Comment on: An Estimated DSGE Model for the Euro Area and the US Economy

Bruce Preston
Columbia University
and
Federal Reserve Bank of New York

The views contained herein are not to be interpreted as reflecting the views of the FRB of NY or the FRB of Governors.

Motivation

- Appear to have reasonable closed economy models for US and EURO area
- Natural question: What about their interconnections?

Key Elements

- Monopolistic competition
- Nominal and real rigidities
- Range of shocks (22 ARMA and AR shocks!!)
- Rich production structure
- Incomplete asset markets
- Trade in goods

Central Results

- Can estimate
- Model fit good on many dimensions
  - Caveat: can not explain comovement
- Historical decompositions

Remarks

- Assessing fit
- Comovement
- Identification
- Policy evaluation

Matching Moments

- Model estimated with many series in differences
  - Permit series specific trends
- Fit assessed on individually HP filtered levels: May overstate fit
- As benchmark: take trends and resulting theorectical restrictions seriously

Comovement I

- Model cannot explain comovement in consumption, output, employment and investment

- Variance decompositions reveal no transmission of disturbances across blocks
  - Justiniano and Preston (2006)

- Part of the story: "Make hay where the sun shines"
  - Correlated shocks
  - Non-traded goods
  - Does not explain low consumption correlation

Comovement II

- Part of the story: failure of uncovered interest parity
  - Exchange rate disconnect
  - Limits transmission
- Reduced form evidence: Burnside, Eichenbaum, Kleshchelski and Rebelo (2006)
- Suggests common factor/shocks originating from international asset markets drive comovement
  - Two country model ideally suited to analyzing this question

Comovement III

- Does open economy dimension help?
  - Forecasting?
  - Policy evaluation? Difficult implications
- Compare fit/forecasting performance relative to autarky

Comovement: Final note

- Where does the correlation go?

- Comovement is a general problem for DSGE models
  - Even in closed economy
  - Giannone, Monti and Riechlin (2006)

Identification

- Multiple ways to paramterize persistence
  - "Endogenous" structural components; "Exogenous" disturbance components
- 22 ARMA and AR processes
  - ARMA processes help fit
  - Is this to be viewed as a success?
- Benchmark with only AR terms would be useful
  - Permits analyzing which cross-equation restrictions problematic
  - Primiceri, Tambalotti and Schaumberg (2005), Justiniano and Preston (2006)

Identification II: Example

- May be interaction between persistence of mark up shocks, indexation and frequency of price setting in import sector

- Additional data may help resolve some problems

- With local currency pricing real exchange rate and terms of trade related according to

$$q_t = (1 - \alpha)\, s_t + \Psi_t$$

Implications

- Should we care about identification?

- Yes: can have implications for policy evaluation if impulse reponse functions differ across models
  - Canova and Sala (2006) and Fukac, Pagan and Pavlov (2006)

Example I

- Consider small open economy model – Gali and Monacelli (2005)
- Use two priors: one agnostic about endogenous and exogenous sources of persistence
- Examine estimate of the mode from 10 random starting points for each prior
  - Two modes: same value of the posterior
  - Completely different parameter estimates

Identification and Policy

	Prior 1	Prior 2
Log Post Mode	-957.22	-957.89
Estimates:		
Intertemporal subst.	1.24	0.79
Calvo H	0.92	0.40
Calvo F	0.62	0.43
Degree of Openness	0.28	0.17
Elast. of subst btw H and F	0.44	0.58
Habit	0.22	0.14
Persistence Tech	0.46	0.96
Std Dev Tech	0.63	1.26
Policy:		
Loss		
Policy Coefficient		
Interest Rates		
Inflation		
Output		
Exchange Rate		
Output Growth		

Example II

- Modes switch between capturing persistence using endogenous versus exogenous model components

- Central question: does this matter for policy design?

- Find optimal policy within class of Taylor rules to minimize sum of variance of CPI, output and interest rates. That is

$$\min \bar{W}_0(\theta_p) = var(\pi_t) + var(y_t) + var(i_t)$$

subject to

$$i_t = \rho_i i_{t-1} + \psi_\pi \pi_t + \psi_y y_t + \psi_{\Delta y} \Delta y_t + \psi_e \Delta e_t$$

Identification and Policy

	Prior 1	Prior 2
Log Post Mode	-957.22	-957.89
Estimates:		
Intertemporal subst.	1.24	0.79
Calvo H	0.92	0.40
Calvo F	0.62	0.43
Degree of Openness	0.28	0.17
Elast. of subst btw H and F	0.44	0.58
Habit	0.22	0.14
Persistence Tech	0.46	0.96
Std Dev Tech	0.63	1.26
Policy:		
Loss	2.32	3.13
Policy Coefficient		
Interest Rates	1.00	1.00
Inflation	5.11	0.01
Output	0.00	0.13
Exchange Rate	0.00	0.18
Output Growth	1.01	1.60