

Durham, J. Benson

Working Paper

Arbitrage-free affine models of the forward price of foreign currency

Staff Report, No. 665

Provided in Cooperation with:
Federal Reserve Bank of New York

Suggested Citation: Durham, J. Benson (2014) : Arbitrage-free affine models of the forward price of foreign currency, Staff Report, No. 665, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, New York, NY

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/120791>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York
Staff Reports

Arbitrage-free Affine Models of the Forward Price of Foreign Currency

J. Benson Durham

Staff Report No. 665
February 2014



This paper presents preliminary findings and is being distributed to economists and other interested readers solely to stimulate discussion and elicit comments. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and are not necessarily reflective of views at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York or the Federal Reserve System. Any errors or omissions are the responsibility of the author.

Arbitrage-free Affine Models of the Forward Price of Foreign Currency

J. Benson Durham

Federal Reserve Bank of New York Staff Reports, no. 665

February 2014

JEL classification: G10, G12, G15

Abstract

Forward foreign exchange contracts embed not only expected depreciation but also a sizable premium, which complicates inferences about anticipated returns. This study derives arbitrage-free affine forward currency models (AFCMs) with closed-form expressions for both unobservable variables. Model calibration to forward term structures of eleven U.S.-dollar currency pairs from the mid-to-late 1990s through early 2014 fits the data closely and suggests that the premium is indeed nonzero and variable, but not to the degree implied by previous econometric studies.

Key words: arbitrage-free model, foreign exchange

Durham: Federal Reserve Bank of New York (e-mail: jbenson.durham@ny.frb.org). Without implication, the author thanks Nina Boyarchenko, Emanuel Moench, Wesley Phoa, and seminar participants at the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York or the Federal Reserve System.

1. Introduction

In addition to projected variance and covariance among exchange rates, information about expected currency returns is essential for global financial asset allocation. Forward contracts embed investors' expectations for depreciation and therefore anticipated returns on currency positions. But the problem is that, as a gargantuan literature documents (e.g., Froot and Thaler, 1990; Froot, 1990; Engel, 1996), forward quotes also include a sizeable and perhaps anomalous premium. Using observed quotes and subsequent interest rates as well as forward exchange rates, several studies find that in violation of uncovered and sometimes covered interest rate parity (UIRP and CIRP), currencies with higher interest rates tend to appreciate rather than to depreciate, as carry trades are persistently profitable on average. That is, the standard approach is to consider regressions that broadly resemble

$$\ln\left(\frac{E_t}{E_0}\right) = \alpha + \beta(y_{d;0,t} - y_{f;0,t}) + \eta \quad (1)$$

where E is the local price of foreign exchange, $y_{d;0,t} - y_{f;0,t}$ represents the relevant yield differential over horizon 0 through t , and $\beta = 1$ as well as $\alpha = 0$ are the null hypotheses that the literature resoundingly rejects— β is nearly always less than one and is frequently negative. This so-called “forward discount anomaly” might reflect a fair ex ante premium for such trades or chronically incorrect market forecasts. Either way, any attempt to read expectations from forwards should make some allowances for possible premiums.

Rather than start from this ubiquitous econometric approach, what follows takes a different tact, draws from continuous time-finance in general as well as interest rate models in particular, and outlines arbitrage-free affine forward currency models (AFCMs) to estimate both unobservable quantities, notably ex ante. As discussed below, despite the assumption that IRP holds in the short run, the models produce an explicit expression for the (risk-neutral) forward discount premium, defined as the difference between the model-implied forward rate and the

expected depreciation rate. A key parallel with affine term structure models (ATSMs) is that model-based yields comprise expected short rates and (risk-neutral) term premiums, even in the absence of instantaneous arbitrage opportunities along the yield curve (e.g., Vasicek, 1977; Langetieg, 1980).¹

Besides isolation of the discount premium in closed-form solutions, calibration to forward term structures of 11 \$U.S. currency pairs from the mid- to late-1990s through early 2014 suggests that the premium is indeed not only non-zero but also both spatially and temporally variable. However, the degree of variance over time differs across pairs and in general is lower than some econometric studies suggest (e.g., Fama, 1984; Hodrick and Srivastava, 1986). In short, these results in no way reconcile the forward premium anomaly *per se*, but AFCM-implied depreciation rates might include useful information about expected returns to foreign currency positions.

To isolate the discount premium, the next section derives a single model with perhaps the narrowest possible assumptions regarding the stochastic dynamics of instantaneous depreciation. Next, the discussion describes an extension for calibration and application to latent factors, time-varying premiums, and an underlying multi-factor Gaussian random process. The remaining sections describe the parameter estimation of the Gaussian model and the general empirical results.

2. A Partial Differential Equation for Forward Currency Contracts

Denote Q as the depreciation (or appreciation) over a non-instantaneous period t , as in

$$E_t = E_0 \exp[Qt] \tag{2}$$

¹ Backus et al. (2001) examine whether ATSMs produce forward rates that are consistent with the two key findings in Fama (1984) that expected depreciation and the premium are negatively correlated and that the variance of the premium is greater than the variance of expected depreciation. They find that ATSMs are inconsistent with the forward premium anomaly unless either nominal interest rates are negative or the underlying state variables have asymmetric effects on state prices. In contrast, this study uses no information from term structures and models forward exchange rate quotes directly to extract the premium from expected depreciation, with no restrictions on the parameters to conform to Fama (1984).

For reference, the corresponding expression for the price of a zero-coupon bond is

$$P_t = P_0 \exp[yt] \quad (3)$$

where y is the continuously-compounded yield on the bond P that matures at t , and of course the left-hand-side is equal to par at expiry. Returning to foreign exchange, broadly analogous to the pure expectations hypothesis of interest rates, which suggests that longer-dated yields represent the average of expected short rates, r , consider Q as the mean of instantaneous depreciation rates, q , over t , as in

$$y \approx \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \varepsilon \{r_\tau\} d\tau \Leftrightarrow Q \approx \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \varepsilon \{q_\tau\} d\tau \quad (4)$$

where $\varepsilon \{\cdot\}$ is the expectations operator, and both expression ignore Jensen's inequality. The instantaneous currency depreciation rate, q , is not deterministic but follows some stochastic process, say, for simplicity

$$dq = \mu dt + \sigma dW \quad (5)$$

where μ is a drift term, σ is the volatility parameter, and dW is a Brownian motion increment.²

The objective is to derive a formula for a forward contract, F , a financial claim on the future exchange rate. To be sure, multiple factors influence F , as indeed simple IRP suggests forward contracts are a function of domestic and foreign interest rates as well as the spot exchange rate, all of which are random variables. However, just to start, suppose that F is a function of time and the stochastic depreciation rate, $F(q, t)$. Given Ito's lemma, (5), and some rearranging, the instantaneous return is

² Also, by analogy also, the risk-free interest rate process in the domestic and foreign currency would follow, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} dr_d &= \mu_d dt + \sigma_d dW_d \\ dr_f &= \mu_f dt + \sigma_f dW_f \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{dF}{F} = \frac{1}{F} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + \mu \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial q^2} \right) dt + \frac{\sigma}{F} \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} dW \quad (6)$$

Now assume that $\frac{dF}{F}$, again the initial instantaneous return on the forward contract, follows (covered) interest rate parity. That is, the expected return or depreciation is equal to the interest rate differential between the two countries. Under the absence of arbitrage, investors cannot take a short position in a futures contract, borrow one unit of a foreign currency at the domestic risk-free rate at the current rate of exchange, deposit that amount in a foreign-risk-free-rate-bearing account, and deliver the foreign-dominated funds at the forward exchange rate at expiry for a profit. There is substantial debate and a huge literature on whether UIRP or even CIRP hold, and some studies find that some data in the very short run are consistent with the theory (e.g., Chaboud and Wright, 2005).³ Nonetheless, the parity assumption requires that the drift term in (6) conforms to the following partial differential equation (PDE), as in (with simple rearranging and the parity assumption)

$$\frac{1}{F} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + \mu \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial q^2} \right) dt = (r_d - r_f) dt \quad (7)$$

where $r_d - r_f$ is the interest rate differential. Multiplying through by the F and given that the interest rate parity assumption implies $r_d - r_f = q$,⁴ the expression becomes

³ Some studies also report that UIRP holds to some degree in the long run (e.g., Chinn and Meredith, 2005).

⁴ Note that interest rate parity (from borrowing an single unit of domestic currency) implies

$$-\exp[y_d t] + E_0^{-1} \exp[y_f t] F_t = 0$$

or

$$\exp[(y_d - y_f)t] = \frac{F_t}{E_0}$$

But, substituting (2) for the right hand side implies

$$y_d - y_f = Q$$

with the continuous-time equivalent and (4) following

$$r_d - r_f = q$$

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + \mu \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial q^2} = qF$$

To further specify the PDE, consider the market price per unit of risk with respect to the instantaneous depreciation, λ , which follows

$$\frac{\varepsilon \left\{ \frac{dF}{F} \right\} - (r - r_f)}{\sqrt{\text{VAR} \left\{ \frac{dF}{F} \right\}}} = \lambda \quad (8)$$

Given (6), the risk-neutral PDE for the current forward the must follows

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + (\mu - \sigma\lambda) \frac{\partial F}{\partial q} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial q^2} - qF = 0 \quad (9)$$

There are general similarities between the derivation of this PDE and the bond pricing equation that underpins ATSMs. Very briefly, the general argument in Vasicek (1977), Brennan and Schwartz (1977), and Langetieg (1980) is that a portfolio of bonds that has a deterministic return—given a unique hedge ratio—must earn the risk-free rate in the absence of arbitrage. In this application to foreign exchange, the underlying factor is not the short rate but the instantaneous depreciation rate, which obeys interest rate parity instantaneously to preclude arbitrage.

3. A Solution for Forward Currency Contracts

Similar to single-factor, short-rate ATSMs, a proposed solution implies that the continuously-compounded return on the forward, Q , is a linear function of the instantaneous depreciation rate, q , as in

$$F_t = E_0 \exp[Q(t,T)t] = E_0 \exp[A(t,T) + B(t,T)q] \quad (10)$$

Instead of the terminal condition, say, for a bond that pays par at maturity (i.e., Vasicek, 1977, Brennan and Schwartz, 1977), the initial conditions stem from the simple requirement that the

current instantaneous forward rate equals the current spot rate. Furthermore, given that the equation must hold for all values of q , the conditions for the affine solution follow

$$\begin{aligned} F_0 = E_0 = F_0 e^{[A(0,T) + B(0,T)q]} \\ 0 = A(0,T) = B(0,T) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Now take the relevant partial derivatives from (10) with respect to the instantaneous depreciation rate as well as time and substitute the derivatives into the PDE, (9), as in

$$F \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial B}{\partial t} q \right) + (\mu - \sigma\lambda) FB + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 FB^2 - qF = 0 \quad (12)$$

With some further rearranging, the PDE reduces to a system of two tractable ordinary differential equations (ODEs), following

$$-\frac{\partial B}{\partial t} + 1 = 0 \quad (13)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial t} + (\mu - \sigma\lambda) B + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 B^2 = 0 \quad (14)$$

The solution for (13) given the initial condition defined in (11) follows

$$B(t, T) = t \quad (15)$$

And, given substitution of (15) into (14), simple integration with respect to t , and again the relevant initial condition in (11), the solution to the second ODE is

$$A(t, T) = -\frac{1}{2} (\mu - \sigma\lambda) t^2 - \frac{1}{6} \sigma^2 t^3 \quad (16)$$

With (15) and (16), the solution to the PDE for the forward contract is

$$F_t = F_0 \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} (\mu - \sigma\lambda) t^2 - \frac{1}{6} \sigma^2 t^3 + qt \right] \quad (17)$$

And, following (10), the corresponding expression for the depreciation rate over t follows

$$Q_t = q - \frac{1}{2}(\mu - \sigma\lambda)t - \frac{1}{6}\sigma^2 t^2 \quad (18)$$

which traces out a term structure of depreciation rates, with an initial value of q .

4. The Arbitrage-free-implied Currency Premium

To extract any implied premium from the model, ρ_{FX} , and therefore expected returns, the relevant question is whether the instantaneous forward depreciation rate from the solution, $q_{f,t}$, at some future date t is an unbiased predictor of the expected future instantaneous depreciation rate, $E\{q_t\}$. To start, the premium defined formally is

$$\rho_{FX} = q_{f,t} - E\{q_t\} \quad (19)$$

and forward depreciation rate for the discrete interval from t to $t + \varepsilon$ follows

$$q(t, t + \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \ln \left(\frac{F_{t+\varepsilon}}{F_t} \right) \quad (20)$$

The instantaneous forward depreciation rate at t then follows

$$q_f = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ln(F_{t+\varepsilon}) - \ln(F_t)}{\varepsilon} = \frac{\partial \ln F}{\partial t} \quad (21)$$

Therefore, using the solution of the model, (17),

$$q_{f,t} = q - (\mu - \sigma\lambda)t - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 t^2 \quad (22)$$

Now, to determine $E\{q_t\}$, given the stochastic process of the depreciation rate from (5), the expected value of the forward instantaneous depreciation follows

$$E\left\{\int_0^t dq\right\} = E\left\{\mu \int_0^t d\tau + \sigma \int_0^t dW_\tau\right\} \Leftrightarrow E\{q_t\} = q + \mu t \quad (23)$$

Given that the premium is the difference between the model-implied forward depreciation, (22), and the expected value, (23), (19) becomes

$$\rho_{FX} = -2\mu t - \sigma\lambda t - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 t^2 \quad (24)$$

which is indeed non-zero unless the following condition holds (notably if the volatility parameter is zero).

$$\mu = -\frac{1}{2}\sigma\lambda - \frac{1}{4}\sigma^2 t \quad (25)$$

In addition, again the model assumes that the instantaneous deterministic drift must follow IRP, but the volatility term in (5) produces a non-zero forward premium. Therefore, consistent with the preponderance of econometric evidence (Engle, 1996), the broad implication is that forward quotes are not unbiased expectations of depreciation.

5. A Multi-Factor Gaussian AFCM: Derivation and Estimation

Indeed, calibration should disentangle the premium from market expectations for returns, but however illustrative, the model outlined previously is too restrictive for application. Consider instead a latent factor approach with time-varying forward premiums as well as an mean-reverting alternative to the stochastic process in (5), following

$$dX_t = \kappa (\theta - X_t) dt + \Sigma dW_t \quad (26)$$

$\begin{matrix} n \times 1 & n \times n & n \times 1 & n \times n & n \times 1 \end{matrix}$

where X_t is an $n \times 1$ vector of underlying factors, θ is $n \times 1$, κ is an $n \times n$ lower-triangular matrix, Σ is a diagonal $n \times n$ matrix,⁵ and dW is an $n \times 1$ vector of Gaussian disturbances. The instantaneous depreciate rate, q , is a linear function of the factors, as in

$$q_t = \delta_0 + \delta_1^T X_t \quad (27)$$

where δ_0 is a scalar, and δ_1 is $n \times 1$. Also, the vector of market prices of risk is a linear function of the factors, following

⁵ Different normalizations are of course possible, such as a diagonal κ and a lower-triangular Σ . See Dai and Singleton (2000). Not also that in the estimation the n elements of $\lambda_1(\theta)$ are equal to 1 (0).

$$\lambda_t = \lambda_0 + \lambda_1^T X_t \quad (28)$$

where λ_0 is a scalar, and λ_1 is $n \times 1$. Similar to the single-factor case, arbitrage implies a matrix

PDE for the futures contract that follows

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial X} \left[\kappa(\theta - X_t) - \Sigma(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1^T X_t) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma^T \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial X \partial X^T} \Sigma - (\delta_0 + \delta_1^T X_t) F = 0 \quad (29)$$

The affine form of the proposed solution to the PDE follows

$$F(X, t) = E_0 \exp[Q(t, T)t] = E_0 \exp[A(t, T) + B(t, T)^T X_t] \quad (30)$$

And, following the steps and notation outlined in the Appendix A, the relevant solutions follow

$$B(t, T) = (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \left(I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T} t] \right) \delta_1 \quad (31)$$

and

$$A(t, T) = \delta_0 t - (\kappa^* \theta^*)^T (M_{1,t} - It) \kappa^{*-1T} \delta_1 - \frac{1}{2} \delta_1^T \kappa^{*-1} \left(\Sigma \Sigma^T t - \Sigma \Sigma^T M_{1,t}^T - M_{1,t} \Sigma \Sigma^T + M_{2,t} \right) \kappa^{*-1T} \delta_1 \quad (32)$$

Note that returning to (30), the expression for the depreciation rate over t follows

$$Q(t, T) = \frac{1}{t} \left[A(t, T) + B(t, T)^T X_t \right] \quad (33)$$

Turning to estimation in brief, a common recursive Kalman-filter-based maximum likelihood method produces the parameters (e.g., Kim and Wright, 2005). Very briefly, in state-space form, the measurement equation follows

$$Y_t = \Lambda + H^T X_t + \eta_t \quad (34)$$

$\begin{matrix} q \times 1 & q \times 1 & q \times n & n \times 1 & q \times 1 \end{matrix}$

where Y is a $q \times 1$ vector of observed data, namely log differences between forward quotes and spot foreign exchange rates (at q selected forward horizons); Λ is a $q \times 1$ vector; H is a $n \times q$ matrix; again the vector X_t represents the unobservable state variables; and η is a vector

of Gaussian measurement errors. Given the assumed stochastic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process in (26), the transition equation (from one discrete observation to the next) is

$$X_t = e^{-\kappa} X_{t-1} + (I - e^{-\kappa})\theta + \omega_t \quad (35)$$

where ω is a zero-mean Gaussian error vector.

6. Empirical Results: Selected Time-Series and Cross-Sections

The sample includes 11 \$U.S. currency pairs, and as Exhibit 1 indicates, coverage ranges from the mid- to late-1990s through early 2014. True, the sample period is somewhat short, yet the length is comparable to, if not longer than, common applications to ATSMs (e.g., Dai and Singleton, 2000; Kim and Wright 2005; Kim and Orphanides, 2005), and the tradeoff between parameter stability and robustness of course arises with longer time series. Also, the frequency of Y for the Kalman filter is weekly (Wednesday), with 1-, 3-, 6-, 9-, 12-, 24-, and in cases where available 36-month forward horizons (i.e., the length of q). Even the longest horizon is perhaps short compared to ATSM calibrations, which commonly use maturities to 10 years, but besides data unavailability, the limited span is perhaps not disadvantageous given the presumed stochastic process. That is, as long as X_t is stationary following (26), anticipated depreciation must converge to δ_0 as the horizon lengthens, and calibrated distant-horizon forward quotes owe largely to the premium by construction. However, the precise juncture when expected depreciation asymptotes to δ_0 is likely beyond the 3-year horizon, and besides, the implied depreciation paths should speak to this issue.

Turning to the results, again the closed-form solution to the model(s) imply non-zero premiums under all but the most restrictive parameters, and the estimate of the discount anomaly at a given horizon is simply the difference between the AFCM implied forward (i.e., log-difference in the forward and spot exchange rates) less the corresponding AFCM-implied depreciation rate. In Exhibit 2, the dashed black lines, the solid black lines, the blue lines, and

the red lines for each pair represent the observe forward quotes (in terms of log differences with the spot rate), the AFCM-implied forward, the AFCM-implied expected depreciation rate, and the AFCM-implied discount premium, respectively. The results alternatively refer to 3- and 4-factor models (i.e., alternative assumptions about n), depending on data fit.

Three simple empirical questions for application are, first, whether the model fits the data, second, whether it indeed produces a non-zero discount premium, and third, whether the estimated premium varies over time. To address the first question, judging from the largely minuscule visual distinction between the dashed and solid black lines as well as the simple ratio of the residual to explained sum of squares (reported in Column 6 in Exhibit 1), the models seem to fit very closely. Even those pairs for which 4-factor models fit the data better, corresponding 3-factor models also produce modest errors. Regarding the second question, the red lines in Exhibit 2 indeed diverge from zero to varying degrees across pairs. Therefore, again although the model assumes instantaneous IRP, the results produce a (risk-neutral) estimate of the discount anomaly.

With respect to the third question, the AFCM-implied discount premiums indeed change over time. The degree of variability—at least for the 2- and 3-year forward horizons differs somewhat across pairs, and there is some cross-sectional variation across the forward term structure. For example, the red lines in Exhibit 3—which show the schedule of depreciation by horizon for the most recent sample date—indicate meaningful and in some cases non-linear slopes. In other words, the AFCMs produce cross-sectional as well as time-series variation in the discount premiums, which might help inform more precise assessments of forward-implied depreciation rates over a given investment horizon.

7. Empirical Results: Previous Literature on the Premium Anomaly

To digress briefly, these results may also be noteworthy for the broader (academic) literature on the forward premium anomaly. Using regressions that include contemporaneous and realized quotes of spot and forward rates, Fama (1984) as well as Hodrick and Srivastava (1986) (FHS) and others find that the premium is more volatile than expected depreciation and that the two quantities are negatively correlated. On the other hand, although the derived premium is non-zero and variable, survey-based measures in general suggest that it is less volatile than expected depreciation, and that the correlation is generally non-negative (e.g., Froot and Frankel, 1989; Chinn and Frankel, 1994; Chinn and Frankel, 2002).

In short, Exhibit 4 suggests that the AFCM-implied premium and expected depreciation rate series are, on balance, more consistent with the survey-based results, albeit of course based in distinct underlying methods and samples. The top panel shows the simple correlation coefficients between the two series for the full daily samples at the 1-, 3-, 6-, 12-, and 24-month horizons. Although for eight of 11 cases the correlation is less than zero at the longest horizon, the figures are only consistently negative across these horizons for the NOK and SEK. Also, the lower panel shows the ratio of the variance of the premium and expected depreciation rates, which is less than one for every pair and horizon, in most cases markedly so. Therefore, the results are broadly inconsistent with FHS, as well as Bilson (1981), who argues that expected depreciation is always zero and that changes in forward rates owe exclusively to the premium.

8. Caveats, Uses, and Extensions of AFCMs

No more than ATSMs validate the pure expectations theory of interest rates, the preceding closed-form and empirical analyses do not endeavor to reconcile fully the discount premium anomaly with any version of the efficient markets or rationale expectations

hypotheses.⁶ Rather, the more limited aim is to derive models—albeit with more limited arbitrage-free assumptions—that nonetheless isolate the (risk-neutral) premium and therefore anticipated depreciation rates. Returning to Exhibit 3, the estimated expected depreciation term structures—the gaps between the black and blue lines—suggest that forward quotes are indeed not unbiased estimates of expected returns. True, at least for the most recent sample date, there is no pair for which AFCM-implied expected depreciation differs directionally given log differences between either quoted or fitted forward and spot rates. But, expected depreciation meaningfully diverges from raw forward quotes in some cases—for example, around 50 basis points over a 2-year horizon for the EUR.

Turning to extensions, AFCMs might indeed inform market-based returns in an amended Black-Litterman (1992) framework that relaxes the “reverse-optimization” assumption, which in effect assumes index efficiency (e.g., Sharpe, 1976). But even so, obviously active management requires views that diverge from consensus, and of course the preceding only addresses investors’ expectations. Differences between fitted and actual forward rates implied by AFCMs could be interpreted as valuation gaps, but the key objective of these analyses is to disentangle premiums from expected depreciation. Also, there are alternatives to a pure Gaussian process for the underlying factors, including, say, jump-diffusion, which might better capture exchange rate movements. Nevertheless, the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process in (26), which in the context of models such as Vasicek (1977) problematically allows negative nominal interest rates, is arguably better suited for currencies, which can of course depreciate or appreciate.





⁶ For example, under the condition of pro-cyclical risk-free rates, Verdelhan (2010) outlines a two-country model with external habit preferences that replicates the forward premium puzzle.





Exhibit 1: Expected \$U.S. Depreciation Rates

Expected \$U.S. Depreciation Rates
1/30/2014

		-1-	-2-	-3-	-4-	-5-	-6-	-7-	-8-	-9-
	Horizon:	1-Month	3-Month	6-Month	12-Month	24-Month	1-ESS/RSS	Factors	Sample Start	Sample End
Japanese Yen	JPY	0.21%	0.18%	0.19%	0.28%	0.55%	0.9966	3	11/04/96	01/30/14
European Union Euro	EUR	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	-0.10%	-0.13%	0.99781	4	10/07/99	01/30/14
U.K. Pound Sterling	GBP	-0.30%	-0.31%	-0.33%	-0.41%	-0.57%	0.99583	4	11/28/96	01/30/14
Canadian Dollar	CAD	0.83%	0.82%	0.80%	0.78%	0.74%	0.98865	3	04/30/98	01/30/14
Australian Dollar	AUD	-2.41%	-2.31%	-2.21%	-2.05%	-1.83%	0.98992	3	01/06/98	01/30/14
Swiss Franc	CHF	0.35%	0.37%	0.40%	0.47%	0.62%	0.99455	3	10/07/99	01/30/14
Swedish Krona	SEK	-0.68%	-0.64%	-0.59%	-0.52%	-0.44%	0.99791	4	02/28/96	01/30/14
Norwegian Krone	NOK	-1.32%	-1.28%	-1.21%	-1.05%	-0.70%	0.99852	4	12/08/97	01/30/14
New Zealand Dollar	NZD	-2.60%	-2.77%	-2.83%	-2.84%	-2.78%	0.99379	3	11/15/96	01/30/14
Danish Krone	DKK	0.40%	0.37%	0.35%	0.34%	0.36%	0.99687	4	07/15/99	01/30/14
Singapore Dollar	SGD	0.14%	0.00%	-0.06%	-0.06%	0.01%	0.99768	4	08/11/99	08/06/13
Mexican Peso	MXN	-2.87%	-2.97%	-3.14%	-3.43%	-3.78%	0.99662	3	01/19/00	01/30/14

Exhibit 2: Time Series Results
















Exhibit 3: Term Structures of Expected Depreciation




JPY/\$US:3-factor ACFM Term Structure
01/28/2014




NOK/\$US:3-factor ACFM Term Structure
01/28/2014



\$/US/NZD:3-factor ACFM Term Structure
01/28/2014



SEK/\$US:4-factor ACFM Term Structure
01/28/2014








Exhibit 4:

Fama (1984) Conditions

Correlation Coefficients:

ACFM Expected Depreciation & Premium

		-1-	-2-	-3-	-4-	-5-	-6-	-7-
	Horizon:	1-Month	3-Month	6-Month	12-Month	24-Month	Sample Start	Sample End
Japanese Yen	JPY	0.13891	0.11095	0.088188	0.021215	-0.11099	11/04/96	01/30/14
European Union Euro	EUR	0.12581	0.18122	0.17423	-0.086516	-0.24784	10/07/99	01/30/14
U.K. Pound Sterling	GBP	0.32168	0.65775	0.81378	0.81581	0.7888	11/28/96	01/30/14
Canadian Dollar	CAD	0.52229	0.58615	0.81455	0.977	0.98385	04/30/98	01/30/14
Australian Dollar	AUD	0.69688	0.72752	0.76623	0.67813	-0.54887	01/06/98	01/30/14
Swiss Franc	CHF	0.18596	0.052013	-0.17798	-0.51967	-0.47726	10/07/99	01/30/14
Swedish Krona	SEK	-0.4111	-0.50667	-0.41516	-0.3664	-0.4237	02/28/96	01/30/14
Norwegian Krone	NOK	-0.15892	-0.11299	-0.24551	-0.58437	-0.89883	12/08/97	01/30/14
New Zealand Dollar	NZD	0.020629	-0.19699	-0.30621	-0.099091	-0.13761	11/15/96	01/30/14
Danish Krone	DKK	0.38809	0.50268	0.68267	0.84325	0.82599	07/15/99	01/30/14
Singapore Dollar	SGD	0.12287	-0.13154	-0.28866	-0.31822	0.016198	08/11/99	08/06/13
Mexican Peso	MXN	0.10233	-0.0041387	-0.17896	-0.82486	-0.96398	01/19/00	01/30/14

Variance Ratios:

ACFM Expected Depreciation & Premium

Japanese Yen	JPY	0.00032633	0.0016439	0.0037251	0.014487	0.082143	11/04/96	01/30/14
European Union Euro	EUR	0.00095836	0.0010709	0.0013183	0.014498	0.077782	10/07/99	01/30/14
U.K. Pound Sterling	GBP	0.0082836	0.012438	0.032668	0.14186	0.57248	11/28/96	01/30/14
Canadian Dollar	CAD	0.037121	0.054022	0.045543	0.056385	0.094338	04/30/98	01/30/14
Australian Dollar	AUD	0.019872	0.037123	0.032524	0.018439	0.0011521	01/06/98	01/30/14
Swiss Franc	CHF	0.00072248	0.0023509	0.0019954	0.0037684	0.039424	10/07/99	01/30/14
Swedish Krona	SEK	0.00027093	0.00080124	0.0026716	0.01346	0.073669	02/28/96	01/30/14
Norwegian Krone	NOK	0.00090403	0.01203	0.064059	0.26835	0.70658	12/08/97	01/30/14
New Zealand Dollar	NZD	0.011105	0.0062099	0.003021	0.027227	0.1188	11/15/96	01/30/14
Danish Krone	DKK	0.0050289	0.023304	0.051419	0.11879	0.33344	07/15/99	01/30/14
Singapore Dollar	SGD	0.0012276	0.006005	0.012513	0.016058	0.021256	08/11/99	08/06/13
Mexican Peso	MXN	0.051975	0.044164	0.018651	0.010996	0.052025	01/19/00	01/30/14

References

- Backus, David, Silverio Foresi, and Chris I. Telmer, 2001, Affine term structure models and the forward premium anomaly, *The Journal of Finance*, vol. 56, no. 1., pp. 279-304.
- Bilson, John, 1981, "The speculative efficiency hypothesis," *Journal of Business*, vol. 54, pp. 435-51.
- Black, Fischer and Robert Litterman, 1992, "Global Portfolio Optimization," *Financial Analysts Journal*, pp. 28–43.
- Brennan, Michael J., and Eduardo Schwartz, 1977, "Savings bonds, retractable bonds, and callable bonds," *Journal of Financial Economics*, vol. 5, pp. 67–88.
- Chaboud, Alain P. and Jonathan H. Wright, 2005, "Uncovered interest parity: It works, but not for long," *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 66, pp. 349–62.
- Chinn, Menzie and Jeffrey Frankel, 1994, "Patterns in exchange rates for 25 currencies," *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 759–770.
- Chinn, Menzie and Jeffrey Frankel, 2002, "More Survey Data on Exchange Rate Expectations: More Currencies, More Horizons, More Tests," in W. Allen and D. Dickinson (Eds.), *Monetary Policy, Capital Flows and Financial Market Developments in the Era of Financial Globalisation: Essays in Honour of Max Fry*, (Routledge, 2002), pp. 145-67.
- Chinn, Menzie and G. Meredith, 2005, "Testing uncovered interest parity at short and long horizons during the Post-Bretton Woods Era," NBER Working Paper No. 11077.
- Dai, Q. and K. J. Singleton, 2000, "Specification analysis of affine term structure models," *Journal of Finance*, vol. 55, pp. 1943-1978.
- Engel, Charles, 1996, "The forward discount anomaly and the risk premium: A survey of recent evidence," *Journal of Empirical Finance*, vol. 3, pp. 123–92.
- Fama, Eugene, 1984, "Forward and spot exchange rates," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, vol. 14, pp. 319-38.
- Froot, Kenneth, 1990, "Short Rates and Expected Asset Returns," NBER Working Paper No. 3247 (January).
- Froot, Kenneth and Jeffrey Frankel, 1989, "Forward discount bias: Is it an exchange risk premium?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 139-161.
- Froot, Kenneth and Richard Thaler, 1990, "Anomalies: Foreign Exchange," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 179-192.

Hodrick, Robert J. and Sanjay Srivastava, 1986, "An investigation of risk and return in forward foreign exchange," *Journal of International Money and Finance*, vol. 3, pp. 5-30.

Kim, Don H. and Jonathan H. Wright, 2005, "An Arbitrage-Free Three-Factor Term Structure Model and the Recent Behavior of Long-Term Yields and Distant-Horizon Forward Rates," Federal Reserve Board Finance and Economics Discussion Series, no. 33.

Kim, Don H. and A. Orphanides, 2005, "Term Structure Estimation with Survey Data on Interest Rate Forecasts," Federal Reserve Board Finance and Economics Discussion Series, no. 48.

Langetieg, T. C., 1980, "A multivariate model of the term structure," *Journal of Finance*, vol. 35, pp. 71–91.

Sharpe, William, 1974, "Imputing Expected Security Returns from Portfolio Composition," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, vol. 9, pp. 463–472.

Vasicek, Oldrich, 1977, "An equilibrium characterization of the term structure," *Journal of Financial Economics*, vol. 5, pp. 177–88.

Verdelhan, Adrien, 2010, "A habit-based explanation of the exchange rate risk premium," *Journal of Finance*, vol. 65, pp. 123-145.

Appendix A: Solution to a multi-factor Gaussian AFCM

To solve the PDE, (29), for the multi-factor model, note that the relevant partial derivatives of the proposed affine solution, (30), follow

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial F}{\partial X} &= FB \\ \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial X \partial X^T} &= FBB^T \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} &= F \left(\frac{\partial A(t, T)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial B(t, T)^T}{\partial t} X \right)\end{aligned}\tag{A.36}$$

With substitution and the fact that F is a scalar, the PDE reduces to the following two ODEs,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial A(t, T)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial B(t, T)^T}{\partial t} X + B^T \kappa (\theta - X_t) - B^T \Sigma (\lambda_0 + \lambda_1^T X_t) + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma^T B B^T \Sigma - \delta_0 - \delta_1^T X_t &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial A(t, T)}{\partial t} + B^T \kappa \theta - B^T \Sigma \lambda_0 + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma^T B B^T \Sigma - \delta_0 &= \left(-\frac{\partial B(t, T)^T}{\partial t} + B^T \kappa + B^T \Sigma \lambda_1^T + \delta_1^T \right) X \\ \frac{\partial A(t, T)}{\partial t} + B^T (\kappa \theta - \Sigma \lambda_0) + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma^T B B^T \Sigma - \delta_0 &= \left[-\frac{\partial B(t, T)^T}{\partial t} + B^T (\kappa + \Sigma \lambda_1^T) + \delta_1^T \right] X\end{aligned}\tag{A.37}$$

Analogous to the single-factor model, the right-hand-side, with $\kappa^* = \kappa + \Sigma \lambda_1$, must follow (after taking the transpose)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial B(t, T)^T}{\partial t} &= B^T \kappa^* + \delta_1^T \\ \frac{\partial B(t, T)}{\partial t} &= \kappa^{*T} B + \delta_1\end{aligned}\tag{A.38}$$

To solve (A.38), use the integrating factor, take the definite integral, and use the initial condition following

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp[\kappa^{*T}t] \left[\frac{\partial B(t,T)}{\partial t} - \kappa^{*T} B \right] &= \exp[\kappa^{*T}t] \delta_1 \\
\int_0^t \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left[\exp[\kappa^{*T}s] B(t,T) \right] ds &= \int_0^t \exp[\kappa^{*T}s] \delta_1 ds \\
\exp[\kappa^{*T}t] B(t,T) - \exp[\kappa^{*T}t] B(0,T) &= \left(\exp[\kappa^{*T}t] - I \right) (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \Big|_0^t \delta_1 \\
\exp[\kappa^{*T}t] B(t,T) &= \left(\exp[\kappa^{*T}t] - I \right) (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \delta_1 \\
B(t,T) &= (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \left(I - \exp[\kappa^{*T}t] \right) \delta_1
\end{aligned} \tag{A.39}$$

Given (A.39); with $\kappa^{*-1}(\kappa\theta_t - \Sigma\lambda_0) = \theta^*$, which implies $\kappa\theta - \Sigma\lambda_0 = \kappa^*\theta^*$; and the fact that since

$B(t,T)$ and $\kappa^*\theta^*$ are $n \times 1$, then $B(t,T)^T (\kappa^*\theta^*) = (\kappa^*\theta^*)^T B(t,T)$; the second ODE becomes

$$\frac{\partial A(t,T)}{\partial t} = \delta_0 - (\kappa^*\theta^*)^T \left[(\kappa^{*T})^{-1} (I - e^{-\kappa^{*T}t}) \delta_1 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \left[(\kappa^{*T})^{-1} (I - e^{-\kappa^{*T}t}) \delta_1 \right]^T \Sigma \Sigma^T \left[(\kappa^{*T})^{-1} (I - e^{-\kappa^{*T}t}) \delta_1 \right] \tag{A.40}$$

Taking one of the transposes in the third term on the right-hand-side and subsequent matrix multiplication follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial A(t,T)}{\partial t} &= \delta_0 - (\kappa^*\theta^*)^T \left[(\kappa^{*T})^{-1} (I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T}t]) \delta_1 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \delta_1^T (I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T}t]) \kappa^{*-1} \Sigma \Sigma^T \left[(\kappa^{*T})^{-1} (I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T}t]) \delta_1 \right] \\
&= \delta_0 - (\kappa^*\theta^*)^T \left[(\kappa^{*T})^{-1} (I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T}t]) \delta_1 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \delta_1^T \kappa^{*-1} (I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T}t]) \Sigma \Sigma^T (I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T}t]) (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \delta_1 \\
&= \delta_0 - (\kappa^*\theta^*)^T \left[(\kappa^{*T})^{-1} (I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T}t]) \delta_1 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \delta_1^T \kappa^{*-1} (\Sigma \Sigma^T - \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T}t] - \exp[-\kappa^{*T}t] \Sigma \Sigma^T + \exp[-\kappa^{*T}t] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T}t]) (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \delta_1
\end{aligned} \tag{A.41}$$

Definite integrals produce the solution to (A.41). Given the initial condition, the left-hand-side becomes

$$\int_0^t dA(s,T) = A(t,T) - A(0,T) = A(t,T) \tag{A.42}$$

For the second term on the right-hand-side of (A.41), let $M_{1,t} = (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} (I - e^{-\kappa^{*T}t})$, and the

integration follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t (\kappa^* \theta^*)^T \left[(\kappa^{*T})^{-1} (I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s]) \right] \delta_1 ds &= (\kappa^* \theta^*)^T \left[\int_0^t (I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s]) ds \right] (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \delta_1 \\
&= (\kappa^* \theta^*)^T \left\{ It - \left[-(\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \left(\exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] \right) \Big|_0^t \right] \right\} (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \delta_1 \\
&= (\kappa^* \theta^*)^T \left[It + (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} (\exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] - I) \right] (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \delta_1 \quad (\text{A.43}) \\
&= (\kappa^* \theta^*)^T \left[It - (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} (I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s]) \right] (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \delta_1 \\
&= (\kappa^* \theta^*)^T \left[It - M_{1,t} \right] (\kappa^{*T})^{-1} \delta_1
\end{aligned}$$

For the third term on the right-hand-side, we need to calculate three (matrix) integrals, including

$\int_0^t \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] ds$, $\int_0^t \exp[-\kappa^* s] ds$, and $\int_0^t \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] ds$. The first follows

$$\int_0^t \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] ds = -\kappa^{*-1T} \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] \Big|_0^t = \kappa^{*-1T} (I - \exp[-\kappa^{*T} t]) = M_{1,t} \quad (\text{A.44})$$

Similarly, the second follows

$$\int_0^t \exp[-\kappa^* s] ds = \kappa^{*-1} \left(I - \int_0^t \exp[-\kappa^* t] \right) = M_{1,t}^T \quad (\text{A.45})$$

For the third integral, first use the product rule and take the integrals, as in

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{ds} (\exp[-\kappa^* s] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s]) &= -\kappa^* \exp[-\kappa^* s] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] + \exp[-\kappa^* s] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] (-\kappa^{*T}) \\
\int_0^t d (\exp[-\kappa^* s] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s]) &= \int_0^t -\kappa^* \exp[-\kappa^* s] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] ds - \int_0^t \exp[-\kappa^* s] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] \kappa^{*T} ds \\
\exp[-\kappa^* t] \Sigma \Sigma^T e^{-\kappa^{*T} t} - \Sigma \Sigma^T &= -\kappa^* \left(\int_0^t \exp[-\kappa^* s] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] ds \right) - \left(\int_0^t \exp[-\kappa^* s] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] ds \right) \kappa^{*T} \\
&= -\kappa^* \Omega_t - \Omega_t \kappa^{*T} \quad (\text{A.46})
\end{aligned}$$

with $\Omega_t = \int_0^t \exp[-\kappa^* s] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] ds$. Vectorize both sides of the equation⁷ and solve

following

$$\begin{aligned}
-\text{vec}\left(\exp[-\kappa^* t] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} t] - \Sigma \Sigma^T\right) &= \text{vec}\left(\kappa^* \Omega_t + \Omega_t \kappa^{*T}\right) \\
&= \text{vec}\left(\kappa^* \Omega_t I\right) + \text{vec}\left(I \Omega_t \kappa^{*T}\right) \\
&= \left(I \otimes \kappa^*\right) \text{vec}\left(\Omega_t\right) + \left(\kappa^* \otimes I\right) \text{vec}\left(\Omega_t\right) \\
&= \left(I \otimes \kappa^* + \kappa^* \otimes I\right) \text{vec}\left(\Omega_t\right) \\
\text{vec}\left(\Omega_t\right) &= -\text{vec}\left(\exp[-\kappa^* t] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} t] - \Sigma \Sigma^T\right) \left(I \otimes \kappa^* + \kappa^* \otimes I\right)^{-1} \\
\Omega_t &= -\text{vec}^{-1}\left[\text{vec}\left(\exp[-\kappa^* t] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} t] - \Sigma \Sigma^T\right) \left(I \otimes \kappa^* + \kappa^* \otimes I\right)^{-1}\right] \\
\int_0^t \exp[-\kappa^* s] \Sigma \Sigma^T \exp[-\kappa^{*T} s] ds &= M_{2,t} \\
\text{(A.47)}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the solution to the second ODE follows (32).

⁷ Note that $\text{vec}(ABC) = (C^T \otimes A) \text{vec}(B)$.