

Robustly Optimal Monetary Policy in a Microfounded New Keynesian Model: discussion

Riccardo Colacito



THE UNIVERSITY
of NORTH CAROLINA
at CHAPEL HILL

ECB conference on "Information, Beliefs and Economic Policy", Frankfurt, 12/2011

Roadmap

- Relation to the literature

Roadmap

- Relation to the literature
- Main results hinge on local log-linear approximation

Roadmap

- Relation to the literature
- Main results hinge on local log-linear approximation
- What are we missing by shutting down higher order moments?

Roadmap

- Relation to the literature
- Main results hinge on local log-linear approximation
- What are we missing by shutting down higher order moments?
 - Asset Pricing implications of optimal monetary policy

Relation to the Literature

Clarida, Gali, Gertler (JEL, 1999)

- 1 The Central Bank minimizes

$$\frac{1}{2} E_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j [\pi_{t+j}^2 + \lambda(x_{t+j} - x^*)^2]$$

- 2 Private Sector's Aggregate supply equation is

$$\pi_t = \kappa x_t + \beta E_t \pi_{t+1} + \sigma_u w_t$$

Relation to the Literature

Woodford (AER, 2010)

- 1 The Central Bank minimizes

$$\frac{1}{2} E_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j [\pi_{t+j}^2 + \lambda(x_{t+j} - x^*)^2]$$

- 2 Private Sector's Aggregate supply equation is

$$\pi_t = \kappa x_t + \beta \hat{E}_t \pi_{t+1} + \sigma_u w_t$$

Relation to the Literature

Woodford (AER, 2010)

- 1 The Central Bank minimizes

$$\frac{1}{2} E_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j [\pi_{t+j}^2 + \lambda(x_{t+j} - x^*)^2]$$

- 2 Private Sector's Aggregate supply equation is

$$\pi_t = \kappa x_t + \beta E_t m_{t+1} \pi_{t+1} + \sigma_u w_t$$

- $m_{t+1} = \frac{\text{Distorted Probability}}{\text{Approximating Model Probability}}$

Relation to the Literature

Woodford (AER, 2010)

- 1 The Central Bank minimizes

$$\frac{1}{2} E_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j [\pi_{t+j}^2 + \lambda(x_{t+j} - x^*)^2] - \theta E_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j m_{t+j} \log m_{t+j}$$

- 2 Private Sector's Aggregate supply equation is

$$\pi_t = \kappa x_t + \beta E_t m_{t+1} \pi_{t+1} + \sigma_u w_t$$

- $m_{t+1} = \frac{\text{Distorted Probability}}{\text{Approximating Model Probability}}$

Relation to the Literature

This Paper

- 1 The Central Bank minimizes

$$\frac{1}{2} E_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j [\pi_{t+j}^2 + \lambda(x_{t+j} - x^*)^2] - \theta E_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j m_{t+j} \log m_{t+j}$$

- 2 Private Sector's Aggregate supply equation is

$$\pi_t = \kappa x_t + \beta E_t m_{t+1} \pi_{t+1} + \sigma_u w_t$$

- $m_{t+1} = \frac{\text{Distorted Probability}}{\text{Approximating Model Probability}}$
- Where is the aggregate supply equation coming from?
- What does it look like in a New-Keynesian model?

Answered and Open Questions

- Where is the aggregate supply equation coming from?

Answered and Open Questions

- Where is the aggregate supply equation coming from?
 - An otherwise standard New Keynesian model
 - E_t is replaced by \hat{E}_t in Private Sector's side of the Economy

Answered and Open Questions

- Where is the aggregate supply equation coming from?
 - An otherwise standard New Keynesian model
 - E_t is replaced by \hat{E}_t in Private Sector's side of the Economy
 - An authentic tour de force: I counted 168 equations!

Answered and Open Questions

- Where is the aggregate supply equation coming from?
 - An otherwise standard New Keynesian model
 - E_t is replaced by \widehat{E}_t in Private Sector's side of the Economy
 - An authentic tour de force: I counted 168 equations!
- What does it look like in a New-Keynesian model?

Answered and Open Questions

- Where is the aggregate supply equation coming from?
 - An otherwise standard New Keynesian model
 - E_t is replaced by \widehat{E}_t in Private Sector's side of the Economy
 - An authentic tour de force: I counted 168 equations!
- What does it look like in a New-Keynesian model?
 - As in Woodford (2010), up to a first order local log-linear approx

Answered and Open Questions

- Where is the aggregate supply equation coming from?
 - An otherwise standard New Keynesian model
 - E_t is replaced by \widehat{E}_t in Private Sector's side of the Economy
 - An authentic tour de force: I counted 168 equations!
- What does it look like in a New-Keynesian model?
 - As in Woodford (2010), up to a first order local log-linear approx
- Are we missing any interesting economics?

My question in a nutshell

Woodford (2010) revisited

- 1 The Central Bank minimizes

$$\frac{1}{2} E_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j [\pi_{t+j}^2 + \lambda(x_{t+j} - x^*)^2] - \theta E_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j m_{t+j} \log m_{t+j}$$

- 2 Private Sector's Aggregate supply equation is

$$\pi_t = \kappa x_t + \beta E_t m_{t+1} g(\pi_{t+1}) + \sigma_u w_t$$

where $g(\pi_{t+1})$ is a possibly non-linear function of π_{t+1} .

My question in a nutshell

Woodford (2010) revisited

- 1 The Central Bank minimizes

$$\frac{1}{2} E_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j [\pi_{t+j}^2 + \lambda(x_{t+j} - x^*)^2] - \theta E_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j m_{t+j} \log m_{t+j}$$

- 2 Private Sector's Aggregate supply equation is

$$\pi_t = \kappa x_t + \beta E_t m_{t+1} (\pi_{t+1} + \alpha \pi_{t+1}^2) + \sigma_u w_t$$

What if $g(\pi_{t+1})$ is a quadratic function of π_{t+1} ?

The key: figure out Distorted Probabilities

The key: figure out Distorted Probabilities

Notation:

- $f(w)$ is the **approx. model** pdf of AS shock
- $\hat{f}(w) = m \cdot f(w)$ is the **distorted** pdf of AS shock

The key: figure out Distorted Probabilities

Notation:

- $f(w)$ is the **approx. model** pdf of AS shock

$$f(w) = N(0, 1)$$

- $\hat{f}(w) = m \cdot f(w)$ is the **distorted** pdf of AS shock

$$\hat{f}(w) = ?$$

The key: figure out Distorted Probabilities

Notation:

- $f(w)$ is the **approx. model** pdf of AS shock

$$f(w) = N(0, 1)$$

- $\hat{f}(w) = m \cdot f(w)$ is the **distorted** pdf of AS shock

$$\hat{f}(w) = ?$$

Results:

The key: figure out Distorted Probabilities

Notation:

- $f(w)$ is the **approx. model** pdf of AS shock

$$f(w) = N(0, 1)$$

- $\hat{f}(w) = m \cdot f(w)$ is the **distorted** pdf of AS shock

$$\hat{f}(w) = ?$$

Results:

- 1 In baseline log-linear model: $\hat{f}(w) = N(\mu_t, 1)$

The key: figure out Distorted Probabilities

Notation:

- $f(w)$ is the **approx. model** pdf of AS shock

$$f(w) = N(0, 1)$$

- $\hat{f}(w) = m \cdot f(w)$ is the **distorted** pdf of AS shock

$$\hat{f}(w) = ?$$

Results:

- 1 In baseline log-linear model: $\hat{f}(w) = N(\mu_t, 1)$
 - Conditional Mean **is** time-varying

The key: figure out Distorted Probabilities

Notation:

- $f(w)$ is the **approx. model** pdf of AS shock

$$f(w) = N(0, 1)$$

- $\hat{f}(w) = m \cdot f(w)$ is the **distorted** pdf of AS shock

$$\hat{f}(w) = ?$$

Results:

- 1 In baseline log-linear model: $\hat{f}(w) = N(\mu_t, 1)$
 - Conditional Mean **is** time-varying
 - Conditional Variance **is not** time-varying

The key: figure out Distorted Probabilities

Notation:

- $f(w)$ is the **approx. model** pdf of AS shock

$$f(w) = N(0, 1)$$

- $\hat{f}(w) = m \cdot f(w)$ is the **distorted** pdf of AS shock

$$\hat{f}(w) = ?$$

Results:

- 1 In baseline log-linear model: $\hat{f}(w) = N(\mu_t, 1)$
 - Conditional Mean **is** time-varying
 - Conditional Variance **is not** time-varying
- 2 In quadratic model: $\hat{f}(w) = N(\mu_t + \mathbf{v}_t, \sigma_t)$

The key: figure out Distorted Probabilities

Notation:

- $f(w)$ is the **approx. model** pdf of AS shock

$$f(w) = N(0, 1)$$

- $\hat{f}(w) = m \cdot f(w)$ is the **distorted** pdf of AS shock

$$\hat{f}(w) = ?$$

Results:

- 1 In baseline log-linear model: $\hat{f}(w) = N(\mu_t, 1)$
 - Conditional Mean **is** time-varying
 - Conditional Variance **is not** time-varying
- 2 In quadratic model: $\hat{f}(w) = N(\mu_t + \mathbf{v}_t, \sigma_t)$
 - Conditional Mean **is** time-varying

The key: figure out Distorted Probabilities

Notation:

- $f(w)$ is the **approx. model** pdf of AS shock

$$f(w) = N(0, 1)$$

- $\hat{f}(w) = m \cdot f(w)$ is the **distorted** pdf of AS shock

$$\hat{f}(w) = ?$$

Results:

- 1 In baseline log-linear model: $\hat{f}(w) = N(\mu_t, 1)$
 - Conditional Mean **is** time-varying
 - Conditional Variance **is not** time-varying
- 2 In quadratic model: $\hat{f}(w) = N(\mu_t + \mathbf{v}_t, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_t)$
 - Conditional Mean **is** time-varying
 - Conditional Variance **is** time-varying

I'll spare you the details...

- Focus on linear policies: $\pi_{t+1} = \rho_{0,t} + \rho_{1,t} w_{t+1}$.
- Distortion is of the form: $\log m_{t+1} = c_t + \phi_{2,t} (\pi_{t+1} + \alpha \pi_{t+1}^2)$.
- Imposing the constraint $0 = \log E_t m_{t+1}$, implies that $c_t = -\phi_{2,t} (1 + \alpha \rho_{0,t}) \rho_{0,t} + \frac{1}{2} \log (1 - 2\phi_{2,t} \alpha \rho_{1,t}^2) - \frac{1}{2} \phi_{2,t}^2 (1 + 2\alpha \rho_{0,t})^2 \rho_{1,t}^2 (1 - 2\phi_{2,t} \alpha \rho_{1,t}^2)$.

- Distorted beliefs are:

$$\begin{aligned} \log \hat{f}(w) &= \log m(w) + \log f(w) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi + \frac{1}{2} \log (1 - 2\phi_{2,t} \alpha \rho_{1,t}^2) \\ &\quad - \frac{(1 - 2\phi_{2,t} \alpha \rho_{1,t}^2)}{2} \left\{ w^2 - 2 \frac{\phi_{2,t} \rho_{1,t} (1 + 2\alpha \rho_{0,t})}{(1 - 2\phi_{2,t} \alpha \rho_{1,t}^2)} + \phi_{2,t}^2 \rho_{1,t}^2 (1 + 2\alpha \rho_{0,t})^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

- Re-scaling: $\hat{f}(w) = N \left(\frac{\phi_{2,t} \rho_{1,t} (1 + 2\alpha \rho_{0,t})}{(1 - 2\phi_{2,t} \alpha \rho_{1,t}^2)}, \sqrt{1 - 2\phi_{2,t} \alpha \rho_{1,t}^2} \right)$, where

$$\mu_t + v_t = \frac{\phi_{2,t} \rho_{1,t} (1 + 2\alpha \rho_{0,t})}{(1 - 2\phi_{2,t} \alpha \rho_{1,t}^2)} \text{ and } \sigma_t = \sqrt{1 - 2\phi_{2,t} \alpha \rho_{1,t}^2}.$$

Conditional variance is distorted: who cares?

- Think about where these distorted probabilities show up.

Conditional variance is distorted: who cares?

- Think about where these distorted probabilities show up.
- Euler equations

$$E_t \left[\underbrace{m_{t+1} \frac{u'(c_{t+1})}{u'(c_t)}}_{SDF_{t+1}} R_{t+1} \right] = 1$$

Conditional variance is distorted: who cares?

- Think about where these distorted probabilities show up.
- Euler equations

$$E_t \left[\underbrace{m_{t+1} \frac{u'(c_{t+1})}{u'(c_t)}}_{SDF_{t+1}} R_{t+1} \right] = 1$$

- The Stochastic Discount Factor is of the form:

$$SDF_{t+1} = A + B \cdot \mu_t + C \cdot \sigma_t \cdot \varepsilon_{t+1}$$

Conditional variance is distorted: who cares?

- Think about where these distorted probabilities show up.
- Euler equations

$$E_t \left[\underbrace{m_{t+1} \frac{u'(c_{t+1})}{u'(c_t)}}_{SDF_{t+1}} R_{t+1} \right] = 1$$

- The Stochastic Discount Factor is of the form:

$$SDF_{t+1} = A + B \cdot \mu_t + C \cdot \sigma_t \cdot \varepsilon_{t+1}$$

- Optimal monetary policy introduces time-variation in the conditional variance of the stochastic discount factor.

Conditional variance is distorted: who cares?

- Think about where these distorted probabilities show up.
- Euler equations

$$E_t \left[\underbrace{m_{t+1} \frac{u'(c_{t+1})}{u'(c_t)}}_{SDF_{t+1}} R_{t+1} \right] = 1$$

- The Stochastic Discount Factor is of the form:

$$SDF_{t+1} = A + B \cdot \mu_t + C \cdot \sigma_t \cdot \varepsilon_{t+1}$$

- Optimal monetary policy introduces time-variation in the conditional variance of the stochastic discount factor.
- The CB contributes to creating time-varying equity risk premia!

Concluding Remarks

- Great paper, great effort!
- I think that there is more than you bargained for, if you take seriously non-linearities!
- The link between optimal monetary policy and time-varying expected returns is important and very actual!
- This channel is already built into the model: is it quantitatively important?