited commitment w.r.t. to the refinancing strategy. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial}{\partial \pi}\Big(\mu_C + \pi[v(C^*) - v(C) - \Delta]\Big)\\ &= \frac{1-e^{-\rho r \Gamma_t}}{\rho r} + \big[v(C^*) - v(C) - \Delta\big] + \pi\left[v'(C^*)\frac{\partial C^*}{\partial \pi} - v_\pi(C) - \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial \pi}\right]\end{aligned}$$

Utilizing $v'(C^*) = \frac{1}{1-\kappa}$, $\frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial C^*} = \frac{1}{1-\kappa}$ and $\frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial \pi} = \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial C^*} \times \frac{\partial C^*}{\partial \pi}$, the above expression simplifies to:

$$\frac{1-e^{-\rho r \Gamma_t}}{\rho r} + \big[v(C^*) - v(C) - \Delta\big] - \underbrace{\pi v_\pi(C)}_{=o(C)}.$$

Thus, for C sufficiently close to zero, the above expression is positive, which implies that $RA(C)$ decreases in π for $C \simeq 0$. Provided a loose IC-condition $\beta \geq \lambda$ in a neighbourhood of zero, also $\beta(C)$ increases in π for C close to zero.

Last, we assume full commitment to a refinancing strategy is possible. Then, the envelope theorem applies, so that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial}{\partial \pi}\Big(\mu_C + \pi[v(C^*) - v(C) - \Delta]\Big)\\ &= \frac{1-e^{-\rho r \Gamma_t}}{\rho r} + \big[v(C^*) - v(C) - \Delta\big] > 0,\end{aligned}$$

so that $RA(C)$ increases in π close to zeros and so does $\beta(C)$. This concludes the proof of the second part. ∎

D.4.3 Part 3

Proof. Third, we show the claim regarding C^*. First, note that for $C > C^*$, we can write

$$v_\pi(C) = \mathbb{E}e^{-(r+\delta)\tau^*}v_\pi(C^*) < v_\pi(C^*)$$

for $\tau^* = \inf\{t \geq 0 : C_{t^-} = C^*\}$. Hence, $v'_\pi(C) < 0$ for $C \in [C^*, \bar{C}]$, since there is no refinancing in this region and $v_\pi(C) > 0$. By continuity, it even follows that $v'_\pi(C) < 0$ for $C \in [C^* - \varepsilon, \bar{C}]$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. We differentiate the identity $v'(C^*) = \frac{1}{1-\kappa}$, which yields:

$$v'_\pi(C^*) + v''(C^*)\frac{\partial C^*}{\partial \pi} = 0 \Longrightarrow \frac{\partial C^*}{\partial \pi} = \frac{v'_\pi(C^*)}{-v''(C^*)} < 0,$$

thereby concluding the proof. ∎

D.5 Proof of Corollary 4

Proof. To prove part i), assume to the contrary there exist $C_1 < C_2$ with $\Delta(C_1) \leq \Delta(C_2)$. This clearly implies $C^*(C_2) > C^*(C_1)$, so that $v'(C^*(C_2)) < v'(C^*(C_1))$ by concavity. Likewise: $v'(C_2) < v'(C_1)$. Wlog, we may assume $\overline{C} > C^*(C_2)$, as otherwise the claim is trivial. However, it is easy to verify that (38) cannot hold for both C_1 and C_2, contradicting the optimality of the hypothesized strategy.

Part ii) follows immediately from the fact that $C^*(C) \geq C$ by definition. Thus, either $C^*(C) = \overline{C}\ \forall\ C \in [\overline{C} - \varepsilon, \overline{C}]$ for appropriate $\varepsilon > 0$, in which case the claim is trivially true, or there exist $\varepsilon > 0$, $C < \overline{C}$ with $C^*(C) < \overline{C}\ \forall\ C \in [\overline{C} - \varepsilon, \overline{C}]$, in which case the claim follows by continuity and $\lim_{C \to \overline{C}} C^*(C) = \overline{C}$.

For Part iii), we can wlog focus on the case where $C^*(C) < \overline{C}$ throughout. We implicitly differentiate (37), in order to obtain:

$$v''(C^*)\frac{\partial C^*}{\partial C} = \frac{\kappa e^{-\rho r \frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}[C^* - C]}}{1-\kappa}\left[-v''(c) + \frac{\rho r \kappa}{1-\kappa}v'(C)\left(\frac{\partial C^*}{\partial C} - C\right)\right],$$

which can be solved for:

$$\frac{\partial C^*}{\partial C} \propto v''(C) + \frac{\rho r \kappa}{1-\kappa}C = v''(C) + o(\rho\kappa),$$

so that C^* decreases for small C, provided ρ or κ are sufficiently low. □

E Further comparative statics

In Figures 7, 8, and 9 we present the full numerical comparative statics of the baseline model without refinancing.

Changing ρ. Next, varying the agent's CARA coefficient ρ makes hedging via labor contracts more expensive as agents require higher risk-premia for variability in their certainty equivalent wages Y_t. In response, as Column 3 in Figure 9 shows, the firm reduces its usage of pay-performance sensitivity, reducing avg β, and instead increases its average cash-holdings, raising $\overline{C}$. On the other hand, moral hazard has more bite for larger ρ, which in turn implies that overall firm value decreases in ρ. As a result, liquidation gets less inefficient, which calls for less hedging of liquidity risks. This leads to the non-monotonic behavior of $\overline{C}$ in ρ. Again, numerically there is only a very mild reduction in $\beta(0)$.

Changing μ, κ and δ As Column 2 in Figure 9 show, the comparative statics w.r.t. μ exhibit non-monotonicity of $\overline{C}$. As pointed out in Décamps et al. (2011), this already occurred in a model absent IC considerations, i.e., $\lambda = 0$. Intuitively, for low μ, the project is not worth a lot as a going concern, and thus it is better to drain cash quickly in terms of dividends. As μ starts increasing, the project value increases, making shareholders more willing to accumulate cash and delay dividend payments. This is the first effect. A second effect is highlighted for very high μ: Here, the optimal payout boundary $\overline{C}$ declines. Intuitively, negative cash-flow shocks can be more easily overcome by the drift, and the need to hold expensive cash balances shrinks. Another way to express this second effect is that all else equal, a higher μ leads to more of the probability mass to be close to $\overline{C}$, and thus average cash-holdings to increase. Lowering average cash-holdings thus requires decreasing $\overline{C}$. The (scaled) $\beta(0)$ and avg β both inherit the non-monotonicity of $\overline{C}$.

Last, δ and κ essentially determine endogenously arising carry cost of cash. Not surprisingly, we find that increases in either κ and λ make cash-holdings more costly, thereby reducing $\overline{C}$. As a



Figure 7: **Comparative statics** w.r.t. λ (Column 1), w.r.t. $\lambda = \kappa$ (Column 2), w.r.t. θ (Column 3), top row $\overline{C}$, middle row $\beta(0)$, bottom row (σ-scaled) avg β. The solid black lines depict the object described on the y-axis, the dashed red line depicts the IC constraint (23), the thin vertical dashed red line depicts the parameter value in our benchmark.



Figure 8: **Comparative statics** w.r.t. κ (Column 1), w.r.t. δ (Column 2), top row $\overline{C}$, middle row $\beta(0)$, bottom row avg β. The solid black lines depict the object described on the y-axis, the dashed red line depicts the IC constraint (23), the thin vertical dashed red line depicts the parameter value in our benchmark.



Figure 9: **Comparative statics** w.r.t. σ (Column 1), w.r.t. μ (Column 2), w.r.t. ρ (Column 3), top row $\overline{C}$, middle row $\beta(0)$, bottom row (σ-scaled) avg β. The solid black lines depict the object described on the y-axis, the dashed red line depicts the IC constraint (23), the thin vertical dashed red line depicts the parameter value in our benchmark.

result, firm value decreases, which makes liquidation less inefficient and therefore also curbs hedging through labour markets.

F Details on the numerical solution

F.1 Determining the payout boundary

Wlog, we consider here the case $\pi = 0$, to describe the procedure. We utilize a shooting method to solve for the value function. We shoot from $\overline{C}$ towards $C = 0$, iterating on the condition $v(0) = L$.

First, define

$$B(C) := \frac{\theta}{1-\kappa} C + L$$
$$D(C) := rC + \mu - \delta A \left(\frac{\kappa \overline{C}}{1-\kappa} \right)$$

Next, write the ODE with optimized $\varphi = \kappa$ as

$$(r+\delta) v(C) = v'(C) \left[D(C) - \rho r \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \beta(C)^2 \right] + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} (1-\beta(C))^2 v''(C)$$

Suppose for the moment that $\beta^*(C) = \frac{-v''(C)}{\rho r v'(C) - v''(C)} > \lambda$. Then, after plugging in for $\beta^*(C)$ and cancelling out terms, we have the non-linear ODE

$$\begin{aligned}(r+\delta) v(C) &= v'(C) D(C) + \rho r \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{v'(C) v''(C)}{\rho r v'(C) - v''(C)} \\ &= v'(C) - \rho r \frac{\sigma^2}{2} v'(C) \beta^*(C)\end{aligned}$$

whereas when $\beta^*(C) < \lambda$, we have the linear ODE

$$(r+\delta) v(C) = v'(C) \left[D(C) - \rho r \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \lambda^2 \right] + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} (1-\lambda)^2 v''(C)$$

Next, let us consider the boundary conditions. Note that we have $v(0) = L$ and $v'\left(\overline{C}\right) = 1$ in any scenario. We have to consider two scenarios:

1. Suppose first that $v\left(\overline{C}^*\right) > B\left(\overline{C}^*\right)$, where $\overline{C}^*$ is defined by $v''\left(\overline{C}^*\right) = 0$. Then, at $\overline{C} = \overline{C}^*$ we have
$$(r+\delta) v\left(\overline{C}\right) = 1 \times \left[D(C) - \rho r \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \lambda^2 \right] + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} (1-\beta(C))^2 \times 0$$
which implies that
$$v\left(\overline{C}\right) = \frac{D(C) - \rho r \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \lambda^2}{r+\delta}$$
and we initialize the shooting algorithm at $\overline{C}$ with
$$\begin{pmatrix} v \\ v' \\ v'' \end{pmatrix} \left(\overline{C}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{D(\overline{C}) - \rho r \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \lambda^2}{r+\delta} \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

2. Suppose next that $v\left(\overline{C}^*\right) = \frac{D\left(\overline{C}^*\right)-\rho r\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\lambda^2}{r+\delta} < B\left(\overline{C}^*\right)$, which implies that the payout boundary cannot be chosen via the super-contact condition. Then, we need to initialize the shooting algorithm at $\overline{C}$ with

$$\begin{pmatrix} v \\ v' \\ v'' \end{pmatrix}\left(\overline{C}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} B\left(\overline{C}\right) \\ 1 \\ v''\left(\overline{C}\right) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $v''\left(\overline{C}\right)$ is given by the continuous function

$$v''\left(\overline{C}\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{(r+\delta)B\left(\overline{C}\right)-D\left(\overline{C}\right)+\rho r\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\lambda^2}{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}(1-\lambda)^2} & ,\overline{C} \geq \overline{C}_\lambda \\ \frac{\rho r\left[(r+\delta)B\left(\overline{C}\right)-D\left(\overline{C}\right)\right]}{\rho r\frac{\sigma^2}{2}+(r+\delta)B\left(\overline{C}\right)-D\left(\overline{C}\right)} & ,\overline{C} < \overline{C}_\lambda \end{cases}$$

and where the constant $\overline{C}_\lambda$ solves

$$\frac{-v''\left(\overline{C}_\lambda\right)}{\rho r - v''\left(\overline{C}_\lambda\right)} = \lambda \iff -\frac{\lambda\rho r}{1-\lambda} = v''(\overline{C}_\lambda) = \frac{(r+\delta)\,B\left(\overline{C}_\lambda\right) - D\left(\overline{C}_\lambda\right) + \rho r\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\lambda^2}{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\left(1-\lambda\right)^2}$$

The derivation is straightforward. Note that $v\left(\overline{C}\right) = B\left(\overline{C}\right)$ as well as $v'(\overline{C}) = 1$ by assumption. There are two cases w.r.t. $\beta^*\left(C\right)$:

   (a) When $\beta^*\left(\overline{C}\right) = \frac{-v''\left(\overline{C}\right)}{\rho r - v''\left(\overline{C}\right)} < \lambda \iff v''\left(C\right) > -\frac{\lambda\rho r}{1-\lambda}$, we have

$$(r+\delta)\,B\left(\overline{C}\right) = \left[D\left(\overline{C}\right) - \rho r\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\lambda^2\right] + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\left(1-\lambda\right)^2 v''\left(\overline{C}\right).$$

   (b) Next, for $\beta^*\left(\overline{C}\right) = \frac{-v''\left(\overline{C}\right)}{\rho r - v''\left(\overline{C}\right)} > \lambda \iff v''\left(C\right) < -\frac{\lambda\rho r}{1-\lambda}$, we have

$$(r+\delta)\,B\left(\overline{C}\right) = D\left(\overline{C}\right) + \rho r\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\frac{v''\left(\overline{C}\right)}{\rho r - v''\left(\overline{C}\right)}.$$

As $v'''(C) > 0$, the partition on $\overline{C} \gtrless \overline{C}_\lambda$ results.

F.2 Determining the optimal refinancing policy

To start with, note the model solution is fully characterized by an equilibrium domain, which is fully described by the payout boundary $\overline{C}$, the value function v, the controls β, φ on this domain as well as the refinancing policy (C^*, Γ^*). We solve for the optimal refinancing policy iteratively. That is to say, we perform the following steps:

1. Solve the model without refinancing, i.e., for $\pi = 0$, which yields the solution triple $(v^0, \beta^0, \overline{C}^0)$. Set $i \mapsto 1$. Set the default refinancing policy $C_0^* \equiv 0$ and $\Gamma_0^* \equiv 0$ and $\varphi_0 = \kappa$.

2. Solve the HJB-equation, taking the optimal refinancing policy Γ_i^* and C_i^* and φ_i as given. This yields the solution $(v, \overline{C}, \beta)$.

3. Given $(v, \overline{C}, \beta)$, calculate the optimal refinancing policy and control φ $(C^*, \Gamma^*, \varphi^*)$.

4. Set $i \mapsto i+1$ and $(v^i, \beta^i, \overline{C}^i, C_i^*, \Gamma_i^*) \mapsto (v, \beta, \overline{C}, C^*, \Gamma^*)$

5. If
$$||v^i - v^{i-1}||_\infty^{[0,\infty)} < \epsilon$$
for some tolerance $\epsilon > 0$, the solution is obtained. Otherwise go back to step 2. Here, $||\cdot||_\infty^{[a,b]}$ is the supremum norm on the interval $[a, b]$.

G Steady-state KFE

To evaluate the average β of a firm w.r.t. to a density implied by the process C, we want to derive the steady-state density induced by resetting all liquidating firms to $C = \overline{C}$. Let us write the dynamics of C on the equilibrium path as

$$dC_t = \mu_C(C_t)dt + \sigma_C(C_t)dZ_t,$$

and define $s_C(C) := (\sigma_C(C))^2$. Then, the stationary density $f(\cdot)$ on $(0, \overline{C})$ solves

$$0 = \frac{1}{2}\partial_{CC}[s_C(C)f(C)] - \partial_C[\mu_C(C)f(C)] - \delta f(C)$$

The boundary conditions are given by

$$f(0) = 0 \tag{G.1}$$

as well as

$$0 = \frac{1}{2}\partial_C[s_C(C)f(C)]_{C=\overline{C}} - \mu_C(\overline{C})f(\overline{C}) + \delta - \frac{1}{2}s_C(0)f'(0) \tag{G.2}$$

Here, the first two terms are the traditional reflection boundary conditions, the third term is the inflow from the (state-independent) Poisson defaults at rate δ, and the fourth term is the inflow from the liquidity defaults at $C = 0$.

Recall that along the equilibrium path (assuming $\varphi = \kappa$) on $(0, \overline{C})$ we have

$$dC_t = \left[rC_{t^-} - \frac{\rho r}{2}(\beta(C_{t^-})\sigma)^2 - \delta A\left(\frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}C_{t^-}\right) + \mu\right]dt + \left[1 - \beta(C_{t^-})\right]\sigma dZ_t - C_{t^-}dN_t. \tag{G.3}$$