



Steven J. Riddiough

Department of Finance

University of Melbourne

Discussion | Global Risks in the Currency Market by George Panayotov

ABFER 6th Annual Conference

Singapore

24 May, 2018



Background to Currency Risks

- An **important** recent literature in foreign exchange markets has taken great strides in deepening our understanding of currency excess returns
- Lustig, Roussanov and Verdelhan (*RFS*, 2011)

$$E[R_{i,t+1}] = \beta_{i,1}\lambda_{dol} + \beta_{i,2}\lambda_{slope}$$

→ currency excess returns can be understood in a standard linear return-beta relationship once **currency-specific** factors are developed

→ two currency-specific factors can account for the cross-section of currency excess returns:

1. a “**dollar**” factor: average return of all currencies against USD
2. a “**slope**” factor: return on the currency carry trade

But let's take a deeper look...



Currency-Specific Risk Factors

- Lustig, Roussanov and Verdelhan (*RFS*, 2011)

$$E[R_{i,t+1}] = \beta_{i,1}\lambda_{dol} + \beta_{i,2}\lambda_{slope}$$



Currency-Specific Risk Factors

- Lustig, Roussanov and Verdelhan (*RFS*, 2011)

$$E[R_{i,t+1}] = \beta_{i,1}\lambda_{dol} + \beta_{i,2}\lambda_{slope}$$

Interpretation: “global” risk premium. Non-diversifiable common risk to which countries have heterogenous exposure

→ $\beta_{i,2}$ will vary substantially



Currency-Specific Risk Factors

- Lustig, Roussanov and Verdelhan (*RFS*, 2011)

$$E[R_{i,t+1}] = \beta_{i,1}\lambda_{dol} + \beta_{i,2}\lambda_{slope}$$

Interpretation: “domestic” risk premium.
E.g., a “dollar” risk premium for the U.S. investor. Compensates for “home country risk”

- “yen” risk premium for Japanese investor, “sterling” risk premium for British investor etc...
- In the paper’s theory, $\beta_{i,1}$ equals 1 no matter which FX is purchased

Interpretation: “global” risk premium. Non-diversifiable common risk to which countries have heterogenous exposure

- $\beta_{i,2}$ will vary substantially



A Can of Worms?

- Verdelhan (*JF*, 2018)
- The “dollar” factor is a **global factor**
 - Not all currencies have a beta of 1 on the dollar factor
 - Sorting currencies by their **dollar** beta generates a large spread in average currency excess returns
 - **But what about the previous home factors?**
 - Are the yen factor, sterling factor, Kazakhstan tenge factor all global (systematic) factors as well? Is this the **new “factor zoo”**?



This Paper

- So where does this paper fit in this story?
- Re-examines the role of the “dollar” factor as a global factor
 - But takes a different approach to Verdelhan (*JF*, 2018)
 - Uses **numeraire invariant test portfolios**
 - Unconventional approach but **I like it!**
 - Quasi *domestic* experimental setting



This Paper

- So where does this paper fit in this story?
- Re-examines the role of the “dollar” factor as a global factor
 - But takes a different approach to Verdelhan (*JF*, 2018)
 - Uses **numeraire invariant test portfolios**
 - Unconventional approach but **I like it!**
 - Quasi *domestic* experimental setting

Example 1: Buy \$1 Facebook share

American investor gross return:

$$(1+r)$$

Japanese investor gross return:

$$(1+r)(1+e)$$



This Paper

- So where does this paper fit in this story?
- Re-examines the role of the “dollar” factor as a global factor
 - But takes a different approach to Verdelhan (*JF*, 2018)
 - Uses **numeraire invariant test portfolios**
 - Unconventional approach but **I like it!**
 - Quasi *domestic* experimental setting

Example 1: Buy \$1 Facebook share

American investor gross return:

$$(1+r)$$

Japanese investor gross return:

$$(1+r)(1+e)$$

Example 2: Buy \$1 Facebook share and short sell \$1 Apple share

American investor gross return:

$$(1+r_{FB}) - (1+r_{AAPL})$$

Japanese investor gross return:

$$(1+r_{FB})(1+e) - (1+r_{AAPL})(1+e)$$

$$\approx (1+r_{FB}) - (1+r_{AAPL})$$



This Paper

Main Findings

1. “Dollar” factor is important for explaining currency excess returns
2. But not all the time!
3. There is a regime structure in the pricing ability of the “dollar” factor.
 - The “dollar” factor determines currency excess returns only when the U.S. interest rate is relatively low (i.e, when $AFD > 0$)



The Rise and (unexpected) Fall of the Dollar Factor

Primary issue: confusion over the **central** message of the paper



The Rise and (unexpected) Fall of the Dollar Factor

Primary issue: confusion over the **central** message of the paper

Rise of the Dollar factor



The Rise and (unexpected) Fall of the Dollar Factor

Primary issue: confusion over the **central** message of the paper

Rise of the Dollar factor

Empirical. Q. How successful is the “dollar” factor?

A. Good (at times) → regime model

		full			$AFD < 0$ (high US int. rate)				$AFD > 0$ (low US int. rate)			
trades	corr.	β_{5-th}	β_{95-th}	sign.	corr.	β_{5-th}	β_{95-th}	sign.	corr.	β_{5-th}	β_{95-th}	sign.
45	0.75	0.07	0.24	(45)	0.05	-0.28	-0.11	(38)	0.73	0.15	0.33	(45)
10	0.80	0.10	0.22	(10)	0.12	-0.27	-0.13	(10)	0.75	0.17	0.33	(10)
120	0.66	0.03	0.25	(105)	-0.07	-0.30	-0.06	(90)	0.69	0.10	0.35	(120)



The Rise and (unexpected) Fall of the Dollar Factor

Primary issue: confusion over the **central** message of the paper

Rise of the Dollar factor

Empirical. Q. How successful is the “dollar” factor?

A. Good (at times) → regime model

		full			<i>AFD</i> < 0 (high US int. rate)				<i>AFD</i> > 0 (low US int. rate)			
trades	corr.	β_{5-th}	β_{95-th}	sign.	corr.	β_{5-th}	β_{95-th}	sign.	corr.	β_{5-th}	β_{95-th}	sign.
45	0.75	0.07	0.24	(45)	0.05	-0.28	-0.11	(38)	0.73	0.15	0.33	(45)
10	0.80	0.10	0.22	(10)	0.12	-0.27	-0.13	(10)	0.75	0.17	0.33	(10)
120	0.66	0.03	0.25	(105)	-0.07	-0.30	-0.06	(90)	0.69	0.10	0.35	(120)

Theoretical. Q. Can a modified version of Lustig et al. (2014) account for these results?

A. Yes! Simulations of the model match up well.



The Rise and (unexpected) Fall of the Dollar Factor

- Primary issue: some confusion over the **central** message of the paper

Fall of the Dollar factor



The Rise and (unexpected) Fall of the Dollar Factor

- Primary issue: some confusion over the **central** message of the paper

Fall of the Dollar factor

- Efforts are made to then distance the “dollar” factor from the model

*“...the dollar’s pricing ability is built **mechanically** into the modified LRV model, hence the dollar factor (DOL) may not represent a separate source of global risk”*

- A search begins for new factors among a large set of candidates

“global risks still present a challenge to the empirical research of the currency markets”



Suggestions

1. Can the analysis be **framed** in a different way? *i.e., don't throw the baby out with the bathwater.*
 - We know the “dollar” factor is not the real fundamental factor (it's a proximate factor). But why down play it's pricing ability?
 - Perhaps better to ask: what are the macro-fundamentals driving the time-variation in the importance of the dollar factor?



Suggestions

1. Can the analysis be **framed** in a different way? *i.e., don't throw the baby out with the bathwater.*
 - We know the “dollar” factor is not the real fundamental factor (it's a proximate factor). But why down play it's pricing ability?
 - Perhaps better to ask: what are the macro-fundamentals driving the time-variation in the importance of the dollar factor?
2. Can this help tame the “home-country/systematic” **factor zoo**?
 - We don't want 175 different “home country” global factors
 - Is Dollar the only “home country risk” really worth considering a “global” factor? Use the numeraire invariant portfolios to rule out others.
 - If so, can that tell us something new about the “yen” factor, “sterling” factor, “tenge” factor etc?



Conclusions

- I enjoyed reading the paper. Must read for anyone interested in better understanding currency returns
- Clever idea to use zero-cost portfolios – turns global asset pricing question into a domestic asset pricing question since everyone has the same returns.
 - Could more be done to **exploit** this technique?
- Interesting new findings on the “dollar” factor. Contributes to recent evidence (Verdelhan, *JF* 2018).
- But I found the final message surprising/confusing. Seems to build a new/alternative case for the dollar factor only to then discard it.
 - Could the message focus on **fundamentals** of the dollar factor?