

Portfolio Investment and U.S. Monetary Policy Announcements: an event study analysis using high frequency data from Mexico

Marco Hernandez Vega

Discussant: Silvia Albrizio

Banco de España

Banco de España 17th November 2016

QUICK SUMMARY

Research question: How unexpected monetary policy announcements in U.S. (QE3 and taper tantrum 2013) affect foreign inflows of debt and equity in Mexico (Jan 2013-July 2015).

Relevance: Observed increase of gross portfolio inflows from 3% of total capital inflows before the crises to 60% after crises. What's the problem?

QE in US: Search for yield => inflow of capital in EME (portfolio rebalancing)

Tapering => capital flow reversals: destabilizing effect on EME

Contribution: extend Park and Um 2016

- One country focus
- Novel dataset: foreign net inflows of debt and equity, daily frequency, maps BoP
- •Different frequencies: daily decrease endogeneity concerns, weekly delayed reactions
- Additional financial variables: omitted variables

Priors about effects:

QE => positive effect on inflows

Tap => negative effect on inflows

Counterintuitive results at daily frequency while results on weekly data more in line with priors and heterogeneous impact between debt and equity flows: debt reaction stronger and delayed – domestic fundamentals are more relevant and portfolio rebalancing.



CHANNELS OF IMPACT OF U.S. UMP ON EMERGING MARKETS:

<u>Portfolio balance channel</u>: QE => decrease supply => decrease return => investors turn to riskier assets for higher risk-adjusted returns.

<u>Signalling channel</u>: commitment to keep future policy rates lower than previously expected => risk-neutral component of bond yields may decline => large interest rate differentials with respect to EMEs will be expected to persist which => triggers carry trades and capital flows into EMEs (Bauer and Rudebusch (2013)).

<u>Liquidity channel</u>: Large-scale of assets purchase => increased reserves of private banks => decline in the liquidity premium => enabling liquidity-constrained banks to extend credit to investors => increased overall bank lending, including cross-border lending.



KEY ASSUMPTIONS

- Key identification assumption:
- News about the economy on the announcement date does not affect the policy choice. Only information available the previous day is relevant.
 - =>daily data (✓)
- Announcements do not affect other confounding factors that are not controlled for. However:
- Intraday noise: forex intraday trading, etc.. & one-day lag could capture other announcements/events
- Weekly data: omitted variables and simultaneity are more likely
- Cross-listed firms (US firms that are also listed in the Mexico) are also affected by US UMP directly =>Focus on Mexican assets that are purely local (municipalities bonds)?
- Unexpected announcements: Difficult to believe it for tapering June 2013. Narrative (a la Aizenman et al. 2014) to convince the reader or test for leads?
- Identification of persistence of the impact: Only one-day lag, one-week lag: are there information frictions? Why not contemporaneous (Gertler and Karadi AER 2015) or same week? Why not a distributed lag model?



HETEROGENEITY

Heterogeneous effect between equity and debt?

- •Two different channels: bonds are affected by portfolio channel while equity is not (Fratzscher et al. 2013, Lim et al. 2014, Dahlhaus and Vasishtha 2014) test?
- •Size of positions and the liquidity of markets play a role (Eichengreen and Gupta, 2014).
- •Different risk aversion of agents in equity and bond market

Heterogeneous effect across episodes?

- •Degree of uncertainty (Dahlhaus and Vasishtha 2014) ...how important is the first moment versus the second moment?
- Deviation from expectations.



ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Why focus on aggregates? Effects on the yield curve among Mexican assets: test channels

Debt issued by Federal Gov't, public institutions, parastatal companies, deposit insurance institute, banks, corporation and all transactions in equity in Mexican stock market.

Improve identification and model specification:

- •Narrative of the news Aizenman et al. (2014): (27/11/2012 3/10/2013) 29 Tap and 33 QE news
- •VAR with high frequency identification (Gertler and Karadi AEJ 2015)
- •Gallagher AEJ 2014: event study. Learning about infrequent events (flood).

Secondary points: external validity, adjusted R2 negative, dropped/interpolated variables, discussion.



Thanks for your attention

