International Spillovers of
Central Bank Balance Sheet Policies

Qianying CHEN, Andrew FILARDO, Dong HE and Feng ZHU[1]

Hong Kong Monetary Authority and Bank for International Settlements

November 2011

I. Introduction

The recent global financial crisis and recession has had a major impact on the design and implementation of monetary policy. Following the crisis, central banks in the major advanced economies lowered policy rates rapidly to near zero, and the scope for further monetary easing through policy rate cuts became very limited. Bernanke and Reinhart (2004) suggested three policy alternatives when central banks face the zero lower bound on nominal interest rates: first, shape public expectations about future path of the policy rate; second, quantitative easing, i.e., increase the size of the central bank's balance sheet beyond the level needed to maintain zero policy rate; third, change the composition of the central bank's balance sheet in order to affect the relative supply of securities held by the public. Notably, several central banks have taken measures which are considered "unconventional", departing from the standard procedure, which would react to changes in inflation and output by changing a short-term interest rate. Such unconventional policy measures often have a quasi-fiscal nature, they are faithfully reflected in the changes in the size or composition, or both, of a central bank's balance sheet (see Graph II.1).

Given the rather limited experience central banks have with the balance sheet policies, a natural question policymakers ask is whether such policies would be effective in the current situation, and if so, how effective these policies are and whether they bring benefits which would outweigh possible costs and risks. Early research on the impact and effectiveness of central bank balance sheet policies is scant as such policies rarely came into serious consideration. One exception was the research on the impact of the 1961-1964 Operation Twist implemented by the Kennedy Administration, which relied on selling short but buying longer-term Treasury debt in order to modify the term structure of interest rates. Past studies including Holland (1969) and Modigliani and Sutch (1966, 1967) show that the Operation had a relatively small impact on longer-term bond yields. This has been confirmed by event studies of Bernanke, Reinhart and Sack (2004)

---

and Swanson (2011). A second strand of literature focuses on the Bank of Japan's 2001-2006 quantitative easing, and Ugai (2007) provides good survey of related empirical work.

The latest unconventional policy actions taken by central banks in a number of major advanced economies have led to a burgeoning literature. Most recent work on the effectiveness of quantitative easing has focused on its domestic effects, analysing several channels of domestic transmission.[2] The literature's emphasis on the domestic impact of balance sheet policies can be justified, on the grounds that a refined knowledge of the exact impact would be essential to a correct calibration of size or composition changes in central bank balance sheet policies needed to have desired effects on the economy.

Much of the work has resorted to event studies analysing the announcement or surprise effects of quantitative easing on domestic asset markets, while a small number of papers employed regression analysis. Among others, D'Amico and King (2010), Doh (2010), Gagnon, Raskin, Remasche and Sack (2010, 2011) and Krishnamurthy, Vissing-Jorgensen (2010, 2011), provide estimates for the US large-scale asset purchase programme; and Joyce, Lasaosa, Stevens and Tong (2010) and Meaning and Zhu (2011) for the Bank of England's asset purchases.

Yet very little has been done to investigate the impact on the real activity of central bank balance sheet policies. On the one hand, monetary policy tends to have long and variable legs, and balance sheet policy may be no exception. Data availability is a main obstacle given that the sample following the implementation of unconventional policy measures remains very short and the effects have yet to be fully spelt out in the coming years. On the other hand, the usual channels of monetary policy transmission could have been severely impaired following the recent global financial crisis and recession, and pre-crisis models could have simply become obsolete. In addition, unconventional policy might be transmitted in rather different ways from the traditional channels for interest rate policy in normal times.

In addition, there is very little research on the international spillovers of central bank balance sheet policies, especially the impact on emerging markets. Relying on event studies of US asset purchases on domestic and international financial markets, Nealy (2010) finds significant impact of US quantitative easing, which reduced Treasury bond yields by 100 basis points and corporate bond yields by 80 basis points; more importantly, US quantitative easing lowered bond rates in the other advanced economies by 20-80 basis points and the value of US dollar by 4-11 percentage points. His results suggest that portfolio rebalancing effect were more significant than signalling effect; and efforts for more international policy coordination could be helpful. Glick and Leduc (2011) showed that commodity prices fell on average on days of the Fed LSAP announcement, despite the decline in long-term interest rates and dollar depreciation.

In fact, having a better understanding of the international implications of quantitative easing is equally important for policymakers in emerging economies to better cope with challenges implied by such policies. There are two dominant views in the likely cross-border effects: the first view, typically held by economies which have implemented such policies in order to revive the domestic economy, sees no major impact or externalities on emerging economies; if anything, stronger domestic growth spurred by quantitative easing would promote a more stable global macro and financial environment, and increase demand for exports by the emerging economies, therefore bringing major benefits to the global economy. The other view, held by many emerging economies, suggests that such policies could depreciate domestic currency and inflate already significant risk-adjusted interest rate differentials vis-à-vis other economies,

---

[2] See the Annex Table for a summary of the recent studies on the impact of central bank balance sheet policies.

leading to potentially large capital inflows, credit growth, and consumer and asset price inflation pressures in these economies.

Nevertheless, the cross-border effects of different stages of quantitative easing might have changed over time as the growth prospects of the advanced and emerging economies diverged. Initially, quantitative easing may have contributed to alleviating acute global funding difficulties and stabilising credit markets at a time of raging financial crisis and a severe global recession. It could have helped stem large capital outflows and prevent a sustained decline in exports from emerging economies, by strengthening trade credit and supporting demand in the advanced economies. However, at a later stage, while emerging economies returned to solid growth, the latest actions, e.g. the US Federal Reserve asset purchases starting in November 2010, have been perceived as less benign with a two-speed global recovery and already rising CPI and asset price inflation pressures in the emerging economies. These actions were perceived to have encouraged speculative capital inflows and raised currency appreciation pressures, further increasing risks of overheating, inflation and asset market excesses in the emerging economies.

In this paper, we provide empirical evidence to the ongoing debate on the cross-border impact of quantitative easing in the major advanced economies, with a special focus on the US asset purchase programmes. We contribute to the existing literature in two ways: by examining the cross-border financial market impact of central bank balance sheet policies in a more systematic fashion; and by studying the real effects of quantitative easing, both domestic and international, using a global VECM model. We focus on the impact on a number of emerging economies in Asia and in Latin America, and compare it to the impact on the major advanced economies. Particular attention is paid to cross-border channels of transmission: compared to previous research on cross-country interdependence relying on trade linkages, we also use the locational bank lending statistics provided by the Bank for International Settlements to gauge the strength of financial linkages across economies.

We find that in the short run, US quantitative easing policy not only stimulated US domestic economy, but also boosted the asset prices globally and helped stabilise the financial markets following the global financial crisis. In particular, it had an expansionary impact on a broad range of assets across the world, including equity prices, government and corporate bond yields, and CDS spreads. In addition, it helped to recover the US domestic real economy.

However, the international spillovers in the longer run differed across economies. Lowering the term spread of the US Treasury bond yield raised the equity prices significantly in the advanced economies, but the expansionary impact on growth and inflation was only around half of that on the US domestic economy. We find no evidence of capital inflow pressure or rapid credit growth in the advanced economies. In contrast, the effect on emerging economies was in general stronger and more diverse. For some economies such as Hong Kong, Brazil and Argentina, the expansionary impact was greater than the domestic effects of US quantitative easing. A US monetary easing typically led to high capital inflow pressures, rapid domestic credit growth, and inflationary pressures in some economies. The longer-run impact depended on the different ways in which each economy reacted or adjusted to the US policy shock, and in part determined by its economic and financial structure, policy framework, capital control and exchange rate regimes. We find that the sign and the size of the medium-run impact differed across economies, implying that the cost and benefit of the US quantitative easing policies have been unevenly distributed across the advanced and emerging economies.

The paper is organised as follows. Section II describes central bank balance sheet policies and their uses since the early 2000s. Section III contains a detailed account of both the domestic and cross-border channels of transmission of central bank balance sheet policies. Section IV presents empirical results of event studies on the impact on the emerging economies of

quantitative easing in the advanced economies; estimates impulse responses to a US quantitative easing shock, based on a global VECM; and estimates likely cross-border spillovers of a US quantitative easing shock on output, inflation, credit, equity prices, and monetary policy. Section V concludes.

II. Central bank balance sheets policies

Central bank balance sheets have changed continuously, much of it as a passive response to monetary policy actions such as open market operations. In addition, balance sheet policies could be seen as a regular feature of monetary policymaking in a number of emerging economies, if one takes into account the fact that many central banks actively intervene in the foreign exchange market and as a consequence accumulate sizeable foreign exchange reserves which could disproportionately inflate a central bank's balance sheet.

On the other hand, the active management of the size and composition of central bank balance sheets as the main policy instrument has been much less common.[3] Besides the US Operation Twist of the early 1960s, so far this has happened only in rather extreme circumstances of very stressful macro and financial conditions. Although in theory, a central bank could carry out balance sheet policies irrespective of the existing level of the policy rate, in practice the recent experiments with balance sheet policies have been associated with policy rates constrained at the zero lower bound. One notable example was Japan. After a decade of anemic growth and persistent deflationary pressures, the Bank of Japan implemented a "quantitative easing" programme from March 2001 to March 2006, expanding its balance sheet on the liability side by setting targets for current account balances held by financial institutions with the Bank. Eventually the BOJ purchased almost JPY 30 trillion of domestic government bonds.

Following the recent global crisis and prolonged economic weakness, several central banks in the major advanced economies implemented different programmes which could be considered balance sheet policy measures. Besides the Bank of Japan, which already had a sizeable balance sheet at the onset of the global crisis, the balance sheets of the US Federal Reserve, European Central Bank and the Bank of England all recorded a sizeable expansion in the second half of 2008 (See Graph II.1). From then on, quantitative easing has been conducted mainly through changes in the composition of central bank balance sheets. In fact, the Fed's holdings of securities rose from a mere USD 790 billion in mid-2007 to an estimated USD 2.6 trillion by mid-2011.

More recently, the US Federal Reserve and the Bank of England, among other central banks, established a number of asset purchase programmes in attempts to change the composition of their balance sheets on the asset side. The latter approach became known as "credit easing" or "qualitative easing", with the objectives of easing domestic financial conditions, restoring credit flows and repairing impaired monetary transmission.[4]

---

[3] See Bernanke and Reinhart (2004) and Bernanke, Reinhart and Sack (2004).

[4] For the ease of exposition, we use the terminologies "quantitative easing", "central bank balance sheet policy", "unconventional monetary policy" and "asset purchase programmes" interchangeably, wherever the circumstances are clear.

Graph II.1

Central bank assets and liabilities

In billions of respective currency units

Federal Reserve

Eurosystem

Bank of England

Bank of Japan

[Legends for Federal Reserve: US Treasuries, Other securities[1], Lending[2], FX swap, Total assets, Total liabilities, Notes in circulation, Reserve balances, US treasury supplementary account]

[Legends for Eurosystem: Securities held for monetary policy purposes[3], Other securities[4], Lending, Foreign currency assets[6], Other liabilities[5], Deposit facility]

[Legends for Bank of England: Securities, Lending, Other assets[7], Short-term OMO[8]]

[Legends for Bank of Japan: Lending, Foreign currency assets[6], Government securities, Corporate bonds, Repurchase agreements]

[1] Includes federal agency debt securities and mortgage-backed securities held outright. [2] Repurchase agreements, term auction credit, other loans and CPFF. [3] Includes portfolios held under the Covered Bond Purchase Programme and Securities Market Programme. [4] Other securities of euro area residents denominated in euro. [5] Including to central banks. [6] Including US dollar liquidity auctions. [7] Including US dollar liquidity auctions and asset purchase facility. [8] Open market operations, including issuance of Bank of England sterling bills.

Sources: Datastream; national data.

The Bank of England established its Asset Purchase Facility (APF) in January 2009 to "buy high-quality assets financed by the issuance of Treasury Bills", with the aim to "improve liquidity in credit markets". The announced £200 billion in asset purchases concentrate on gilts (£198 billion), which accounted for 29% of the free float gilt market. Buyable asset include UK government securities (gilts) and "high-quality" private sector assets, including commercial paper and corporate bonds. The Bank of Japan's Asset Purchase Program (APP), announced in October 2010 as part of its Comprehensive Monetary Easing, would aim at "encouraging a decline in longer-term market interest rates and a reduction in various risk premiums to further enhance monetary easing." Through the programme "the Bank purchases various financial assets and conducts the fixed-rate funds-supplying operation against pooled collateral". On 4 August 2011, the Bank of Japan announced that it will increase its asset purchase programme by 10 trillion yen to 40 trillion yen.

The Eurosystem's covered bond purchase programme (CBPP), announced in May 2009 and implemented between July 2009 and June 2010 for a nominal value of EUR 60 billion, was aimed at supporting "a specific financial market segment that is important for the funding of

banks and that had been particularly affected by the financial crisis". A total of 422 different bonds, mainly with maturities of three to seven years, were purchased, and 73% of these were bought in the secondary market. Despite the relatively small size (Graph II.1), empirical evidence suggests that CBPP helped lower banks' financing costs, stimulating a revival of the covered bond market and dampening euro area covered bonds by about 12 basis points.

The implementation of balance sheet policies by the US Federal Reserve has evolved in three stages: in the first stage, many segments of capital markets became dysfunctional as the global financial crisis raged and a severe global recession set in. Since December 2007, the Fed introduced the Term Auction Facility (TAF), the Term Securities Lending Facility (TSLF), and the Primary Dealer Credit Facility (PDCF), to support the market segments with severe liquidity shortages. [5] The use of such Facilities would change mostly the composition but not the size of the Fed's balance sheet.

The start of the second stage was marked by a sharp size expansion of the Federal Reserve's balance sheet through a large-scale asset purchase (LSAP) programme, first announced in November 2008 and then extended in 2009. It allows the Federal Reserve expands its open market operations to "support the functioning of credit markets through the purchase of longer-term securities". The announced total amount of asset purchases was USD 1.7 trillion, which represent 22% of the combined outstanding Treasuries, long-term Agency debt, and fixed rate agency MBS, worth around $7.7 trillion at the beginning of the operation. Two phases of LSAP should be noted: Quantitative Easing Mark 1 (QE1) was carried out between November 2008 and March 2009, during the financial crisis, and later extended to March 2010; and Quantitative Easing Mark 2 (QE2), which started in November 2010 when the global recovery faltered, was intended to purchase an additional USD 600 billion in longer-term Treasury securities by mid 2011.

On September 21 2011, the Federal Reserve entered the third stage of balance sheet policy by announcing a new maturity extension (ME) programme, under which it would buy longer-term Treasury securities for USD400 billion by the end of June 2012. A distinct feature of the ME programme is that such purchases will be financed with the proceeds from selling shorter-term Treasury securities, instead of increases in reserves. In other words, the "Operation Twist" would only involve changes in the composition of Fed balance sheet. The aim is to extend the average maturity of the Fed's Treasury securities portfolio by 25 months to about 100 months by the end of 2012. The operation would put further downward pressure on the interest rates for longer-term Treasury securities and other financial assets that are close substitutes, therefore contributing to a broad easing in credit market conditions and supporting the economic recovery.

The role, objectives, instruments and corresponding operating procedures of central banks' balance sheet policies have changed over time, as the advanced economies went through different phases of the financial and economic cycle. Initially such policies focused on providing ample liquidity to stabilise financial markets and shore up confidence, e.g. with various term facilities set up by the US Federal Reserve and also currency swaps. As the crisis subsided, balance sheet policies placed a greater emphasis on lowering borrowing costs and easing credit conditions for the private sector, so as to promote growth and employment. Such policies have taken the form of asset purchase programmes, commitment to very low interest rates for a pre-determined period of time, or even foreign exchange market interventions.

Given the elevated degree of financial integration and trade openness, economies have become ever more closely interwoven and highly interdependent on each other. Consequently, even as

---

[5] See Campbell, Covitz, Nelson and Pence (2011) and Wu (2010, 2011) for assessment on the effectiveness of the US Federal Reserve term facilities.

central bank balance sheet policies have been designed primarily to tackle domestic economic issues, these are bound to have wider cross-border spillover effects. Indeed as economic recovery has solidified in the emerging economies, such effects have become a main concern for policymakers in many emerging Asian and Latin American economies, in particular since the asset purchase programmes (QE2) were put in place by several central banks. The US Federal Reserve Bank's LSAP programme has stood out by its size and likely global impact. The focus of this paper is precisely on whether quantitative easing in the advanced economies has had a significant impact on the emerging economies; and if so, how large such cross-border effects have been.

III. Transmission of central bank balance sheet policies

Central bank balance sheet policies are designed to cope with domestic policy challenges, its domestic transmission may operate through a number of channels. First, quantitative easing could work through the traditional interest rate channel by reducing longer-term yields and subsequently real interest rates, as nominal prices and wages are slow to adjust. This encourages borrowing and spending by firms and households. Second, as financial assets are imperfect substitutes with distinct liquidity and risk characteristics, central bank asset purchases could change relative demand and prices of different securities, hence influencing investors' portfolio decisions through a portfolio balance channel. This would cause size and composition changes in private sector asset holdings, leading to easier financial conditions more generally. In the third, signalling or expectations channel, a central bank relies on quantitative easing to demonstrate its commitment to a specific future policy path, therefore shaping market expectations in such a way to, e.g. keep subdued the longer-term yields. A credible commitment would as well inspire confidence and drive down risk premia while supporting asset prices.

Fourth, through a bank lending channel, quantitative easing could help directly ease financial conditions and support bank lending to the private sector by improving the availability of funds. Direct asset purchases could help raise asset prices strengthening bank and corporate balance sheets. Stronger balance sheets, lower borrowing costs and better access to credit stimulate business spending, output and employment. Similarly, quantitative easing could operate through a liquidity channel, by reducing liquidity premia and hence borrowing costs for the private sector through central bank provision of abundant and cheap liquidity to financial institutions. In addition, through an asset price channel, abundant liquidity flows made available by quantitative easing and direct large-scale asset purchases may support equity and housing prices and encourage investors to move to riskier assets. For example, reduced mortgage rates could improve home affordability and lend support to property prices. This would boost household wealth and spending, making a positive contribution to consumption, output and employment.[6]

The focus of this paper is on the international spillover effect of central bank balance sheet policies. There are a number of cross-border transmission channels through which such policies may operate. First, a portfolio rebalancing channel operates in the global economy. For instance, foreign long-term sovereign debt could be imperfect substitutes of long-term domestic debt. Indeed US Treasury securities play a special role in the global economy as the US dollar is the dominant reserve currency, no other sovereign or private debt instruments are seen as perfect substitutes. If quantitative easing lowers US long-term bond yields, investors could turn to emerging market assets of similar maturities for higher risk-adjusted returns. This would boost asset prices and lower long-term interest rates in the emerging economies, effectively easing

---

[6] See Case, Quigley and Shiller (2005) and Lettau and Ludvigson (2004) for recent evidence.

financial conditions there. Indeed, in a globalised financial market, leakage from a domestic monetary easing is unavoidable, and the size of such leakage could differ across countries depending on the strength of cross-border transmission channels.

A second channel operates through international financial markets and is a combination of liquidity, asset price and risk-taking channels. With a well-integrated global market, a sizeable quantitative easing in one economy would boost global liquidity. With policy commitment implicit or explicitly embodied in quantitative easing, policy rate is expected to stay near zero in the foreseeable future in the major advanced economies. Large and rising interest rate differentials are expected to persist, relative to the emerging economies with supposedly sound macro fundamentals and solid growth. Quantitative easing could spur carry trades and capital flows into the emerging economies with higher risk-adjusted rates of return, this in turn would push up consumer and asset prices. In addition, persistently low interest rates and abundant liquidity would create incentives for financial institutions in both advanced and emerging economies to search for yields, taking on greater risk for contractual or institutional reasons.[7] An extended period of suppressed interest rates could also lead banks to miscalculate risks.

While some of these channels are similar in nature to the domestic channels described earlier, others are distinctly international. A third, exchange rate channel, quantitative easing may work through exchange rate depreciation with respect to the other economies. The impact on the emerging economies can be large if the depreciation occurs to a major international reserve currency. Currency speculations could also play a role by increasing the size and volatility of capital flows. For instance, the Fed's LSAP programme could lower US longer-term interest rates making USD-based investment less appealing, leading investors to shift towards assets denominated in higher-yielding currencies. Extended period of extraordinary monetary easing by the Federal Reserve could put persistent appreciation pressure on emerging market currencies, particularly in Asian economies where currencies are somewhat pegged to the USD. Large foreign reserve accumulation, if not fully sterilised, could increase domestic money and credit.

Moreover, real effects of quantitative easing in the advanced economies could spread directly through an external demand or trade channel. Quantitative easing could boost demand for emerging economy goods and services through easier trade credit and increased spending in the advanced economies. However, such effects depend on the size of import elasticity in the advanced economies, and have to be balanced against the likely impact of an appreciation of emerging market currencies caused by such quantitative easing.

In addition, quantitative easing could solicit strong endogenous monetary policy response in the emerging economies: for instance, central banks in emerging economies have kept domestic monetary conditions accommodative, even as the economies recovered, inflation rose and asset prices rallied. In part, the policy response may have reflected fears that widening interest rate differentials would drive up exchange rates and disruptive capital inflows.

Disparate conditions in the advanced and emerging economies could exert strong appreciation pressures on emerging market currencies and lead to disruptive capital flows. It also suggests that the expansion of broad money and credit to the private sector may begin to exceed that of nominal GDP again (Graph III.1, left-hand and centre panels). This may lead to unsustainable asset price pressures in economies which have already experienced rapid broad money and credit in recent years.

---

[7] See Borio and Zhu (2008) and Gambacorta (2009) for further details.

Graph III.1

Broad money, credit and asset prices

Broad money / GDP[1]

Emerging Asia[2,3]	HK
CN	SG

Private credit / GDP[1]

Emerging Asia[2,3]
CN
HK
SG

Asset prices

Housing prices:
CN, HK and SG[2]
Emerging Asia[2,4]
Equity prices[5]

[1] Annual changes in the ratio between broad money and bank credit to private sector (end of quarter) respectively and GDP (moving sum over four quarters); in percentage points. [2] Simple average. [3] China, Hong Kong SAR, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. [4] Economies listed except India and Philippines. [5] MSCI emerging Asia in local currency.

Sources: IMF IFS; national data.

IV. The impact of central bank balance sheet policies

Has quantitative easing in the advanced economies brought significant international spillovers? If so, have such effects been beneficial or detrimental? The answer is not straightforward. While there is less discussion on the spillovers on other advanced economies, there are two typical views on whether these policies have had a substantial impact on the emerging economies. The first view considers that central bank balance sheet policies are designed for domestic contingencies and should be mostly felt in the domestic economy, and any spillover beyond borders should be contained and of limited impact. The second view sees a major impact of such policies: quantitative easing has been conducted in some of the largest advanced economies, with the most active financial markets and also major reserve currencies; in a world of integrated finance and trade, a large-scale and sustained monetary easing is bound to have significant impact on emerging economies.

The same type of central bank balance sheet policies in the advanced economies could have rather different impact across emerging economies and over time, depending on varying economic conditions. During the global financial crisis and the ensuing recession, as well as in the earlier phase of recovery, such policies apparently helped stabilise global financial markets, support trade credit and prevent a collapse in demand and real activity in both the advanced and emerging economies. In a second phase, as recovery gathered pace in the emerging economies but languished in the major advanced economies, growth prospects have since diverged. Growth and interest rate differentials have risen (see Graph IV.1), cheap and abundant liquidity could have encouraged large capital flows, part of which speculative, into a number of emerging economies.[8]

---

[8] De Nicolò, Dell'Ariccia, Laeven and Valencia (2010).

Graph IV.1

Policy rates[1]

In per cent

[1] Policy target rates or their proxies. For Australia, RBA cash target rate; for China, one-year lending rate; for Euro area, ECB minimum bid refinancing 1 week rate; for Hong Kong SAR, discount window base rate; for India, reverse repo rate; for Indonesia, one-month SBI rate; for Japan, uncollateralized overnight call rate; for Korea, overnight call rate; for Malaysia, overnight policy rate; for New Zealand, official cash daily rate; for Philippines, overnight reserve repo rate; for Singapore, 3-month SIBOR; for Thailand, 14-day repo rate before 17 January 2007; overnight repo rate thereafter; for US, fed funds rate.

Sources: Bloomberg, Datastream.

This may aggravate the already mounting overheating, CPI and asset price inflation pressures in some emerging economies (see Graph IV.2). Quantitative easing in the advanced economies could have complicated policymaking by central banks in the emerging economies, and further easing could imply significant future challenges.

Graph IV.2

Bond yields and equity prices

Bond yields; in basis points

Equity price indices[3]; 9 Mar 2009 = 100

[1] Simple average of ten year sovereign bond yield of China, Hong Kong SAR, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. [2] JPMorgan EMBI (Global) sovereign spread of Asia. [3] MSCI in local currency.

Sources: Bloomberg.

Additional domestic liquidity in the United States associated with the ballooning of the Federal Reserve's balance sheet could boost capital flows of various types to the rest of the world. Asia has been a favoured target of US capital outflows. While total outflows of capital from the United States has not been exceptional during the US QE period (Graph IV.3, left-hand panel), the

flows of securities and bank claims have surged into Asia in 2010 and so far in 2011 (Graph IV.3, right-hand panel). Some of this likely reflects some bounce back in activity from 2008-09.

Graph IV.3

US capital outflows

In billions of USD

Total outflows[1]

Outflows to emerging Asia[1,2]

- Direct investment
- Securities
- Bank claims

- Direct investment
- Equity
- Debt securities
- Other investment

[1] 2011 figure based on annualised Q1 data.   [2] US-owned private assets vis-á-vis emerging Asia-Pacific

Sources: IMF *IFS*; US Bureau of Economic Analysis.

One additional channel of dollar funding in Asia is through dollar funding originated outside the United States. Hong Kong SAR and Singapore, for example, are international financial centres in the region that respond to demand for dollar funding without relying on actual dollar flows from the United States. To the extent such demand at very low US interest rates is ample, this could lead to lending booms in the region. Indeed, Graph IV.4 shows a marked increase in US dollar credit to Asia emanating from non-US banks. Bank loans make up a lion's share of the increase. However, this surge in assets is not matched by a similarly sized increase in US liabilities (at the same reporting banks). A number of financial stability issues can arise in such circumstances, arising in part from credit booms and in part from the implied currency mismatches.[9]

We study the international impact of the central bank balance sheet policies in the advanced economies in two steps. We first examine the more immediate impact of these policies on the financial markets of emerging markets using event study techniques, which has been little discussed in the literature. Using an event study methodology to capture the impact in a short time window is justified, since the spillover effects are expected to rapidly transmit between the highly integrated financial markets through portfolio rebalancing, asset price or exchange rate channels. However, monetary policy has long and variable lags to have an impact on real activity, and quantitative easing is no exception. Therefore, in the second step, we assess the longer lasting impact using a formal econometric model, which is intended to capture relevant cross-country macro-financial linkages. The analysis could help us better understand the cross-broader spillovers, in particular the two competing views on the cross-border impact of central bank balance sheet policies.

---

[9] See Borio et al (2011) and He and McCauley (2010) on the growth of US dollar credit outside the United States and the policy implications.

Graph IV.4

USD flows outside US[1, 2]

In billions of USD

Assets of non-US banks vis-à-vis Asian residents

- Loans
- Debt securities invested
- Other instruments

Liabilities of non-US banks vis-à-vis Asian residents

- Deposits
- Debt securities issued
- Other instruments

[1] 2011 figure based on annualised Q1 data. [2] Estimated exchange rate adjusted changes of total positions of BIS reporting banks vis-à-vis all sectors in emerging Asia-Pacific.

Source: BIS locational banking statistics.

IV.1. Announcement effects of quantitative easing: an international perspective

This section offers evidence on the impact of US QE on the emerging economies, with a focus on emerging Asia. We examine the response in emerging financial markets to significant QE announcements by the US Federal Reserve. The results are compared to the impact of QE programmes in Japan, the United Kingdom and the European Central Bank.

We find significant spillovers from US monetary policy actions to a wide range of emerging financial markets. Averaging across countries, US QE1 had a much larger cumulative effect than US QE2. By way of comparison, Japan's quantitative easing programme earlier in the decade had a somewhat greater impact on the region than the US QE2. This evidence offers clues about the transmission channels through which QE programmes work and policy implications for the emerging economies going forward as monetary authorities in the advanced economies contemplate additional monetary easing.

Event study methodology and results

We measure financial market responses to significant announcements about QE programmes, extending the methodology used in Gagnon, Raskin, Remasche and Sack (2010, 2011) to focus on the international impact. One important finding of their research is that US QE had the effect of compressing the term spread of US Treasury securities; the 10-year Treasury yields fell much more than the 2-year Treasury yields at the time of the announcement dates (Graph IV.5). With the very short end of the term structure pinned down by the zero lower bound, the yield curve generally pivoted down; this had knock-on effects on other US fixed income securities too.

We focus on significant announcement dates associated with QE1 and QE2, making adjustments based on the opening and closing times of emerging financial markets. Then, we estimate the average, cumulative 2-day percentage changes in a number of major financial indicators across various emerging financial markets. These include the 2- and 10-year sovereign bond yields, corporate bond yields, sovereign CDS spreads, the US dollar exchange rate and commodity prices. Table IV.1 reports our findings.

Graph IV.5

US interest rates

Financial market impact on QE event days[1]　　　　Treasury and policy rates[2]

[1] In basis points; from Gagnon et al (2011); 2y UST = two-year Treasury yield; 10y UST = ten-year Treasury yield; 10y Agy = ten-year agency debt yield; Agy MBS = current-coupon thirty-year agency mortgage-backed security yield; 10y TP = ten-year Treasury term-premium; 10y Swap = ten-year swap rate; Baa Index = Baa corporate bond index yield.　　[2] In per cent.

Sources: Bloomberg; Gagnon et al (2011)

The cumulative impact of US QE was to lower EM Asian bond yields, boost equity prices and exert upward pressures on bilateral exchange rates against USD and commodity prices. During QE1, 2-year yields fell on average across emerging Asia by about 45 basis points, and 10-year yields declined by almost 80 basis points, implying a downward twist at longer maturities; during QE2, 2- and 10-year yields edged down another 9 basis points. In other words, much of the yield curve shifted downwards. Yields on corporate bonds fell significantly, indicating an impact of the programmes on the risk premia in Asia.

In terms of perceived credit risk on sovereign debt, the announcements of the Federal Reserve during the QE1 period significantly reduced emerging Asian sovereign CDS spreads, especially when compared to responses during the QE2 period. One explanation is that the QE1 announcements were seen as credible Federal Reserve commitment, backed up with a demonstrated readiness to act on its balance sheet to combat the intense headwinds coming from the crisis and recession. In fact, QE2 could be seen as a follow-up to this initial commitment, and much of the surprise element was largely lost and over time the market developed a better understanding of asset purchases.

In addition, the differences reflect the economic conditions at the time. Asian economies were in a much more precarious state at the time of QE1 versus QE2;[10]. In the immediate aftermath of the Lehmann bankruptcy, the financial meltdown in the advanced economies spread rapidly to emerging Asia, quickly casting a pall on the economy. In this context, QE1 played an important role in countering the forces behind an emerging self-reinforcing financial-macroeconomic downward spiral. At the time of QE2, however, emerging Asia had by and large been experiencing a strong recovery. Unsurprisingly, the impact of QE2 on credit default spreads became fairly muted.[11]

---

[10] The chronology of the International Financial Crisis in Asia can be found in Filardo (2011).

[11] We focus on the aggregate impact of changes in a central bank's balance sheet, instead of the differences in the impacts that might be due to changes in the asset composition of the balance sheet.

Table IV.1

Cumulative two–day change around announcement days of QE for Asia[1]

	Announce-ment period	Total amounts (billions)	Gov't 2-year yields (bps)	Gov't 10-year yields (bps)	Corp bond yields[2] (bps)	Sov'gn CDS premia[3] (bps)	Equity prices (%)	FX against USD[4] (%)	Com-modity prices[5] (%)
US QE1	Nov 08 to Nov 09	$1,400	-45.37	-79.70	-52.90	-46.92	10.75	4.49	-2.57
QE2	Aug 10 to Nov 10	$600	-9.06	-9.16	-14.84	-4.80	1.53	-0.36	-2.95
JP QE1[6]	Mar 01 to Mar 06	¥30,000	-39.91	-49.07	…	…	7.42	0.86	4.36
QE2	Oct 10 to Aug 11	¥50,000	-9.08	-13.17	-17.93	7.16	-3.89	-0.75	-5.81
BoE	Feb 09 to Feb 10	£200	5.58	18.42	-7.80	22.67	-3.54	0.43	4.64
ECB	Jul 09 to Aug 11	€60	-9.00	-10.91	5.59	15.46	-5.73	-0.73	-6.85

[1] Simple averages of China, Hong Kong SAR, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. [2] Excluding Indonesia. [3] Excluding India and Singapore. [4] A positive change indicates an appreciation against the US dollar. [5] S&P GSCI composite index, in US dollar terms. [6] Due to data availability, 2– and 10–year yields exclude China, Indonesia and Malaysia; for corporate bond yields and sovereign CDS premia, data unavailable.

Sources: Bloomberg; Datastream; Markit; national data; BIS calculations.

Other asset markets have also been affected by QE announcements. Equity prices during QE1 rallied and emerging Asian currencies experienced some appreciation. The extent of the actual appreciation has to be interpreted carefully. Some of the exchange rate pressure in Asia was addressed by foreign exchange intervention to resist appreciation, especially during the QE2 period. Notwithstanding initial concerns in the region of disruptive currency appreciation pressures, significant currency appreciation did not materialise following QE2 announcements.

One question concerning the effectiveness of central bank QE programmes is the size of the per-dollar impact. Table IV.2 presents the results of converting the cumulative impacts of the QE programmes in Table IV.1 to a USD1 billion equivalent (x 100) impact on Asian financial markets.

The results confirm the impression that US QE2 announcements had a smaller per-dollar impact than did the QE1 announcements. In terms of bond yields and equity returns, the per-dollar impact of QE1 was many times as strong as QE2; the QE2 per dollar impact on the sovereign CDS spreads and exchange rates is as well much smaller.

It is illustrative to compare the impact of the Federal Reserve's QE programmes on emerging Asian financial markets with those of the Bank of Japan, the Bank of England and the European Central Bank. The results indicate that announcements of Japan's past 2001-2006 QE programme had a sizeable per dollar effect. This is consistent with the general lesson from this

experience that the BOJ's unconventional monetary policies were important in preventing the financial system from falling deep into a self-reinforcing deflationary cycle.[12]

Table IV.2

Per-billion dollar impact (x 100) of QE for Asia[1]

	Announce–ment period	Total amounts (billions)	Gov't 2-year yields (bps)	Gov't 10-year yields (bps)	Corp bond yields[2] (bps)	Sov'gn CDS premia[3] (bps)	Equity prices (%)	FX against USD[4] (%)	Com–modity prices[5] (%)
US QE1	Nov 08 to Nov 09	$1,400	-3.24	-5.69	-3.78	-3.35	0.77	0.32	-0.18
QE2	Aug 10 to Nov 10	$600	-1.51	-1.53	-2.47	-0.80	0.25	-0.06	-0.49
JP QE1[6]	Mar 01 to Mar 06	$258	-15.45	-18.99	…	…	2.87	0.33	1.69
QE2	Oct 10 to Aug 11	$618	-1.47	-2.13	-2.90	1.16	-0.63	-0.12	-0.94
BoE	Feb 09 to Feb 10	$315	1.77	5.85	-2.47	7.19	-1.12	0.14	1.47
ECB	Jul 09 to Aug 11	$83	-10.87	-13.17	6.75	18.67	-6.92	-0.88	-8.27

[1] Simple averages of China, Hong Kong SAR, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand of the cumulative 2-day changes around announcement days of QE, divided by the total dollar amount of QE * 100. [2] Excluding Indonesia. [3] Excluding India and Singapore. [4] A positive change indicates an appreciation against the US dollar. [5] S&P GSCI composite index, in US dollar terms. [6] Due to data availability, 2– and 10–year yields exclude China, Indonesia and Malaysia; for corporate bond yields and sovereign CDS premia, data unavailable.

Sources: Bloomberg; Datastream; Markit; national data; BIS calculations.

Some additional caveats against this type of event study relate to some inherent limitations. First, focussing on cumulative responses would inevitably include impact from other potentially important events surrounding the announcement dates. The sequence of these and QE events are not examined, hence one could not determine the direction of causality. A window of 2 days helps to reduce this contamination risk but cannot completely eliminate it. Besides, the results using 1-day or 2-day event window are largely consistent. Second, the event study methodology does not account for co-movements of different financial markets and therefore cannot properly account for contagion that may run across emerging Asian markets.

Third, to the extent that some of the impact of QE programmes occurs outside the identified announcement dates, and QE policy could have non-negligible lags, our study may underestimate the impact of QE programmes on Asia. Inevitably, we surely missed some less dramatic announcements, and markets may have learned to better anticipate announcements and move accordingly in advance.

Despite these caveats, the results of the event study clearly suggests that the overall thrust of the results is consistent with the view that the Federal Reserve's QE programmes had an

---

[12] For example, see Ugai (2007).

important cross-border spillover on emerging Asia. Moreover, the US QE programmes have had differential impacts across economies in Asia. Graphs IV.6 and IV.7 report the cross-economy cumulative 2-day changes in Asian financial markets. The results reveal a rather diverse set of impacts between QE1 and QE2. However, there are some patterns that emerge by focusing on the most and least affected thirds of Asian economies.

Graph IV.6

Cumulative two-day changes around announcement days of QE1

2-year sovereign bond yield; in basis point

10-year sovereign bond yield; in basis point

Corporate bond yield[1]; in basis point

Sovereign CDS spread[2]; in basis point

Equity price; in per cent

USD per local currency[3]; in per cent

[1] Merrill Lynch AAA-bond yields for GB, JP, US and XM; JPMorgan Corporate Emerging Markets Bond Index (Broad) yield for others. [2] Senior five-year CDS spreads. [3] A positive change indicates appreciation against the US dollar.

Sources: Bloomberg; CEIC; Datastream; JPMorgan; Markit; national data.

16

Graph IV.7

Cumulative two-day changes around announcement days of QE2

2-year sovereign bond yield; in basis point

10-year sovereign bond yield; in basis point

Corporate bond yield[1]; in basis point

Sovereign CDS spread[2]; in basis point

Equity price; in per cent

USD per local currency[3]; in per cent

[1] Merrill Lynch AAA-bond yields for GB, JP, US and XM; JPMorgan Corporate Emerging Markets Bond Index (Broad) yield for others.   [2] Senior five-year CDS spreads.   [3] A positive change indicates appreciation against the US dollar.

Sources: Bloomberg; CEIC; Datastream; JPMorgan; Markit; national data.

The relatively large estimated per-dollar impact of the ECB's programme and the somewhat counter-intuitive estimated impacts of the Bank of England's programme on Asian financial markets raise questions about the extent to which reliable inferences can be drawn from these event studies. Robustness tests are needed to be examined in future research.

It is clear that those economies most effected – both on the high side and the low side – differ across the two US QE programmes. In other words, QE1 and QE2 did not affect the region in a uniform way. Some economies that responded strongly in QE1 were not the same ones that responded strongly in QE2. This suggests that the spillovers are context dependent.

For US QE1, Hong Kong SAR, Korea and Indonesia stand out as those economies most positively affected in terms of the yields and equity returns. The latter two also saw big moves in CDS spreads and USD exchange rates. This is consistent with the fact that these economies were more heavily hit by the initial phase of the global financial crisis. For Hong Kong SAR and Korea, the impact reflects the strong trade ties and the importance of cross-border financing with the United States. For Indonesia, its credit rating and general vulnerabilities to the global economy via its commodity exports appear to account for the sensitivity. The Philippines and Thailand, on the other hand, were much less affected than the rest of emerging Asia, at least in terms of financial market reactions to announcements during the QE1 period.

For the US QE2 announcements, the results are rather mixed. Sovereign CDS spreads declined in almost all emerging economies under analysis, while the Philippines saw its yields drop much more relative to the others. Thailand, China and Hong Kong SAR and Argentina experienced a significant rally in their equity markets. One factor that might account for this was the pace of foreign reserve accumulation. In some of these economies, foreign reserve accumulation was rapid. Markets may have seen further QE as an indication that policy rates would stay low and foreign reserve accumulation continue. In contrast, those economies that found themselves in the bottom of the ordering were diverse and defy any obvious systematic interpretation.

Tentative conclusions from financial market responses to QE programmes

Overall, the event study provides evidence of an expansionary impact of unconventional policy easing in the advanced economies on the emerging economies. This is consistent with several channels through which QE works. The most direct channel is through the pricing of global financial assets. As the US term premium fell, interest rates fell globally.

QE also works through a confidence channel, as emerging financial markets deem the large-scale asset purchases credible and manage to deduce possible impact from such purchases. The QE1 and QE2 announcement effects themselves were seen as firm commitments to future actions. One reason the QE1 results were stronger than the QE2 results is that the Federal Reserve made it quite clear how far it was willing to go to backstop the private sector in the United States. Without doubt, this had the effect of reducing the generalised aversion to risk globally, as seen in the large CDS spread movements at the time of QE1 announcements versus those seen during the QE2 period.

In sum, in this section we document the immediate impact of QE announcements by central banks in advanced economies on emerging financial markets. The results suggest US QE has spilled over geographical borders through various channels, especially through the role of the US term structure in setting a benchmark for pricing global assets, through a confidence channel reflecting perceptions of the strength of the global economy and international investor risk aversion, through an interest rate channel via US dollar credit created outside the United States, and especially through an endogenous monetary policy response channel in emerging Asia that captures policies aimed at narrowing international policy rate differentials. To further understand these channels and to consider the more enduring effects of QE policies, we now turn to a GVECM econometric method.

IV.2. Impulse Response Analysis

We estimate a global vector error-correction model (GVECM) to assess the longer term effect of US central bank balance sheet policy on the emerging economies.[13] We examine the effects of a reduction in the US term spreads on real and financial variables in both the advanced and emerging economies, paying special attention on the relative strength of different channels of domestic and international transmission.

Changes in the US term spread between 10-year and three-month Treasury yields could be a good indicator of US Federal Reserve balance sheet policies, when the zero lower bound on nominal interest rates becomes binding, and when the major objective of Fed asset purchase programmes has been to reduce long-term bond yields.[14] Even in normal times, term spreads could be a useful indicator of interest rate policy, as central banks often act to shape public expectations of a specific policy path well into the future. We also use US corporate spreads as an indicator for US quantitative easing, and the results are not very different.

Domestic effect of a US term spread shock

We present in Graph IV.8 the impulse responses to a negative US term spread shock of about 20 basis points (one standard deviation of the shock) over 36 months, estimated based on the pre-crisis sample (February 1995 to December 2006), the full sample (February 1995 to December 2010), and the crisis sample (January 2007 to December 2010). The crisis-sample impulse responses are derived from impulse responses estimated from the pre-crisis and the full samples, assuming that the full-sample estimates are a weighted average of the pre-crisis-sample and crisis-sample estimates.

Interestingly, impulse responses estimated from the pre-crisis sample are insignificant for almost all variables, except for bank credit, suggesting that bank lending could be the main channel of monetary policy transmission in the 1995-2006 period. There are considerable differences in the impulse responses estimated from the full and pre-crisis samples, in terms of the sizes rather than the direction of responses. Full-sample estimates turn out to be clearly larger for all variables, and statistically significant for output, equity prices and bank credit. Assuming linearity, the estimates suggest that within one year, a 100-basis-point cut in US term spread leads to large increases in output (1.25%), equity prices (15%) and bank credit (2%).

The full-sample responses show the historical average impact of lowering the US term spread. Comparing results from pre-crisis and full samples suggest that US economy seem to have reacted much more strongly to changes in US term spreads in the aftermath of the crisis. Small sample size prevents us from directly estimating post-crisis impulse responses with a global VAR model. To capture the effects of quantitative easing embedded in the post-crisis sample, we need to deduce the "crisis-sample" impulse responses from estimates based on the pre-crisis and full samples. More precisely, we assume that the estimated full-sample impulse responses are a weighted average of pre- and post-crisis sample estimates, and back out the crisis-sample impulse responses accordingly. We could then infer the impact of term spread cuts induced by US quantitative easing by examining differences between the two sets of estimated impulse responses for samples before January 2007 and thereafter.[15] The results are shown in the third column of Graph IV.8.

---

[13] See Appendix II for details of the model. We follow Pesaran, Schuermann and Weiner (2004).

[14] See Blinder (2010) for an analysis of central bank quantitative easing, and in particular, the attempts by central banks to lower both term premia and risk spreads with the unconventional policies.

[15] The weights are determined by the lengths of the two sub-samples relative to the full sample.

Graph IV.8

**Impulse response functions of US**

**Pre-crisis Sample**   **Full Sample**   **Crisis Sample**

GDP; in per cent

Inflation; in percentage points

Stock price; in per cent

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

Graph IV.8 (con't)

Impulse response functions of US

Pre-crisis Sample   **Full Sample**   **Crisis Sample**

Foreign Exchange pressure; in percentage points

Bank credit; in per cent

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

Indeed the more significant full-sample responses appear to have been a result of much greater crisis-sample impulse responses to variations in the US term spreads, precisely during the period when US quantitative easing was implemented. A 20-basis-point cut in the US term spread would increase output by over 1.1% in 12 months, and inflation by 0.6 percentage point in 20 months. Bank credit also rises by about 0.6% higher in 30 months, following an initial decline lasting for about 5 months. Stock prices rise strongly by about 12% 12 months after the term spread shock. In addition, US dollar depreciates immediately by over 0.6% and loses value by around 2.4% twos year after the term spread reduction. Indeed a permanent cut in the US term spread could have a sizeable impact on the domestic economy, and all major transmission channels seem to have come into play. In fact, a large cut in the US term spread could have a much greater impact.

International impact of a US term spread shock

We investigate the impact of US quantitative easing on the other major advanced economies, emerging Asia and Latin America in this section, focusing on the impulse responses computed for the crisis sample. Graph IV.9 shows the maximum impact of the crisis-sample impulse responses to a US term spread shock over a five-year horizon.

Three observations are warranted. First, the impact on the other major advanced economies is relatively muted, US term spread shocks do lead to a significant increase in equity prices in the euro area, Japan and the United Kingdom. The equity prices in these three countries rise in tandem with the US asset prices in the first year, but they seem less persistent and gradually fall

21

back to the original levels afterwards. This means the confidence channel could have played the major role in the spillover among the advanced economies. Impulse responses (Graph IV.9.1) show that the trade channel is also non-negligible, although weaker. In addition, real GDP in the advanced economies rises in a pattern similar to in the United States, but by less. The weak impact on real GDP and inflation in these economies could reflect their own domestic economic and financial market difficulties, and also the endogenous monetary policy responses to the US term spread shock. Euro area and UK tend to tighten slightly their policy rates in response to the increases in equity prices and real GDP, moderating the impact of US monetary easing. In contrast, with a high degree of trade dependence, Japan lowers its term spread, and this leads to a sharp depreciation of the Yen and an output level slightly higher than the European economies in the medium run.

Second, the impact on the emerging economies is significant and appeared to have been wide-spread. The US term spread shock affects all variables: real GDP, inflation, stock prices, bank credit, foreign exchange pressure and money growth. This indicates several different transmission channels could have been at play.

Third, the impact of US quantitative easing may have differed significantly across economies and across variables, implying that different transmission and adjustment mechanisms might dominate in different economies. Moreover, the impacts on US economy and on some emerging economies actually have opposite signs, suggesting that benefits and costs have not been distributed evenly. For instance, while the impact on real GDP is below 2.5% in most emerging economies, but the US term spread shock increases output by 15% in Brazil and contracts it by over 5% in the Philippines. While the impact on inflation is positive for all emerging Asian economies except for China, it is negative for the Latin American economies except for Chile.

In addition, compared to its domestic impact, US quantitative easing turns out to have far greater impact on most emerging economies. This is true for almost all variables except for stock prices, where the US domestic impact is also sizeable. Bank credit and inflation are two good examples. In the emerging Asia, inflation increases range from 0.5 in Singapore to almost 4 percentage points in Indonesia, while US inflation rises at most by 0.6 percentage point.

How have the effects of US quantitative easing differed within emerging Asia and Latin America, and how have the policy responses in these economies affected the corresponding output and inflation dynamics? To address these questions, we first examine in greater detail the crisis-sample impulse responses in the emerging Asia to a drop in the U.S. term spread by about 20 basis points (Graph IV.10).

Graph IV.9

Maximum of impulse response functions

Crisis sample

Monetary policy indicator / money growth[1]

GDP[2]

Inflation[1]

Stock price[2]

Foreign Exchange pressure[1]

Bank credit[2]

[1] In percentage points.   [2] In per cent.

AR = Argentina; BR = Brazil; CL = Chile; CN = China; GB = United Kingdom; HK = Hong Kong SAR; ID = Indonesia; IN = India; JP = Japan; KR = Korea; MX = Mexico; MY = Malaysia; PH = Philippines; SG = Singapore; TH = Thailand; US = United States; XM = Euro area.

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

23

Graph IV.9.1

**Impulse response functions (median estimates) of advance economies**

Money growth; in percentage points

- Euro area
- Japan
- United Kingdom

GDP[1]; in per cent / percentage points

Inflation; in percentage points

Stock price; in per cent

Forex pressure; in percentage points

Bank credit; in per cent

[1] Growth rate (in percentage points) for United Kingdom and level (in per cent) for others.

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

Graph IV.10

**Impulse response functions (median estimates) of emerging Asia**

Money growth; in percentage points

Indonesia
India
Hong Kong SAR
Thailand

China
Korea
Malaysia
Philippines
Singapore

GDP[1]; in per cent / percentage points

Inflation; in percentage points

Stock price; in per cent

Forex pressure; in percentage points

Bank credit; in per cent

[1] Growth rate (in percentage points) for Philippines and level (in per cent) for others.

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

On the other hand, the impact on real GDP is muted in most emerging Asian economies. But Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia, the smaller and more trade-dependent economies, clearly benefit from a US monetary easing, with output rising by more than 2% within two years. Curiously, in most economies, inflation drops in the first year before rising slowly in the second year. The greatest inflationary impact is felt in Hong Kong, Indonesia and the Philippines.

Third, the impulse responses of foreign exchange pressure, money growth and bank credit in the emerging Asian economies do not seem to have uniform patterns. This probably reflects differences in the transmission channels and in the adjustment mechanisms each economy chooses to rely on. Unsurprisingly, with a currency board, Hong Kong's money growth increases at the fastest pace and to the largest extent in emerging Asia. Indeed, without an independent monetary policy, Hong Kong has no choice but to follow US monetary easing and increase money supply. In addition, bank credit in Hong Kong keeps growing steadily at a strong pace over the 36-month horizon. Notably, foreign exchange pressure in Hong Kong actually rises in about six months, even though the HK dollar should depreciate relative to currencies of most trading partners as it is pegged to the US dollar. One might attribute this to the increased foreign reserve associated with strong capital inflows. In fact, the currency board regime implies that Hong Kong would not be able to adjust to the US term spread shock with its exchange rate, and the adjustment might have to go through capital flows and growth in money and credit.

In India and Korea, foreign exchange pressures also rise in the first year and half. Yet estimated impulse responses suggest that money growth in these countries does not increase, indicating a possible tightening of monetary policy. Responses in real GDP and inflation stay muted. Countries in which bank credit and money growth remain stable tend to see inflation rising two to three years following the US term spread shock. In Indonesia, bank credit and money growth rise, and they peak in the third year following a decline in the second year. Real GDP remain roughly unchanged. In Malaysia, the foreign exchange pressure declines, indicating a possible currency depreciation, while bank credit increases six months after the shock. Real GDP increases by about 2% in two years and inflation climbs up by around 0.8 percentage point.

In the emerging Asia, Hong Kong, Indonesia and the Philippines appear to be among the economies which react most strongly to the US quantitative easing, while China and Korea are among the least affected. This may be attributed to differences in the size and nature of these economies.

The impact of US quantitative easing in the Latin America is less diverse but also much stronger than in the emerging Asia (Graph IV.11). Stock prices in all four economies rise strongly by almost 15% in Argentina and Mexico and by over 11% in Brazil by the end of first year. Currency appreciation pressures are strong and rising in Argentina, Brazil, and to a less extent,

26

Graph IV.11

Impulse response functions (median estimates) of Latin America

Money growth; in percentage points

GDP[1]; in per cent / percentage points

Legend:
- Agentina (red)
- Brazil (green)
- Chile (blue)
- Mexico (gold)

Inflation; in percentage points

Stock price; in per cent

Forex pressure; in percentage points

Bank credit; in per cent

[1] Growth rate (in percentage points) for Brazil and level (in per cent) for others.

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

Chile, supporting the claims of significant USD devaluation impact of US quantitative easing on economies with more flexible currency regimes. On the other hand, both bank credit and money growth decline in these three countries, which may imply a policy tightening. The impact on real GDP is most significant in Brazil, and but the US quantitative easing seems to be deflationary for the Latin American economies bar Chile.

27

Robustness Check

The results of impulse response analyses are robust to different specifications of variables, including using base money growth instead of broad money growth, and using US federal funds rate for the term spread instead of the 3-month Treasury bill rate. They are also robust to different ordering of the variables in our identification schemes of the unconventional monetary policy shocks. Specifically, the results change little when assuming that term spread reacts to stock price in addition to real GDP and inflation contemporaneously.

IV.3. GVECM Model-based effects of quantitative easing

Given the very short period of time that has passed since the introduction of the large-scale asset purchasing programmes, the empirical results should be seen as work in progress and the conclusions are tentative. Uncertainties remain large surrounding both the strength and pace of transmission of US quantitative easing to financial and real activities. In fact, the pre-crisis norm of domestic and cross-border monetary policy transmissions could have been severely impaired following the global financial crisis. The ongoing experiments with balance sheet policies, a set of tools neither the practicing central banks nor the private sector are familiar with, could imply that it take time for economic agents to learn how such policies transmitted and adjust their behaviour accordingly. All this adds difficulties to our work.

In this section, we try to gain a better understanding of the impact of quantitative easing by constructing different counterfactual scenarios about the US term spread, using the full-sample estimates of the impulse responses we obtained in the previous section. We then compare the actual data with the counterfactual scenarios in order to gauge possible effects of the US quantitative easing supposedly reflected in the actual data. Nevertheless, we need to bear in mind that the actual data would also reflect many other factors affecting the global economy following the global financial crisis, which may include supply-side shocks such as euro area sovereign debt crisis and fluctuations in commodity prices.

Actually data indicate that, corresponding to US Federal Reserve asset purchases, US term spread between 10-year and 3-month Treasury yields dropped sharply in December 2008 by 83 basis points, from 3.18% to 2.35%, remaining low in the subsequent months. In July 2009, the spread fell further by 19 basis points from 3.53% to 3.34%.

We construct counterfactual scenarios in which the US Federal Reserve asset purchases were assumed to be zero, i.e., they were not implemented at all. We do so by assuming that the US term spread did not decline between December 2008 and June 2009, and then from July 2009 to April 2010. We design three scenarios: first, the term spread remained constant within each period, at the average values of November 2008 (3.18%) and June 2009, respectively; second, within the above-mentioned two periods, US term spread is assumed to rise by 10 basis points in each and every month, e.g., the term spread rises to 3.28% in December 2008 and 3.38% in January 2009; third, the term spread has a jump of 200 basis points at the beginning of each period (e.g. 5.18% in December 2008) and then stays 200 basis points above the actual path of US term spread. The three alternative policy paths are termed "constant", "increasing" and "jump" scenarios respectively. The first panel of Graph IV.12 shows both the actual and the three policy paths.

Domestic Impact

Counterfactual analysis suggests that US quantitative easing could indeed have had a significant domestic impact. Assuming the two phases of asset purchases (from December 2008 to June 2009; from July 2009 to April 2010) managed to keep US term spreads at levels lower than otherwise, such actions indeed facilitated the US recovery. Notice that in both

periods, US term spread actually drifted back midway through the asset purchases to levels higher than those when the asset purchases began (see the black and blue lines in Graph IV.12). This means that such asset purchases did not quite manage to cut US term spreads below levels when quantitative easing began. There are two possibilities: first, there were economic factors, such as adverse supply shocks which counteracted the effects of asset purchases and pushed US term spreads higher than they would have been; second, the effect of US asset purchases on term spreads was short-lived and such effects diminished and died out even before each phase of the programme was completed.

Graph IV.12

Counterfactual Analysis--United States

In per cent

Term Spread; in percentage points

GDP; in Logarithm

Inflation; in percentage Points

Foreign Exchange Pressure

Bank Credit; in Logarithm

Stock Price

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

Graph IV.12 compares dynamics of US domestic variables in three counterfactual scenarios, with their actual path. First, the most significant impact was probably on US stock prices, with actual values rising more rapidly and staying constantly above those in other scenarios. By June 2009, equity prices would have been 3.5% lower should the US term spread remain at the 2008 November level; and 4.6% lower should the spread continued to rise. Proportionally, the effect in the second phase was smaller, as US term spread fell less than in the first phase.

Second, lowering the term spread might have lent significant support to US bank credit in both periods. Judging from this against the stated goal of boosting bank credit flows, the LSAP programmes could be seen as a success. Third, compared to the scenario of a "jump" in the US term spread, Fed asset purchases might indeed have led to a significant depreciation in the US dollar, as suggested by Yellen (2010). Finally, while lowering the term spread did not seem to

have had much an impact on US inflation, it did provide a strong boost to US real GDP, shaking off an otherwise rather severe decline in output in the first half of 2009, and promoting a more solid growth since July 2009.

The results so far suggest that the domestic impact of US quantitative easing was sizeable, and it could be larger if it were not for certain major events which could have driven US long-term yields higher. Among the candidate factors driving up US sovereign yields were the euro area sovereign debt crisis and concerns with US fiscal situation which eventually led to a downgrading of US credit rating by the Moody's. Nevertheless, US quantitative easing appeared to have worked pretty well through the confidence, liquidity, and bank lending channels, and currency depreciation could have also helped.

International Impact

Counterfactual analysis in this section shows that US quantitative easing, through a reduction in the long-term bond yields or term spreads, indeed has had a significant impact on the emerging economies. Moreover, as we discussed in the previous section on the estimated impulse responses, the impact tends to be diverse both across economies and across variables, reflecting equally diverse policy responses, exchange rate regimes and economic structures.

Graph IV.13

Counterfactual Analysis-Monetary policy indicator[1]

In per cent

[1] Monetary policy rate for US and money growth for others.

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

Compared to the more stressful scenarios of a 200-basis-point jump in the US term spread or a 10-basis-point monthly increase, broad money growth turned out to be stronger in Brazil and Hong Kong, two economies with complete different exchange rate arrangements (Graph IV.13). Hong Kong currency board forces the economy to maintain rather low interest rates, but money

supply had to rise to accommodate low interest rates. On the other hand, with flexible exchange rates, Brazil probably experienced significant capital inflows. But money growth in China and India remained basically the same as the actual path in all three counterfactual scenarios. In China, much of the capital inflow pressures could have been absorbed through foreign reserve accumulation which could be completely sterilised.

Graph IV.14

Counterfactual Analysis-Real GDP

Natural logarithm of the level

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

Interestingly, the paths of real GDP in China and India were also little affected by changes in US term spreads (Graph IV.14). In fact, following the global recession, domestic demand became a main driver of growth in the two countries, and there was probably some degree of "decoupling" in their recovery from that of the advanced economies. However, in the smaller emerging Asian economies like Hong Kong and Thailand, output would be lower without a reduction in the US term spread. Curiously, in both phases of US asset purchases, real GDP would be higher in Brazil should the US term spread increase, suggesting a completely different mechanism at work. One possibility is that without US quantitative easing, the Brazilian Real would not appreciate so much and external demand would support a stronger output growth in Brazil.

While US quantitative easing had little impact on US domestic inflation, its cross-border impact is diverse (Graph IV.15). The inflation impact in the first phase of asset purchases turned out to be smaller than in the second phase in Hong Kong, India and Thailand. More interestingly, while lowering US term spread led to inflationary pressure in Thailand, it caused deflationary pressures in the other economies. Indeed such deflationary pressures were sizeable in Brazil and China. It is possible is that a significant reduction in the US term spread could reflect a bleak US economic outlook and be interpreted as indicating a prominent US recession, causing

31

a downward adjustment in global growth prospects and in inflation. In Brazil, if a cut in the US term spread leads to a sizeable appreciation in Real, this could imply lower inflation.

Graph IV.15

**Counterfactual Analysis-Inflation**

In per cent

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

The impact of US quantitative easing conforms to expectation. The impact was not big on the emerging Asian economies (Graph IV.16), so capital inflows probably were not sufficient to cause major currency appreciation pressures. On the other hand, a cut in the US term spread did have a large appreciation on the Brazilian Real in both periods of US asset purchases, confirming worries by the Brazilian policymakers with the currency impact of US quantitative easing.

Our analysis suggests that the cross-border spillover effect of US easing on bank credit was very small, except probably Hong Kong and Thailand (Graph IV.17). Bank credit would have been lower in Hong Kong without a cut in the US term spread in both phases of US asset purchases, but would have been slightly higher in Thailand. Evidence of any significant impact on bank credit is rather weak in Brazil, China and India.

Graph IV.16

Counterfactual Analysis-Foreign Exchange pressure

In per cent

United States

```
increasing
jump
constant
actual
```

China

Hong Kong SAR

India

Thailand

Brazil

Graph IV.17

Bank credit

Natural logarithm of the level

United States

```
increasing
jump
constant
actual
```

China

Hong Kong SAR

India

Thailand

Brazil

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

33

Last but not the least, liquidity and confidence channels could be a significant factor in play. Stock markets across the emerging economies were affected by the US term spread cut (Graph IV.18). Most emerging economies would have experienced slower recovery of equity prices or even recorded a significant decline without a lower US term spread. The impact was most obvious in Hong Kong, India and Thailand. For example, at the end of the first phase of US asset purchases, stock prices in Hong Kong would have been 3.6% lower without such actions, an impact larger than seen in the US stock market. For the same period, equity prices in India would have been 2.9% lower.

Graph IV.18

Counterfactual Analysis-Stock prices

Natural logarithm of the level

Source: Authors' estimation based on Global Error Correction Model.

V. Conclusion

In this paper, we examine the domestic and cross-border consequences of the recent central bank balance sheet policies, with a special emphasis on several advanced economies and the emerging economies in Asia and Latin America. We first use event study techniques to study the impact of such policies on the global financial markets. Then we rely on an estimated global VAR model to analyze the effects of Federal Reserve balance sheet policies on the real activity in other economies, and to better understand both the domestic and international transmission of central bank quantitative easing policy.

Event studies reveal sizeable expansionary impact of US quantitative easing on the emerging economies, and the global asset price channel seems to play a significant role. The effects tend

to be larger on the emerging economies than that on the US domestic markets. Furthermore, such effects differed across economies, and the impact of US QE1 and QE2 also differed in the emerging economies. The US quantitative easing lowered emerging Asian bond yields, boosted equity and commodity prices and exerted upward pressures on bilateral exchange rates against USD. During QE1, 2-year yields fell on average across emerging Asia by about 45 basis points, and 10-year yields declined by almost 80 basis points, implying a downward twist at longer maturities; during QE2, 2- and 10-year yields edged down another 9 basis points. Corporate bond yields fell significantly, indicating a reduction in the risk premia in emerging Asia.

Analyses based on an estimated global VAR model suggest that the US quantitative easing has had a sizeable impact on emerging economies in the short and medium term. The computed impulse responses reveal significant differences across economies in how each endogenous variable evolves following a reduction in the US term spread; and also major differences in the behaviour of various endogenous variables within each economy. First, the impact on the other advanced economies is relatively muted, except for a significant increase in equity prices in the euro area, Japan and the United Kingdom. Second, the impact on the emerging economies is significant and appears to be wide-spread. In addition, the impacts on US economy and on some emerging economies actually have opposite signs, suggesting that benefits and costs have not been distributed evenly. Third, compared to its domestic impact, the US quantitative easing turns out to have far greater impact on most emerging economies. In the emerging Asia, inflation increases range from 0.5 in Singapore to almost 4 percentage points in Indonesia, while US inflation rises at most by 0.6 percentage point.

Counterfactual analysis suggests that in terms of domestic transmission of the US quantitative easing, the most significant impact was probably on US stock prices. Asset purchases were also transmitted through the bank lending and currency depreciation channels. The effect in QE2 was smaller than in QE1, as the US term spread also declined less in QE2. From an international perspective, Brazil and Hong Kong were among the economies most affected by the US quantitative easing, although not in the same way. Brazil suffered most from strong currency appreciation and CPI deflationary pressures, while the impact on Hong Kong was most strongly felt on equity prices, bank credit, and real GDP. Interestingly, Brazil has a flexible exchange rate while Hong Kong implements a currency board. Both economies responded to the US quantitative easing with a significant increase in money growth. The results validate the view that US quantitative easing indeed could have a large impact on some emerging economies. But such impact is far from uniform, and can be small in other economies.

Differences in responses may reflect significant differences across economies, in terms of stage of development, institutions, monetary, fiscal and financial policy frameworks, strength of trade and financial linkages, and exchange rate regimes, among many other factors. The emerging economies could use different adjustment mechanisms and react to US unconventional monetary policy measures in different ways. Looking forward, the results suggest that another round of quantitative easing would represent a challenge for some emerging economies.

References:

Baumeister, Christiane and Luca Benati (2010) "Unconventional monetary policy and the great recession – Estimating the impact of a compression in the yield spread at the zero lower bound", Working Paper No 1258, European Central Bank.

Benford, J., Berry, S., Nikolov, K. and Young, C. (2009) "Quantitative Easing", Quarterly Bulletin, Bank of England, Q2, pp.90-99

Bernanke, Ben S. (2009), "The Crisis and the Policy Response," Stamp Lecture, London School of Economics, 13 January.

Bernanke, Ben S., Vincent R. Reinhart and Brian P. Sack (2004) "Monetary Policy Alternatives at the Zero Bound: An Empirical Assessment," Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Economic Studies Program, The Brookings Institution, vol. 35(2004-2), pages 1-100.

Bernanke, Ben, and Vincent Reinhart. (2004) "Conducting Monetary Policy at Very Low Short-Term Interest Rates", American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings, Vol. 94, No. 2, May, pp. 85-90.

Binder, Michael, Qianying Chen, and Xuan Zhang (2009) "On the Effects of Monetary Policy Shocks on Exchange Rates", CES-ifo Working Paper.

Blinder, Alan (2010) "Quantitative easing: entrance and exit strategies," *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*, Vol. 92(6), pages 465-479.

Blinder, Alan and Zandi, Mark. (2010) "How the Great Recession was brought to an end", Working Paper.

Borio, Claudio and Piti Disyatat. (2009) "Unconventional monetary policies: an appraisal", Working Paper No. 292, Bank for International Settlements.

Borio, Claudio and Haibin Zhu (2008) "Capital regulation, risk-taking and monetary policy: a missing link in the transmission mechanism?" Working Paper No 268, Bank for International Settlements.

Borio, C, R McCauley and P McGuire (2011) "Global credit and domestic credit booms", BIS Quarterly Review, September.

Campbell, Sean, Daniel Covitz, William Nelson and Karen Pence (2011) "Securitization markets and central banking: an evaluation of the term asset-backed securities loan facility," Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2011-16, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Canova, Fabio (2005). "The transmission of U.S. shocks to Latin data", Journal of Applied Econometrics Vol. 20, 229–251.

Case, Karl E., John M. Quigley and Robert J. Shiller (2005). "Comparing Wealth Effects: The Stock Market versus the Housing Market," The B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics, Berkeley Electronic Press, vol. 0(1).

Cecchetti, Stephen G, 1988. "The Case of the Negative Nominal Interest Rates: New Estimates of the Term Structure of Interest Rates during the Great Depression," Journal of Political Economy, University of Chicago Press, vol. 96(6), pages 1111-41, December.

Chung, Hess, Jean-Philippe Laforte, David Reifschneider, and John C. Williams. (2011). "Have We Underestimated the Likelihood and Severity of Zero Lower Bound Events?" FRBSF Working Paper 2011-01, January.

Cúrdia, Vasco and Woodford, Michael, (2011). "The central-bank balance sheet as an instrument of monetary policy," Journal of Monetary Economics, Elsevier, vol. 58(1), pages 54-79, January.

D'Amico, Stefania, and Thomas King. (2010). "Flow and Stock Effects of Large-Scale Treasury Purchases." Federal Reserve Board Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2010–52.

De Nicolò, Gianni, Giovanni Dell'Ariccia, Luc Laeven and Fabian Valencia (2010) "Monetary Policy and Bank Risk Taking", IMF Staff Position Note SPN/10/09, International Monetary Fund.

Dees, Stephane, Filippo di Mauro, Vanessa Smith and M. Hashem Pesaran (2007) "Exploring the international linkages of the euro area: a global VAR analysis," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, Vol. 22(1), pages 1-38.

Dell'Ariccia, Giovanni, Luc Laeven and Robert Marquez, (2010) "Monetary Policy, Leverage, and Bank Risk-Taking", Working Paper, International Monetary Fund

Doh, Taeyoung. (2010). "The Efficacy of Large-Scale Asset Purchases at the Zero Lower Bound." FRB Kansas City Economic Review, Q2, pp. 5-34.

Filardo, A (2011): "The impact of the International Financial Crisis on Asia and the Pacific: highlighting monetary policy challenges from an asset price bubble perspective", unpublished BIS working paper, August.

Fuhrer, Jeffrey C. and Brian F. Madigan (1997). "Monetary Policy When Interest Rates Are Bounded at Zero," The Review of Economics and Statistics, MIT Press, vol. 79(4), pages 573-585, November.

Gagnon, Joseph, Matthew Raskin, Julie Remache, and Brian Sack (2010). "Large-Scale Asset Purchases by the Federal Reserve: Did They Work?" FRB New York Staff Reports 441 (March).

Gagnon, Joseph, Matthew Raskin, Julie Remasche, and Brian Sack. (2011). "The Financial Market Effects of the Federal Reserve's Large-Scale Asset Purchases." International Journal of Central Banking 7(1), pp. 3-43.

García-Cicco, Javier (2011) "On the Quantitative Effects of Unconventional Monetary Policies", International Journal of Central Banking 7(1), pp. 53-115.

Giannone, Domenico, Michele Lenza, Huw R. Pill and Lucrezia Reichlin (2011) "Non-standard monetary policy measures and monetary developments", Working Paper No 1290, European Central Bank.

Glick, Reuven and Sylvain Leduc (2011) "Are Large-Scale Asset Purchases Fueling the Rise in Commodity Prices?" Economic Letters 2011-10, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Hancock, Diana and Wayne Passmore (2011) "Did the Federal Reserve's MBS purchase program lower mortgage rates?" Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2011-01, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

He, Dong and Robert McCauley (2010): "Offshore markets for the domestic currency: monetary and financial stability issues," BIS Working Papers no 320, September.

Hiroshi, Ugai (2010) "Effects of the Quantitative Easing Policy: A survey of Empirical Analyses", Working Paper Series No.06-E-10, Bank of Japan.

José Manuel González-Páramo (2011) "The ECB's non-standard monetary policy measures during the current financial crisis", European Central Bank.

Gurkaynak, Refet, Brian Sack, and Eric Swanson. (2005). "Do Actions Speak Louder Than Words? The Response of Asset Prices to Monetary Policy Actions and Statements." International Journal of Central Banking 1, pp. 55–93.

Hamilton, James, and Jing (Cynthia) Wu. (2011). "The Effectiveness of Alternative Monetary Policy Tools in a Zero Lower Bound Environment." Unpublished manuscript, University of California, San Diego.

Joyce, Michael, Ana Lasaosa, Ibrahim Stevens and Matthew Tong. (2010). "The Financial Market Impact of Quantitative Easing." Working Paper 393, Bank of England.

Krishnamurthy, Arvind and Annette Vissing-Jorgensen (2011), "The Effects of Quantitative Easing on Interest Rates", Unpublished manuscript, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University.

Lenza, Michele, Huw R. Pill and Lucrezia Reichlin (2010) "Monetary Policy in Exceptional Times", Economic Policy, Vol. 25, Issue 62, pp. 295-339, April.

Lettau, Martin, and Sydney C. Ludvigson (2004). "Understanding Trend and Cycle in Asset Values: Reevaluating the Wealth Effect on Consumption." American Economic Review, 94(1): 276–299.

Meier, André. (2009). "Panacea, Curse, or Nonevent? Unconventional Monetary Policy in the United Kingdom." IMF Working Paper 09/163 (August).

Modigliani, Franco and Richard Sutch (1966) "Innovations in Interest Rate Policy," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 56, No. 1/2, pp. 178-197.

Modigliani, Franco and Richard Sutch (1967) "Debt Management and the Term Structure of Interest Rates: An Empirical Analysis of Recent Experience," *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 75, pp 569.

Neely, Christopher J. (2010). "The large scale asset purchases had large international effects," Working Papers 2010-018, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

Pesaran, M. Hashem, T. Schuermann and S. M. Weiner (2004) "Modeling Regional Interdependencies Using a Global Error-Correcting Macroeconometric Model," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, Vol. 22, pages 129-162.

Sack, Brian (2009), "The Fed's Expanded Balance Sheet", Remarks at the Money Marketeers of NYU, 2 December.

Shiratsuka, Shigenori (2010). "Size and Composition of the Central Bank Balance Sheet: Revisiting Japan's Experience of the Quantitative Easing Policy," Monetary and Economic Studies, Institute for Monetary and Economic Studies, Bank of Japan, vol. 28, pages 79-106, November.

Stroebel, Johannes C. and John B. Taylor (2009), "Estimated Impact of the Fed's Mortgage-Backed Securities Purchase program", NBER Working Paper 15626

Swanson, Eric. (2011). "Let's Twist Again: A High-Frequency Event-Study Analysis of Operation Twist and Its Implications for QE2." Forthcoming in Brookings Papers on Economic Activity.

Taylor, John B. (2010). "Macroeconomic Lessons from the Great Deviation," NBER Chapters, in: NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2010, Volume 25 National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Taylor, John B. and John Williams (2009) "A Black Swan in the Money Market", American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, Vol 1. No. 1 pp 58-83.

Ugai, Hiroshi (2007) "Effects of the Quantitative Easing Policy: A Survey of Empirical Analyses," *Monetary and Economic Studies*, Institute for Monetary and Economic Studies, Bank of Japan, vol. 25(1), pages 1-48, March.

Wong, Alfred and Chi-Sang Tam (2009). "Policy Responses to Recent Capital Flows to Asia Pacific," *Policy Note,* Hong Kong Monetary Authority.

Wu, Tao (2010) "The Term Auction Facility's Effectiveness in the Financial Crisis of 2007-09", Economic Letter, May, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas.

Wu, Tao (2011) "The U.S. Money Market and the Term Auction Facility in the Financial Crisis of 2007-2009," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 93(2), pages 617-631.

Appendices: Methodology and Data

Appendix I: Event studies of announcement effects: an international perspective

Contained in the main text.

Appendix II: Structure of the GVECM Model

The Global Vector Error Correction model (GVECM) developed by Pesaran, Schuermann and Weiner (2004) provides a multilateral dynamic framework for the analysis of interdependence and international transmission of country-specific shocks among a large number of economies. The post-crisis sample would be too small to yield meaningful estimates of the impact the central bank asset purchase programmes on the merging economies. But assuming the model itself and parameter estimates remained little changed after the global financial crisis and recession, such impact could still be studied using estimates from the pre-crisis sample or the complete sample. Indeed our results confirm that international transmission of US monetary policy might have stayed little affected following the crisis despite a potentially significant change to the domestic transmission of its policy.

The structure of the Global VAR (GVECM) model can be summarized as the follows. Consider N+1 economies, indexed by i = 0, 1, 2, ..., N, and a vector $\mathbf{x}_{it}$ of k_i domestic variables for each economy. Stacking the vectors of country-specific variables,

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \left(\mathbf{x}_{0t}', \quad \mathbf{x}_{1t}', \quad ..., \quad \mathbf{x}_{Nt}' \right), \tag{1}$$

a VAR in $\mathbf{x}_t$ would contain too many parameters to be estimated if the time dimension T of the data is not much larger than the number of economy N. Instead of regressing $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ on

$$\mathbf{x}_{-i,t} = \left(\mathbf{x}_{0t}', \quad \mathbf{x}_{1t}', \quad ,..., \quad \mathbf{x}_{i-1,t}', \quad \mathbf{x}_{i+1,t}', \quad ,..., \quad \mathbf{x}_{N,t}' \right), \tag{2}$$

without any restriction, GVECM links $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ to a $k_i^* \times 1$ vector $\mathbf{x}^*_{i,t}$, where

$$x^*_{\ell it} = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \omega_{\ell ij} x_{\ell jt}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, ..., k_i^*. \tag{3}$$

The weight ω_{lij} captures the spillover effect of variable l of foreign economy j on variable l of domestic economy i. Since ω_{lij} measures the relative importance of economy j to economy i, the spillover effect of variable l is in proportion to the weight chosen to measure the relative importance. Therefore, each economy's component of GVECM is given as a VARX* $\left(p_i, q_i\right)$:

$$\mathbf{x}_{it} = \mathbf{a}_{io} + \mathbf{a}_{i1} \cdot t + \sum_{s=1}^{p_i} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{is} \mathbf{x}_{i,t-s} + \sum_{s=0}^{q_i} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{is} \mathbf{x}_{i,t-s}^{*} + \sum_{s=0}^{r_i} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{is} \mathbf{d}_{t-s} + \mathbf{u}_{it} \tag{4}$$

with $u_{it} \overset{iid}{\sim} \left(0, \sum_i\right)$,

where $\mathbf{d}_{t-s}$ is the observed common factor of $q \times 1$ dimension and ε_{it} is *iid* across time. Country-specific vector $\mathbf{x}_{i,t-s}^{*}$ reflects interdependence among economies and serves as a proxy for the unobserved common effects across economies. The country-specific foreign variables and common factors are treated as weakly exogenous (if confirmed by statistical tests), i.e., they are "long-run forcing" country-specific domestic variables. The term "long-run forcing" means that in the equations for foreign variables, the coefficients on the error-correction terms are set to zero. The dynamics of foreign variables are not influenced by deviations from the long-run equilibrium path, in contrast to the dynamics of domestic variables.

The VARX* can be estimated economy by economy using the ordinary least squares (OLS) method or rank-reduced approach if the cross-dependence of the idiosyncratic shock is sufficiently small, that is:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N} Cov\left(\varepsilon_{lit}, \varepsilon_{sjt}\right) / N \to 0, \tag{5}$$

all $i \neq j$, l and s.

From equation (3), it can be seen that

$$\mathbf{z}_{it} = \mathbf{W}_i \mathbf{x}_t \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \tag{6}$$

Where $\mathbf{z}_{it} = \left(\mathbf{x}_{it}^{'} \quad \mathbf{x}_{it}^{*'}\right)$ and $\mathbf{W}_i$ is an appropriately defined weighting scheme. Thus, stacking (4) across i, the endogenous variables can be solved for in a global system:

$$\mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{a}_{i0} + \mathbf{a}_{i1} \cdot t + \sum_{s=1}^{p} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_s \mathbf{x}_{t-s} + \sum_{s=0}^{r} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_s \mathbf{d}_{t-s} + \mathbf{u}_t \tag{7}$$

thus

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{G}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{i0} + \mathbf{G}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{i1} \cdot t + \mathbf{G}^{-1}\sum_{s=1}^{p} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_s \mathbf{x}_{t-s} + \mathbf{G}^{-1}\sum_{s=0}^{r} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_s \mathbf{d}_{t-s} + \mathbf{G}^{-1}\mathbf{u}_t \tag{8}$$

Where $p = \max\{p_i, q_i\}$, $r = \max\{r_i\}$, and

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 W_0 \\ A_1 W_1 \\ \vdots \\ A_N W_N \end{pmatrix}, \quad H_s = \begin{pmatrix} B_{s,0} W_0 \\ B_{s,1} W_1 \\ \vdots \\ B_{s,N} W_N \end{pmatrix}, \quad u_t = \begin{pmatrix} u_{0,t} \\ u_{1,t} \\ \vdots \\ u_{N,t} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{9}$$

Equation (8) is a VAR for the complete set of domestic variables for all economies.

The advantage of the GVECM model is that it makes the estimation of (8) feasible by accounting for interdependence among economies and then estimating the partial system on an economy-by-economy basis, which implies allowing for modelling a large number of economies. The impulse response is computed based on (8).

Appendix III: GVECM Model Specification

We rely on a GVECM model to examine the domestic and cross-border impact of central bank balance sheet policies, using data on 17 economies. These include four advanced economies: the United States, euro Area, Japan and the United Kingdom; and nine emerging economies in Asia: China, Hong Kong SAR, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand; and four economies in Latin America: Argentina, Chile, Brazil and Mexico. Model estimation is based on monthly macroeconomic and financial data for the period ranging from February 1995 to December 2010.

In models for each individual economy, the set of endogenous variables include: in logarithm, real GDP, bank credit and equity prices; in level, an indicator of monetary policy and a foreign exchange pressure index; and inflation as year-on-year change in CPI. [16] The set of exogenous variables include foreign financial variables, and foreign real GDP and foreign inflation. For any economy, the foreign variables are constructed as the weighted averages of the corresponding variables in all other economies. The oil price, in logarithm, is included for each economy but with different specifications to account for different country dynamics.

The VARX are specified differently for the economies under analysis. First, in the US model, oil prices are assumed to be endogenous and depend on the dynamics of US domestic variables. But we exclude foreign financial variables as these are assumed weakly exogenous for the US economy: given the important impact of the US economy on global financial markets, non-US financial variables are less likely to be weakly exogenous to US domestic variables.

Second, for all non-US economies, oil prices are taken as weakly exogenous, a common factor underlying the global economy which is assumed to be little affected by domestic conditions in the non-US economies.

Third, we use money growth as the monetary policy indicator for the emerging markets. This is due to the fact that, in the already short sample period we examine, some emerging economies

---

[16] Real GDP growth rates are used for Brazil, the Philippines and the United Kingdom in order to satisfy the stability assumption of the GVECM model.

have combined the use of several policy instruments and operation targets, and the relative importance of each instrument has as well changed over time. For the advanced economies, the term spreads between 10-year and 3-month government bond yields are used as monetary policy indicators for the US and Japanese economies, which are particularly useful to capture measures based on changes in a central bank's balance sheet.[17] Policy interest rates are used as the monetary policy indicator for the euro area and the United Kingdom.

Fourth, we use an exchange rate pressure index, a weighted average of changes in nominal effective exchange rates (NEER) and in foreign reserves to measure possible tensions arising from capital flows. The index, a variation of the index proposed by Eichengreen, Ross and Wyplosz (1995), takes into account different exchange rate regimes and as well policy interventions by respective governments.

One key issue is how to faithfully measure the strength of cross-border transmission channels. In the past, cross-country linkages have been largely based on bilateral trade data, and financial linkages tend to be ignored for want of accurate data. A more recent strand of literature has taken into account financial linkages but ignored important temporal evolution of such linkages. One novelty of this paper is the use of BIS cross-broader bank lending statistics data to gauge the time-varying strength of the financial channels of international spillovers. This is essential given the high degree of global financial integration and a large increase in all types of capital flows in the last two decades. Yet limitations on data, especially those on broader bilateral financial activities beyond bank lending, prevent us from measuring the financial linkages with greater precision. Details of weight construction and data sources are provided in Appendix III.A.

We use data on both bilateral trade and cross-broader bank lending as weights to construct the foreign variables for each economy, which would reflect bilateral financial and real linkages. The weights are time-varying so as to take into account potentially large and volatile movements in such linkages, especially in banking flows among the advanced and emerging economies. In addition, trade weights, computed based on bilateral export and import, should reflect sizeable changes in the global trade pattern to reflect the rising shares and changing structure in the trade of several major emerging economies. See Appendix III.B for detailed information about data sources and transformations.

---

[17] See Blinder (2010) for an exposition on the issue.

Appendix III.A:

Construction of foreign exchange pressure index

The exchange pressure index EMP_t measures the pressure of capital inflow. In economies with flexible exchange rate regime, strong net capital inflow pushes up the demand for domestic currency, which in turn leads to an appreciation of the domestic currency. If the authorities intervene the foreign exchange market by purchasing foreign currency with domestic currency, we may not observe significant changes in exchange rate of the domestic currency, but an increase in foreign reserves of the authorities' balance sheet. In economies with fixed exchange rate regime, strong net capital inflow is reflected in the increase of foreign reserves only. Therefore, the foreign exchange pressure index is constructed in the following way, which is a variation of the index proposed by Eichengreen, Ross and Wyplosz (1995):

$$EMP_t = 100 \cdot (w_{t,e} e_t + w_{t,rev} rev_t)$$

where

$$w_{t,X} = \frac{\sigma_{t,X}^{-1}}{\sigma_{t,e}^{-1} + \sigma_{t,rev}^{-1}}$$ for $X = e, rev$, with σ_t being the standard deviation of the corresponding variable in the previous five years, for weights of the sixth year onward. For weights of the first five years, the standard deviation computed from data covering the first five years is used.

Moreover, $e_t = \ln(E_t) - \ln(E_{t-12})$ and $rev_t = \ln(R_t) - \ln(R_{t-12})$, where E_t is the NEER and R_t denotes the foreign reserves.

Construction of time varying weight for foreign variables

The weight of country I assigned to country j at year t is written as

$$W_{ij,t}^{agg} = w_{i,t}^T W_{ij,t}^T - w_{i,t}^F W_{ij,t}^F$$, for all $i \neq j$,

where $W_{ij,t}^T$ and $W_{ij,t}^F$ are the bilateral trade and financial weight computed based on the capital inflow and outflow in the previous year. $w_{i,t}^T$ and $w_{i,t}^F$ are the relative importance of trade flow and capital flow in a country respectively. They are computed by the value of the respective aggregate trade flow (export and import) and capital flow (capital inflow and outflow) relative to the total value of these two types of flow in the previous year. The financial weight of countries without capital flow data in the 1990s are set to zero.

Appendix III.B: Data

Data sources include the IMF's International Financial Statistics, CEIC, Bank for International Settlement (BIS), Bloomberg and Datastream.

Variable	Description	Source	Notes
Real GDP		IMF IFS, national data.	Read GDP of China is at 1990 price those of other countries are at 2005 price; billions of domestic currency. The monthly time series are interpolated using method by Chow and Lin (1971) with industrial production series as reference. Series for HK is interpolated using compound growth rate due to unavailability of monthly industrial production;
Inflation	Year-on-year change in consumer price index.	CEIC, IMF IFS, national data.	
Bank Credit			In billions of domestic currency; data before Sep 1997 is computed using growth rate of banks' loan to non-government and non-banks; for China, data before Jun 1999 is interpolated from quarterly data using monthly data of loans in China with method by Chow and Lin (1971).
Policy Rate	Short-term Policy Interest Rate	Bloomberg, Datastream, BIS, national data.	Bank of England base rate for UK and main refinancing operation, middle rate for euro area from 1999 onwards. Policy rate of Germany is used for euro area before 1999.

Term Spread	Interest Rate spreads between 10-year and 3-month Treasury bill yield	CEIC, IMF, IFS, national data.	Only data for United States and Japan are used.
Money growth	Year-on-year M2 growth rate.	CEIC, IMF IFS.	Billions of domestic currency.
Stock Price	Stock price index	Bloomberg.	Index of stock prices in each country is in "List of Stock Price Index".
	Nominal Effective Exchange Rate	BIS.	Period average; 2005 = 100;
Foreign Exchange Pressure	Foreign Reserve	IMF IFS.	Total reserves minus gold in billions of USD; euro Area data starting from Jan 1999 is official reserves published by ECB; data before 1999 is either estimated or the aggregate of reserves of 11 EU Member States participated the euro area in 1999.
Oil price	spot oil price	IMF IFS.	Brent Crude oil, US dollar per barrel; period end data.
Export/import		IMF IFS	Million in US dollar.
Cross-broader bank lending	BIS reporting banks' cross-broader claims	BIS	
Capital inflow/outflow		IMF IFS	

List of Stock Price Index

United Kingdom	FTSE 100 Index
Japan	Nikkei 225 Index
United States	S&P 500 Index
euro area	euro Stoxx 50 (Price) Index
China	Shanghai A-share Stock Pirce Index
Hong Kong SAR	Hang Seng Index
India	Bombay Stock Exchange Sensitive Index
Korea	KOSPI Index
Indonesia	Jakarta Stock Price Index
Malaysia	FTSE Bursa Malaysia KLCI Index
The Philippines	Philippine Stock Exchange PSEi Index
Singapore	FTSE Straits Times Index
Thailand	Bangkok SET Index
Argentina	Buenos Aires Stock Exchange Merval Index
Brazil	Sao Paulo Stock Exchange Boverspa Index
Chile	Santiago Stock Exchange IGPA Index
Mexico	Mexican IPC Index

Annex table: Empirical results on the impact of unconventional monetary policies

Paper	Methodology	Main results	Other interesting findings
Bernanke, Reinhart and Sack (2004)	Event study	• 400 bps (±370 bps) in Japan • 40 bps (±60 bps) in US	•
Blinder and Zandi (2010)	Moody's analytics' model, impact on real activity	• GDP ↑ 6 pps by 2011Q2 • Unemployment rate ↓ 3 pps (or 5 mil jobs) • Inflation ↑ 1.7 pps	• Using Moody's model to assess economic impact of monetary & fiscal stimulus • The combined effect is larger than sum of the two • Monetary stimulus has a bigger impact than fiscal boost
Campbell, Covitz, Nelson and Pence (2011)		•	•
Chung, Laforte, Reifschneider, and Williams. (2011)	DSGE model simulations, impact on real activity	• Unemployment rate ↓ 1.5 pps • Inflation ↑	•
D'Amico and King (2010)	Event study and regression analysis of financial market impact	• 100 bps (±80 bps)	•
Doh (2010)	Regression analysis	•	•
Gagnon, Raskin, Remasche and Sack (2010, 2011)	Event study and regression analysis of financial market impact	• Tsy yields 30-100bps • Agency/MBS rates ↓ 100-150bps • Corporate/swap rates 60-100bps	• key driver of the yield reduction comes from falling term/ liquidity premium rather than lower policy rate expectations • Announcement effect far outweighs operation effect (actual purchase)
Glick and Leduc (2011)		•	•
Goldman Sachs	Descriptive and regression analysis, on financial market and real impact	• $1 tri purchase will reduce Tsy yields ↓ 100 bps • GDP ↑ 7 pps • Mortgage rate 80 bps	• Announcement effect is more significant than the actual purchase
Greenwood-Vayanos (2008)	Regression analysis for pre-crisis US sample	• 14 bps (±7 bps)	•
Hamilton and Wu (2011)	Affine and no-arbitrage mode	• 17 bps	•
Hancock and Passmore (2011)	Regression analysis of MBS purchases	• About 30 bps	•
Joyce, Lasaosa,	Event study and VAR	• Gilt yields 55-120bps	• significant than signalling

Stevens and Tong (2010)	analysis on financial market impact	• Corporate bonds 70-150bps • Sterling 4% • Equity: unclear • Bond issuance & market liquidity improved	• BoE's QE had no impact on offshore bond yields • QE helped improve market conditions: corporate issuance and market liquidity improved post QE announcements
Krishnamurthy and Vissing-Jorgensen (2010, 2011)	Regression analysis	• 15 bps (±5 bps)	•
Modigliani and Sutch (1966, 1967)	Regression analysis on impact of operation Twist	• 0 bp (±20 bps)	•
Neely (2010)	Event study on cross-border financial market impact	• Tsy yields 100 bps • Corporate bonds 80 bps • 30 yr mortgage rate 40 bps • Foreign bond rates 20-80bps • US dollar 4-11 pps • Equity: unclear	• US QE had impact on foreign bond yields and the currency • Portfolio rebalancing effect more significant than signalling effect • The international effect argues for more policy coordination among central banks
Taylor and Williams (2009)	No-arbitrage pricing model, impact of TAF	No statistically significant effect on Libor-OIS spread	• Libor-OIS is sensitive to interest rate expectations and counterparty risk. • The no-arbitrage pricing model does not formally incorporate liquidity premium
Stroebel and Taylor (2009)		•	•
Swanson (2011)	Event study on financial market impact of Operation Twist	• 15 bps (±10 bps)	•
Ugai (2007)		•	•
Wu (2010, 2011)	Regression analysis on financial market impact of TAF	• Libor-OIS spread 50-55 bps	• The TAF was effective in reducing liquidity premium, but not counterparty risk premiums. • Libor-OIS spread is also sensitive to counterparty (or default) risk