Coordinating Monetary and Financial Regulatory Policies

by Alejandro Van der Ghote

DISCUSSION BY GIOVANNI DELL'ARICCIA (IMF AND CEPR)

FRANKFURT, MAY 2018

The views expressed in this presentation are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the IMF, its Executive Board, or IMF management.

Summary

- Model with price rigidities and occasionally binding leverage constraint on intermediaries
- Pecuniary externality: Banks do not take into account effects of constraint on asset prices/marginal investors
- Macroprudential policy can redistribute and smooth intermediaries' relative capacity to borrow across states of the world

What I Liked

- Rigorous approach based on relatively standard model
- Puts together two frictions critical to policy / objectives
- Can compare different institutional solutions within same world
- Lends itself to calibration

What could be improved

- The paper is hard to read for a "non-macro person"
- Describe in greater detail main frictions/market failures and rationale for policy intervention
- Provide better intuition for main results
- Examples of how policies work: for instance how capital requirements vary over "cycle"
- Discuss alternative policy mandates

What I Think Is Missing

- Credibility associated with simple mandates critical issue
- If not, why not giving independent agencies the "proper" objective function
- Gains from coordination have to be compared with costs from loss of credibility
- Additional tradeoff: transparency/accountability vs coordination
- Risks to central bank independence

Political Economy of Central Bank Independence

- Simple observable targets and instruments
- Ex post accountability
- Can we replicate this model for macroprudential policy?
- ▶ A new intermediate target?

Monetary Policy Affects Output (we know) & Risk Taking

- Effect on output/inflation relatively well understood
- ► Effects on macro-financial stability:
 - ► Theoretically, it can go either way (risk-shifting versus leverage and portfolio reallocation)
 - ► Empirically, seems to be: low interest rates → more risk taking
 - Emerging consensus that prolonged periods of easy money may lead to trouble (short term more complex)

Effects of Macro-prudential Policy?

- Effects on macro-financial stability. Proposed measures:
 - Reduce risk taking (cyclical CARs)
 - Strengthen financial sector (dynamic provisioning)
 - Reduce balance sheet vulnerabilities (LTV & DTI limits)
- Effects on output/inflation:
 - ► Likely to reduce credit flows
 - Contain demand
 - ▶ Lower output growth

 α

Separate Agencies with Different Mandates

- ► CB tasked with price/output stability:
 - Not necessarily indifferent to risk/financial stability
 - But greater weight on inflation/output gap
- ► FA tasked with macro-financial stability:
 - May care about output/inflation as they affects balance sheets
 - But focus on risk taking, financial sector strength, balance sheet vulnerability

9

Outcome Under Separate Agencies

- Separation improves credibility
 - Especially if CB's mandate very clear
 - ► Similar to fiscal/monetary policy divorce
- At potential cost of second-best policy mix
- Example, in a recession:
 - CB cuts rate aggressively to stimulate demand
 - FA reacts by tightening macro-prudential regulation to reduce risk-taking → CB eases even more → FA
 - Result: a policy mix with too low interest rates and too tight macro-prudential measures

Centralized Solution

- Two objectives, two instruments
 - ► Single agency internalizes effects of policy action on both targets
 - Can be designed to set optimal policy mix
- But dual targets question commitment to either one
 - Reluctant to tighten macro-prudential if demand weak?
 - ► Forbearance on banks to support output?
 - ▶ Will it fight inflation if it means to hurt banks in the short run?
 - Will it ease aggressively as needed, if it means more risk taking?
- Credibility issues are costly
 - Increase sacrifice ratio (higher r to achieve same inflation rate)
 - Not dissimilar from Barro-Gordon

_