

Policy Rules for Capital Controls



Gurnain Kaur Pasricha, Ph.D. Bank of Canada

Abstract

- Are capital controls macroprudential or mercantilist?
- The paper uses a policy reaction function approach to examine this question
- Two novel datasets:
 - A novel, weekly dataset on capital controls policy actions in 21 EMEs from 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2015
 - A new proxy for mercantilist motivations: the weighted appreciation of an emerging-market currency against its top five trade competitors

Results

- **1.** Capital controls are both macroprudential and mercantilist
 - Mercantilism stronger with higher exchange rate pass-through to export prices
 - Stronger governance arrangements for macroprudential policy lead to more responsiveness to macroprudential motivations

2. Choice of instruments is also systematic:

• Policymakers respond to mercantilist concerns by using both instruments:

Introduction

- A policy rule describes the systematic response of policy to competing objectives
- Two main objectives of capital controls policy:
 - **Macroprudential:** Mitigate systemic risk from excessive foreign borrowing
 - **Mercantilist:** Exchange rate management to maintain export competitiveness
- The different objectives of capital controls policy can involve trade-offs:



Dataset on capital control policy actions

- inflow tightenings and outflow easings
- Only inflow tightenings in response to macroprudential concerns \bullet
- 3. However, policy is not well-targeted to foreign debt:
 - No systematic response to foreign currency debt or external credit

For inflow controls, macroprudential and mercantilist variables both important

AUROC: Baseline model outperforms VIX-only model	Мо	Model predicts actual policy well	
Note: Table reports the proportional odds ratios.			
P-value (Chi-Squared)		0	0
Chi-Squared (All coefficients =0)		68	76.12
Pseudo-Log Likelihood		-1715	-1716
Number of Countries		11	11
Observations		7,448	7,448
Previous policy action (1, E)		1.33***	1.32***
Bank Credit-GDP gap (%)		1.30***	1.31**
Mercantilism Proxy (Real, 13-wk appr, %)			1.26**
Mercantilism Proxy (Nominal, 13-wk appr, %)		1.27***	
		Dependent Variable: Weighted Net Inflow Tightenings (non-FDI)	

- ~1300 policy actions for 21 EMEs,1 January 2001 31 December 2015.
- A policy action: Easing or tightening of capital controls.
- Extension of Pasricha et al (2018 JIE) dataset, available online at: http://www.nber.org/data-appendix/w20822/



New Mercantilism Proxy

- Measures nominal/real appreciation against trade competitors (not USD)
- Identify top 5 trade competitors for each EME: Merchandise Trade Correlation Index (UNCTAD)

Appreciation against competitors makes you uncompetitive but doesn't increase systemic risk







Methodology: Panel Ordered Logit

- Dependent variable: Number of net inflow tightening actions in the week
- Main explanatory variables:
 - Mercantilism proxy
 - Macroprudential concerns, proxied by Domestic Bank Credit-GDP gap
- Other key controls: VIX, Other domestic policies (fiscal, monetary)

Conclusions

- Capital Controls are both macroprudential and mercantilist
- First paper to provide direct evidence of the existence either motivation in the use of capital controls policy
- More transparency of objectives can improve effectiveness and accountability

Contact

Gurnain Kaur Pasricha Bank of Canada Email: gpasricha@bankofcanada.ca Website: https://www.bankofcanada.ca/profile/gurnain-pasricha/ Phone: +1 (613) 782 7159

References

Fernández, A, M Klein, A Rebucci, M Schindler and M Uribe (2015) "Capital control measures: a new dataset", IMF Working Papers, no. 80, April.

Pasricha, G, M Falagiarda, M Bijsterbosch and J Aizenman (2018) "Domestic and multilateral effects of capital controls in emerging markets", Journal of International Economics, Volume 115, pages 48-58, November 2018.