

## **Discussion of**

## "Frictions in the Interbank money market and the Demand for Reserves: Lessons from the Financial Cricis"

## Flemming Würtz European Central Bank

The views expressed herein may not reflect the views of the ECB, the Eurosystem or the ESCB

EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK

## The paper

- Paper models (corridor position of) O/N-rate as a function of
  - Daily excess liquidity
  - Transaction costs
  - Credit risk
  - Several dummies
- Paper finds that
  - Increased excess liquidity reduces O/N-rate;
  - Transaction costs brings O/N-rate closer to mid-point and reduces risk of exceeding corridor;
  - Credit risk increases O/N-rate;

Comment I: to model O/N rate before August 2007, it is particularly important to consider expectations of accumulated liquidity, not daily liquidity

• Gaspar et al (2004):

$$r_t = E_t(r_{t+1}) + \pi_t$$

Where  $\pi_t$  is compensation for risk of using standing facilities already on day t.

• In case  $\pi_t$  is zero on all but the last day, T, of the maintenance period:  $r_t = E_t(r_T) = P_t(deficit) \cdot r_{MLF} + P_t(surplus) \cdot r_{DF}$ Deficit if accumulated liquidity supply < reserve requirements Surplus if accumulated liquidity supply > reserve requirements

3

Comment I: to model O/N rate before August 2007, it is particularly important to consider expectations of accumulated liquidity, not daily liquidity

• What matters is **expected accumulated** liquidity conditions

- Several papers, e.g. Würtz (2003), show that, before the crisis:
  - Expectations about net use of standing facilities on last day of the maintenance period give rise to the main liquidity effect
  - daily liquidity insignificant => change measure for excess liquidity

- $\pi_t$  is no longer zero until last day of the maintenance period
- Funding liquidity risk => preference for "frontloading"
- => daily excess liquidity is significant

- At any point in time, the effect of daily liquidity depends on liquidity position on previous days, and expected future availability => change measure for excess liquidity to account for accumulated position
- Demand varies strongly in the course of a maintenance period
  => one could allow parameters to vary across an MP(?)
- Liquidity supply is highly endogenous to the O/N-rate:
  - August 2007 to October 2008: non-neutral OMO allotments
  - since October 2008: fixed rate full allotment
  - => use instruments or reduce sample to days with no OMOs

6

- Banks have different initial endowment of liquidity
  - some banks will have negative marginal utility out of trading =>
  - different equilibrium O/N-rate than assumed in paper =>
  - What happens to proposition I (on effect of transaction costs)?

Comment 3: introducing reasonable heterogeneity of banks would bring into question the theoretical conclusions

- Some banks do not have access to standing facilities =>
  - notably in times of frictions (e.g. high transaction costs) the corridor does not bind O/N rate (contrary to proposition I)

- Banks have different degrees of credit risks
  - assume credit risk increases excessively for some banks =>
  - they can no longer borrow in the market and borrows from the central bank instead =>
  - excess liquidity increases and there is less average credit risk underlying the (remaining) average market transactions =>
  - The O/N-rate does not increase but declines (contrary to proposition 2)

Comment 4: Do not measure transaction costs from the spread between I week overnight index swap (OIS) and realised EONIA

- Cashflow on an OIS is the realised average path of EONIA =>
  - Transaction costs equally priced into EONIA and OIS
  - Difference between OIS and realised EONIA reflects new information (uncertainty/volatility) or patterns which are averaged out in the one week OIS;
- Probably, the transaction cost measure applied by the paper (based on one week OIS) is very significant in explaining EONIA, because  $r_t = E_t(r_{t+1}) \approx OIS_t$
- Alternative: use bid/ask spread

9