GLOBAL FOOTPRINTS OF MONETARY POLICIES

SILVIA MIRANDA-AGRIPPINO^{1,3} TSVETELINA NENOVA² & Hélène Rey^{2,3,4}

 $^1\mathrm{Bank}$ of England & CfM $^{-2}\mathrm{London}$ Business School $^{-3}\mathrm{CEPR}$ $^{-4}\mathrm{NBER}$

Konstanz Seminar on Monetary Theory & Monetary Policy 23-25 May, 2023

The views expressed are those of the authors and do not represent those of the Bank of England, the Monetary Policy Committee, the Financial Policy Committee or the Prudential Regulation Authority.

POTENTIAL FOR INTERNATIONAL MONETARY POLICY TRANSMISSION

1. Classic

- Countries engage in bilateral trade
- Potency of transmission depends on CA balances
- $\circ~{\rm FX}$ is a shock absorber \rightarrow classic Mundellian paradigm

POTENTIAL FOR INTERNATIONAL MONETARY POLICY TRANSMISSION

1. Classic

- Countries engage in bilateral trade
- Potency of transmission depends on CA balances
- $\circ~{\rm FX}$ is a shock absorber \rightarrow classic Mundellian paradigm

2. Amplification through Global Financial Cycle [Rey (2013)]

- $\circ~$ Global fin'l aggregates comove to a very large extent
- $\circ~{\rm MP}$ influences common component $\implies~{\rm global~spillovers}$
- $\circ~$ Through fin'l conditions: risk, leverage, capital flows, asset prices
- $\circ~{\rm FX}$ only a partial shocks absorber

- 1. Because it's at the centre of the international financial system
- 2. Because of the dominant role of the USD

- 1. Because it's at the centre of the international financial system
- 2. Because of the dominant role of the USD



Note: Includes private & official cross-border investment in Eqy + Debt securities. Coppola, Maggiori, Neiman and Schreger (2021) + IMF's Coordinated Portfolio Investment Survey (CPIS), 2013

- 1. Because it's at the centre of the international financial system
- 2. Because of the dominant role of the USD

- 1. Because it's at the centre of the international financial system
- 2. Because of the dominant role of the USD



Sources: BIS, IMF, SWIFT and ECB calculations.Note: The latest data are for the fourth quarter of 2019.

$\circ~$ International financial transactions & trade invoicing

[Gopinath et al. (2019), Gopinath & Stein (2020), Maggiori, Neiman & Schreger (2020)]

• Reserve/Anchor currency

[Gopinath (2015), Ilzetzki, Reinhart & Rogoff (2019, 2020), Eichengreen & Mathieson (2000), He, Krishnamurthy & Milbradt (2016), Farhi & Maggiori (2018)]

Avenues for International Monetary Policy Transmission

1. Classic

2. Amplification through Global Financial Cycle

3. Amplification through Global Value Chains

- Additional transmission from integrated production
- Through supply/production constraints

Global Spillovers of US and Chinese Monetary Policy

• Via Global Cycles:

Financial
 Trade/Commodity

• Empirical characterisation of international transmission

Global Spillovers of US and Chinese Monetary Policy
 Via Global Cycles:

 Financial
 Trade/Commodity

 Empirical characterisation of international transmission

 \triangleright Outline:

Global Spillovers of US and Chinese Monetary Policy
 Via Global Cycles:

 Financial
 Trade/Commodity

 Empirical characterisation of international transmission

▷ Outline:

- 1. Recap & extension of Global Financial Cycle Facts
 - $\,\triangleright\,$ New data & new facts
 - $\,\triangleright\,$ Global Spillovers of US MP

Global Spillovers of US and Chinese Monetary Policy
• Via Global Cycles:
1. Financial
2. Trade/Commodity

 \circ Empirical characterisation of international transmission

- \triangleright Outline:
 - 1. Recap & extension of Global Financial Cycle Facts
 - $\triangleright~$ New data & new facts
 - $\,\triangleright\,$ Global Spillovers of US MP

2. Global Trade & Commodity Cycle

- $\triangleright~$ New data & new facts
- > Global Spillovers of Chinese MP

Dimensions of Global Comovements #1: Global Financial Cycle & US MP Transmission

DO GLOBAL RISKY ASSET PRICES CO-MOVE?

DO GLOBAL RISKY ASSET PRICES CO-MOVE?

Yes, a lot.

- $\circ~1$ factor in global risky asset prices
- Explains $\simeq 1/4$ of common variance $(n \simeq 1 \text{K})$

DO GLOBAL RISKY ASSET PRICES CO-MOVE?

Yes, a lot.

- 1 factor in global risky asset prices
- Explains $\simeq 1/4$ of common variance $(n \simeq 1 \text{K})$



Co-movement extends to quantities

- 1. Between asset prices and capital flows (corr $\simeq 80\%$)
- 2. Between inflows & outflows
- 3. And across flows types (FDIs less so)



Co-movement extends to quantities

- 1. Between asset prices and capital flows (corr $\simeq 80\%$)
- 2. Between inflows & outflows
- 3. And across flows types (FDIs less so)



Co-movement extends to quantities

- 1. Between asset prices and capital flows (corr $\simeq 80\%$)
- 2. Between inflows & outflows
- 3. And across flows types (FDIs less so)



WHAT'S BEHIND THE FACTORS?

WHAT'S BEHIND THE FACTORS?

- Stylised model of heterogeneous investors
- Common component = f(time-varying aggregate risk aversion)

What's behind the factors?

- Stylised model of heterogeneous investors
- \circ Common component = f(time-varying aggregate risk aversion)



Specific role for MP: Coimbra & Rey (forth.)



Median IRFs, 68% & 90% posterior credible sets, 1991:2018.



Median IRFs, 68% & 90% posterior credible sets, 1991:2018.



Median IRFs, 68% & 90% posterior credible sets, 1991:2018.



Median IRFs, 68% & 90% posterior credible sets, 1991:2018.

DO ALL COUNTRIES RESPOND IN THE SAME WAY?

DO ALL COUNTRIES RESPOND IN THE SAME WAY?

• Still a role for FX, but partial [Corsetti, Kuester, Müller and Schmidt (2021)]

DO ALL COUNTRIES RESPOND IN THE SAME WAY?

- Still a role for FX, but partial [Corsetti, Kuester, Müller and Schmidt (2021)]
- And additional vulnerabilities for EMEs



Median IRFs, 68% & 90% posterior credible sets, 1991:2018.

Dimensions of Global Comovements #2: Global Trade/Commodity Cycle & Chinese MP Transmission

GFC is $\underline{\text{not}}$ the only Global Cycle

GFC is $\underline{\text{not}}$ the only Global Cycle

- 1. Large commonality between capital flows, cmdy prices, global trade [Davis et al. (2019)]
- 2. Emergence of China



GFC is $\underline{\text{not}}$ the only Global Cycle

- 1. Large commonality between capital flows, cmdy prices, global trade [Davis et al. (2019)]
- 2. Emergence of China





Trade (no services), IMF's Direction of Trade Statistics (DOTS)

- ▷ Objectives: stable inflation, growth/employment, currency [Ma & He (2020), Wu & Li (2016)]
- ▷ Achieved through price and quantity policy instruments [Huang, Ge & Wang (2020)]
- ▷ From central planning to interest rate liberalisation:
 - $\circ~$ Bank loans quota, benchmark lending and deposit rates prior to 2000
 - $\circ~$ Official shift to M2 growth in 2000
 - Market rates after the GF Crisis, SHIBOR and interbank repo [Fernald, Spiegel & Swanson (2014)]
 - PBoC's loan prime rates (LPR) from 2019

- 1. Monetary Policy Indicator [Xu & Jia (2019)]
 - Combines prices and quantities
 - Triangularisation consistent with Taylor rule

- 1. Monetary Policy Indicator [Xu & Jia (2019)]
 - Combines prices and quantities
 - Triangularisation consistent with Taylor rule



- 1. Monetary Policy Indicator [Xu & Jia (2019)]
 - Combines prices and quantities
 - Triangularisation consistent with Taylor rule



• Replicability, units, and ad hoc restrictions

- 2. Markets' reaction to PBoC announcements [Kamber & Mohanty (BIS, 2018)]
 - Daily changes in 1-year interest rate swap (IRS) on interbank 7-day repo
 - Announcements: lending rates (LR), reserve requirements (RRR), FX, MPR

- 2. Markets' reaction to PBoC announcements [Kamber & Mohanty (BIS, 2018)]
 - Daily changes in 1-year interest rate swap (IRS) on interbank 7-day repo
 - Announcements: lending rates (LR), reserve requirements (RRR), FX, MPR



- 2. Markets' reaction to PBoC announcements [Kamber & Mohanty (BIS, 2018)]
 - Daily changes in 1-year interest rate swap (IRS) on interbank 7-day repo
 - Announcements: lending rates (LR), reserve requirements (RRR), FX, MPR



• Largely predictable, still many caveats...



Median IRFs, 68% & 90% posterior credible sets, 1999:2018.



Median IRFs, 68% & 90% posterior credible sets, 1999:2018.



Median IRFs, 68% & 90% posterior credible sets, 1999:2018.



Median IRFs, 68% & 90% posterior credible sets, $1999{:}2018.$

Special Exposure

Special Exposure

• AE with important manufacturing sector



Special Exposure

• AE with important manufacturing sector



• Financial conditions of commodity producers



Median IRFs, 68% & 90% posterior credible sets, 1999:2018. $_{15/16}$

CONCLUSIONS

- ▷ Global comovements enable and amplify int'l transmission of MP shocks
 - 1. Global Financial Cycle: asset prices, capital flows, risk, leverage
 - 2. Global Trade & Cmdy Cycle: commodity prices, capital flows, trade
- $\,\triangleright\,$ US MP most powerful at influencing global financial conditions
- ▷ Integrated production networks & GVC new pieces on the chessboard
 - Different channels, equivalent broad reach
 - Rising influence of Chinese policies

▷ Coming Next..

- Integrated empirical framework for joint dynamics: GVAR [Cesa-Bianchi, Pesaran & Rebucci (2012); Dees and Galesi (2019)] Networks in VARs [Mlikota (2023)]
- Account for evolution of network structures

Going Forward: Evolution of Networks: Exports, 2000 vs 2019





- Merchandise trade, excludes services
- IMF's Direction of Trade Statistics (DOTS)

Going Forward: Evolution of Networks: PF A + L, 2000 vs 2018



- Includes private & official cross-border investment in Eqy + Debt securities
- Coppola, Maggiori, Neiman & Schreger (2021) + IMF's Coordinated Portfolio Investment Survey (CPIS)