

Incorporating Financial Stability into Monetary Policy Framework: The Bank of Thailand's Experience

Sophon Tunyavetchakit

(Joint with W. Wongwachara, B. Jindarak, and C. Klungjaturavet) Monetary Policy Department, Bank of Thailand

BSP 7th International Research Conference 24 September 2018

Disclaimer: The views expressed herein are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent those of the Bank of Thailand.





Motivation

- Financial Cycle and Its Implications
- FS-oriented Monetary Policy Decision
- Summary



Conventional MP Framework



- The conventional MP framework focused on maintaining price stability (PS)
- A lesson from the GFC is financial imbalances could build up even under low and stable inflation and closed output gaps



Emerging MP Framework



- Link (1): PS and FS are mutually beneficial and re-enforcing
- Link (2): FC and BC are related
- Link (3): Interaction between MP and MaP



Financial Cycle and Its Implications





Thailand's Financial Cycle



- FC is a summary measure of financial imbalances*
- The determinants of FC are primarily cycles of credit** and asset prices
- Peaks are used as a predictor of financial crisis

* FC (composite) is calculated by averaging 4 sub-indices: credit gap, credit-to-GDP gap, land price index gap, and house price index gap, by using CF-filter, see Drehmann et al. (2012) "Characterising the financial cycle: don't lose sight of the medium term!".

** Non-financial private credit (household + corporate) is used.



Interaction Between FC and BC



- Duration and amplitude of FC (red) are higher than those of BC (blue)*
- Economic recessions are more severe during the financial crises period



Magnitude of FC

Quantile regression coef. of 1Yr-ahead GDP growth on FC



- The magnitude of FC inversely impacts the magnitude of futue GDP growth*
- Example: Around the 5th percentile of (historical) GDP growth

FC increases by 1% \longrightarrow GDP growth (next year) decreases by 0.27%

* We use quantile regression for panel data (with country dummy variables) of 9 countries over the period of 1993-2017. Dependent variable is one-year ahead GDP growth while the independent variable is FC. Data comprises 2 groups: (i) emerging economies (ii) advanced economies, gathered from BIS, OECD and CEIC.



FC and Crisis Probability

Forward-looking crisis probability in Thailand (1-3 years ahead)



- Crisis probability can be derived by mean of cross-country panel logistic regression*
- This can be used as an early warning indicator for systemic crisis up to 1-3 years ahead
- A threshold of crisis probability enables policymakers to get an idea of an early warning state
- * See Anundsen et al. (2016) "Bubbles and crises: The role of house prices and credit". The same data set as in the quantile regression analysis is used and mapped to individual systemic crises (see crises database in Laeven and Valencia (2013), "Systemic banking crises database: An update").



Derivation of Early Warning Threshold



False Positive Rate

Two criteria* used to identify thresholds for an early warning state of financial crisis

i) Capturing 2/3 of the crises

ii) Minimizing the noise-to-signal ratio = $\frac{FPR}{TPR}$



FS-oriented Monetary Policy Decision



A Simple MP Trade-off



- In 'complementary' zone (green), policy that addresses PS would also benefit FS
- In 'opposite' direction (red), we need to trade-off between PS and FS



A Core Model with Financial Variables

A structural VAR model comprises GDP, CPI, RP1, LAND and CREDIT

 $X_t = A_0 X_t + A_1 X_{t-1} + A_2 X_{t-2} + e_t + DUBAI_1 t + REER_1 t$

where $X_t = (CPI_1_t, GDP_1_t, RP1_1_t, LAND_1_t, CREDIT_1_t)'$

The model is experimentally used to investigate the IRFs of policy rate shock on macro and financial variables.



Real Credit (%)

* See Disyatat and Vongsinsirikul (2003) "Monetary policy and the transmission mechanism in Thailand".



Analytical Framework



- Δ FC is calculated by impulse responses of CREDIT and LAND
- Δ FC impacts future GDP growth and probability of crisis



A Policy Simulation



- The simulation exercise enables policymakers to evaluate costs and benefits of LAW
- Short run [cost]: Cut down GDP growth by 0.10% 0.18% (via BOT's macro-model)
- Long run [benefit]: Improve future GDP growth by 0.01% (via quantile regression) and

Mitigate crisis prob. by 0.91 % (via panel logistic regression)



Summary



Steps to Incorporating FS into MP

STEP 1

Assessing FS risk

- Source of financial imbalances ?
- Development of financial imbalance going forward ?
- Potential consequence on the economy ?

STEP 2 Evaluating benefits and costs of MP reaction

- Effectiveness of MP
- Costs and benefits analysis:

[-] Decelerating
economic growth in the
short run
[+] Stability in financial
sector, leading to
sustainable growth

STEP 3 MP policy decision-makings

Balancing 3 objectives:
 (i) Price stability
 (ii) Economic growth
 (iii) Financial stability



Conclusions

- FS is an integral part of MP framework
- A systematic approach to incorporate FS into MP framework is considered:
 - Simple trade-off: Quadrant of BC vs. FC
 - Analytical trade-off: PS (short-run) vs. FS (long-run)
- FC is an overall measure for FS. It should be complemented with a set of disaggregate indicators to capture all pocket of vulnerabilities



Forthcoming Research

- Developing macro-model (e.g. DSGE with financial frictions) to enhance quantitative analysis
- Analyzing macro-financial linkage using micro and balance sheet data
- The interaction between MP and MaP to design an optimal policy mix



Thank You

