

Langedijk, Sven; Monokroussos, George; Papanagiotou, Evangelia

Working Paper

Benchmarking Liquidity Proxies: Accounting for Dynamics and Frequency Issues

JRC Working Papers in Economics and Finance, No. 2016/3

Provided in Cooperation with:

Joint Research Centre (JRC), European Commission

Suggested Citation: Langedijk, Sven; Monokroussos, George; Papanagiotou, Evangelia (2016) : Benchmarking Liquidity Proxies: Accounting for Dynamics and Frequency Issues, JRC Working Papers in Economics and Finance, No. 2016/3, ISBN 978-92-79-57682-9, European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Ispra, <https://doi.org/10.2760/623445>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/202277>

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.

Benchmarking Liquidity Proxies: Accounting for Dynamics and Frequency Issues

Sven Langedijk,
George Monokroussos,
Evangelia Papanagiotou

2016

JRC Working Papers in Economics and Finance, 2016/3



JRC Working Papers in Economics and Finance are written by the staff of the Joint Research Centre, the European Commission's science and knowledge service, or by experts working in association with them. The Papers aim to increase awareness of the research work done by staff and to seek comments for further analysis. The scientific output expressed does not imply a policy position of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

Contact information

Name: Evangelia Papanagiotou
Address: Via Enrico Fermi 2749, I - 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy
E-mail: evangelia.papanagiotou@jrc.ec.europa.eu
Tel.: +39 0332 785164

JRC Science Hub

<https://ec.europa.eu/jrc>

JRC104336

ISBN 978-92-79-57682-9 (PDF)

ISSN 2467-2203 (online)

doi: 10.2760/623445 (online)

© European Union, 2016

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

All images © European Union 2016

How to cite: Sven Langedijk, George Monokroussos, Evangelia Papanagiotou; Benchmarking Liquidity Proxies: Accounting for Dynamics and Frequency Issues; doi: 10.2760/623445

Contents

Acknowledgements.....	1
Abstract.....	2
1 Introduction	3
2 Liquidity measures and data	6
2.1 Cleaning the data	7
2.2 Describing the measures	7
3 The relationship between liquidity benchmarks and proxies: An empirical investigation.....	10
3.1 Assessing liquidity using benchmarks and proxies: Some examples	10
3.2 Monthly and daily correlations	11
3.3 The frequency domain: Coherences between benchmarks and proxies	17
3.4 Modeling the dynamic relationship between benchmarks and proxies: A MIDAS approach.....	21
3.5 Implications of the results.....	30
4 Conclusions	31
References	32
List of abbreviations and definitions	34
List of figures	35
List of tables.....	36

Acknowledgements

We thank participants at the 1st Conference on Recent Developments in Financial Econometrics and Applications, at the 20th International Conference in Computing in Economics and Finance, at the 6th Annual Financial Market Liquidity Conference, at the 14th Conference on Research on Economic Theory and Econometrics, as well as Alessandro Fontana, Andrea Pagano, Beatrice Pataracchia, the editor and four anonymous referees for many useful comments and suggestions. The content of this study does not reflect the official opinion of the European Commission. Responsibility for the information and views expressed in the study lies entirely with the authors.

Authors affiliations: Sven Langedijk^a, George Monokroussos^{a,b}, Evangelia Papanagiotou^a

a European Commission - Joint Research Centre (JRC) – Ispra (VA), Italy

b Amazon – Seattle, WA, USA

Authors

Sven Langedijk,

George Monokroussos,

Evangelia Papanagiotou

Abstract

We revisit a central task of the extant liquidity literature, which is to identify effective measures of liquidity, in the context of sovereign bonds and the new Basel III regulatory framework. We critically assess the influential practice of identifying the best liquidity measures based on monthly correlations by comparing and contrasting correlations between monthly and daily averages of high-frequency benchmarks and low-frequency proxies of liquidity, as well as by examining the coherences between such measures. Furthermore, we propose MIDAS regressions as a way of investigating the bilateral relationships between benchmarks and proxies without averaging out potentially valuable high-frequency information, as is common practice. We conclude that the empirical correlations between benchmarks and proxies in general become weaker as the frequency over which these relationships are examined becomes higher, and that standard practices may lead to misleading conclusions in our context. One implication of our results is that any liquidity measure needs to be assessed against the relevant timeframe for conversion into cash.

1 Introduction

Liquidity measures have received renewed interest following the financial crisis. In particular, in December 2010, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) announced the introduction of a Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR) into the new Basel III regulatory framework. The main objective of the LCR is to enhance the short-term resilience of banks in the event of a severe liquidity stress scenario. The LCR requires banks to hold sufficient unencumbered high-quality liquid assets (HQLA) to meet the bank's liquidity needs for 30 calendar days in a significant stress scenario. In case of 'financial instability' banks are allowed to use their stock of HQLA¹.

A gradual phase-in schedule has been proposed to ensure that the LCR can be introduced without disruption to the orderly strengthening of banking systems or the ongoing financing of economic activity. Specifically, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (2013) suggests phasing in the LCR starting January 2015, gradually increasing from 60% to 100% by 2019. Furthermore, national authorities have taken up the task of adjusting Basel III rules on the LCR to better reflect national and regional specificities. For example, US regulators adopted on 10 October 2014 a final rule that implements the LCR. They broadened some categories of debt and equity securities that can be counted as high quality liquid assets and clarified that only banks with assets exceeding \$250 billion would be considered for the full set of LCR rules. On the same day, the European Commission presented its detailed rules for the LCR application in Europe, with a broader coverage of banks including smaller banks and broadening the eligible assets in particular as regards covered bonds. The European Commission has been tasked by co-legislators to specify the detailed general liquidity coverage requirements, including the HQLA. The European Banking Authority (EBA) advises the European Commission (EC) and analyses the relative liquidity of asset classes for the purpose of determining which assets should be eligible for inclusion in banks' liquidity buffers.

One implication of the above is that the need for good liquidity measures is as high in the context of the current regulatory environment as it has ever been. Liquidity of an asset in general refers to how quickly and cheaply it can be converted into cash, or it is "*the degree to which an asset or security can quickly be bought or sold in the market without affecting the asset's price.*"² There is a large literature on liquidity measures, attempting to translate the general definitions of liquidity into concrete and quantitative concepts based on market data.³ There is however no consensus on a common best measure based on available information. One issue that has been recognized in this literature as being key is the availability and frequency of market data that is used for calculating liquidity measures. Another key issue that has not received as much attention though, is that liquidity depends on the relevant timeframe and the stress scenario considered. "Quickly" in the above definition can mean within seconds, within hours, within days, weeks or even a month, depending on the context.

The existing literature classifies liquidity measures according to two dimensions: (i) Trade-based measures (e.g. Amihud price impact, trading volume) versus order-based measures (e.g. quoted bid-ask spread, percent quoted spread); and (ii) intra-day benchmarks versus proxies (on the basis of lower-frequency (daily) data, daily, monthly, quarterly or annual liquidity proxies are developed). High-frequency liquidity benchmarks are often viewed as being more accurate and complete measures of liquidity. However, as high-frequency data is expensive, not always available, and difficult to handle due to size and irregular-frequency issues, low-cost liquidity proxies are often preferred for many purposes in academic and policy circles.

¹ The LCR rules apply to about 10% of banks' balance sheets. The European Banking Authority (2013a) reported on an impact assessment of the LCR (using end-of-2012 balance sheets of 357 EU banks from 21 EU countries with total assets of EUR 33,000 billion) that the aggregate stock of liquid assets amounted to EUR 3,739 billion on an LCR denominator of EUR 3,251 billion http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-579_en.htm. Globally it concerns approximately \$ 15,000 billion of bank assets.

² This definition is quite standard in the literature. See, for instance, Earne and Sherk (2013).

³ For example Goyenko et al. (2009) provide an overview of measures.

Recent literature improves upon such common practices by attempting instead to identify the best daily proxies using time-series and cross-sectional correlations of proxies and benchmarks. See, *inter alia*, Goyenko et al. (2009), Fong et al. (2011), and Marshall et al. (2013) on stocks and Schesstag et al. (2013) on U.S. corporate bonds. However, correlating benchmarks and proxies faces a double challenge: both mixed frequencies (high and low) and irregularly-spaced variables. These problems are dealt with by resorting to the aggregation of both proxies and benchmarks to monthly or quarterly averages. Based on such aggregation and correlation exercises, this literature typically provides substantial evidence that empirically justify the use of proxies. For instance, as Goyenko et al. (2009) state, *"the evidence is overwhelming that both monthly and annual low-frequency measures capture high-frequency measures of transaction costs. Indeed in many applications the correlations are high and the mean square error low enough that the effort of using high-frequency measures is simply not worth the cost."* A similar approach that focuses on low-frequency statistics of liquidity measures seems to be influential with policy authorities which are currently tasked with implementing the Basel III/LCR regulatory framework; for instance, see EBA (2013b).⁴

In this study, we question this influential practice of identifying the best liquidity measures by correlating monthly (or even quarterly or cross-sectional) aggregates of benchmarks and proxies, when this practice is extended to the context of sovereign bonds. Our focus on sovereign bonds reflects the currently unfolding regulatory environment of Basel III with its emphasis on sovereign debt for the calibration of the LCR numerator (e.g., see Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (2013)).

A key concern associated with averaging the liquidity benchmarks at a low frequency is that such averaging removes the extra information and dynamics that come at the higher frequency.⁵ This is a central advantage of the high-frequency data and a reason why the literature typically considers benchmarks to be better than proxies. For instance, the practice of using monthly averages may fail to reflect the ability (or lack thereof) of investors to transact immediately and the cost associated with this, which is the essence of liquidity. In the unfolding policy context of LCR/Basel III this issue is very relevant. In a liquidity stress scenario, banks need to be able to sell assets within days to cover liquidity needs. Short-term, high-frequency dynamics of liquidity are thus expected to be important and ignoring those could lead to misleading assessments and conclusions. The extent to which results from low-frequency analyses could lead to such misleading assessments and conclusions is an empirical matter. Our contribution consists of shedding light on this empirical matter, and doing so in a robust way.

We investigate the above through a series of exercises. First, we compute and contrast daily and monthly correlations for various proxies and benchmarks, for a series of sovereign bonds coming from both "core" and "periphery" EU countries. Next, we attempt to get a more complete picture of such frequency issues by considering the frequency domain, and specifically by looking at the coherences between benchmarks and proxies. Finally, we move beyond even daily correlations and towards capturing intra-day dynamics. In particular, rather than aggregating the high-frequency benchmarks to daily or monthly averages, we employ underlying intra-day measures directly in Mixed Data Sampling (MIDAS) regressions, which is a parsimonious regression-based approach for handling models where the dependent variable is of a different (lower) frequency than that of the explanatory variables. Our findings provide empirical support to concerns such as the ones outlined above; for example, correlations between benchmarks and proxies tend to become

⁴ As discussed earlier, the European Commission and the European Banking Authority are tasked with translating the heuristic notion of liquidity, and some general criteria and guidance for classifying liquid assets, into a concrete classification framework for assets classes of high and extremely high liquidity based on objective criteria, which could serve as a basis for the implementation of the LCR in the EU. And, according to EBA (2013b), *"Monthly price impact measures are defined by taking the monthly median of the daily measure for each asset. When making cross asset class analysis, the average value across the relevant assets of the monthly medians has been taken."*

⁵ For volatility of equity returns (which is strongly related to market liquidity), Dobrev and Szerzen (2010) find that model inference without high-frequency data takes insufficient account of skewness and kurtosis, underestimating risk during bad times and overestimating risk during good times.

substantially weaker as the frequency over which these relationships are examined becomes higher.

The remainder of this report is structured as follows: Section 2 discusses the liquidity measures and the data we use, Section 3 provides the details of our methodology and results, as well as the policy implications of our results, and Section 4 concludes.

2 Liquidity measures and data

We use sovereign bond data. Globally, sovereign debt securities make up between 15 - 20% of the total stock of debt and equity outstanding, and are the second category of market assets behind equities. Sovereign bonds are considered as assets of extremely high liquidity and credit quality in the LCR framework (EBA (2013b)). No haircut is applied to their HQLA weight and they may make up 100% of the LCR (no ceiling). The importance of sovereign bonds in bank asset portfolios is illustrated by the sovereign bond holdings of more than EUR 2.7 trillion that the 64 banks covered by the 2013 European Banking Association stress tests reported in their December 2012 balance sheets. This reflects a share of their total assets on average in excess of 10%.

We obtain our sovereign bond market data by combining two MTS (Mercato Telematico dei Titoli di Stato) datasets: a low-frequency daily and a high-frequency intra-day dataset. MTS is the major wholesale market⁶ for fixed income securities in Europe in which all major international financial institutions participate. EuroMTS is the reference pan-European electronic market for Euro benchmark bonds, or bonds with an outstanding value of at least €5 billion. The MTS platform liquidity is guaranteed by quoting requirements for market makers with minimum quote sizes varying between EUR 2.5 million and EUR 10 million. Participants can join the MTS markets either as a market maker or market taker and are subject to minimum capital requirements, as well as trading requirements.⁷

We consider 4 sovereigns: Germany, Finland, Italy and Portugal. We choose these four to have a mix of large and small markets, with high and lower credit quality. The dataset covers two calendar years: 2011-2012. This time period reflects a wide range of market circumstances and covers the Eurozone sovereign debt crisis. Our sample is composed of 95 unique bond codes (ISINs): 46 for Italy, 29 for Germany, 8 for Finland and 12 for Portugal.

The low frequency MTS daily data contains daily traded volume, average daily bid-ask spread, closing price, closing mid-quote, yield to maturity, modified duration, convexity, bond type, issue date, issuer name, maturity date, coupon. The high-frequency data provides for every trade the size, price, millisecond time stamps, direction of the trade (buy or sell) and yield. It also provides the pricing of the order book with three levels of depth throughout the day, resulting in a very large dataset with up to 1000 quotes per bond per day on average for the most traded bonds. For example, in our sample the number of quotes amounts to more than 25 million across the four countries, the total number of trades is more than 100,000 and the total traded volume across the sample considered is more than EUR 500 billion. The trading activity is unevenly spread across bonds, with trading activity limited to a few trades per month in a sizable share of bonds.

To further investigate the effect of influential practices of identifying the best liquidity proxies when such practices are extended to our present context of sovereign bonds, we need to select a number of commonly used proxies and benchmarks to contrast their daily and monthly correlations, and for the rest of our analysis. The literature has produced a wide variety of alternative proxies and benchmarks for measuring liquidity.⁸ There is little agreement on the best measures to use. Each captures specific aspects of liquidity. Some of the popular low-frequency proxies can only be calculated for longer periods based on daily data (e.g. Roll (1984), zeros (number of zero return days in a given period), Kyle price impact (requiring regression analysis)). As we assess accuracy of actual daily proxies compared to the high-frequency intraday benchmarks, we identify proxies that can be

⁶ Pelizzon et al. (2013) report for instance that the MTS market share of interdealer transactions in Italian sovereign bonds ranges between 80 and 85%.

⁷ For the EuroMTS market, market makers need to have a net worth of at least EUR 375 million. All market makers must commit to providing two-way quotes for the securities assigned to them and display them for all bonds at least five hours per day. For sovereign bonds, proposals must be formulated for a minimum quantity equal to EUR 10 million, EUR 5 million, EUR 2.5 million depending on the MTS market and instrument (bucket of maturity, liquid/ benchmark security). Odd lots of EUR 0.5 million and multiples up to EUR 2.5 million with manual matching are subject to market makers' acceptance.

⁸ Fong et al. (2011) provide an overview of the most used proxies and benchmarks.

calculated on a daily basis using daily data. From the remaining proxies we consider: (i) Amihud price impact⁹: $Amihud = \frac{abs(R_{i,t})}{Volume_t}$ ¹⁰ (ii) number of trades (iii) traded volume; and (iv) end of the day spread: $Spreadendofday = \frac{P_{ask}(t) - P_{bid}(t)}{(P_{ask}(t) + P_{bid}(t))/2}$ ¹¹. As benchmarks, we use: (i) the intraday quoted bid-ask spreads; (ii) the quote slope: $Quoteslope = \frac{P_{ask}(t) - P_{bid}(t)}{\ln(q_{ask}(t)) + \ln(q_{bid}(t))}$; and (iii) the number of quotes per hour.

2.1 Cleaning the data

Due to the very big data files reflecting all trades and quotes over a two-year period, construction of the liquidity measures required substantial efforts. As the low- and high-frequency data files provided by MTS contain raw information, several actions needed to be taken in order to clean the data before calculating the proxies and the benchmarks discussed above. As previously noted, the Amihud price-impact measure is calculated using the “mid price” from the previous day. As reported in the MTS documentation file the mid price (i.e. the average of the best bid and ask quote) for each ISIN is collected at or before 5pm. However, if the spread is beyond three hundred basis points the bid ask is considered as non-tradable and is not reported by MTS. For those cases we calculate the mid price manually using the high-frequency data at 5pm. In the case where no quotes are reported at 5pm the last mid price of the book throughout that day is used (for example by using the bid-ask at 4pm). For the calculation of the proxies, the MTS low-frequency files are also checked for double recording of dates and double records are deleted as that would lead to a miscalculation of the low frequency measures. Another issue regarding the two different MTS source files (i.e. at low and high frequency) is the treatment of cases where for some ISINs, only low-frequency data are reported and no data are available at the high-frequency level. Those dates are excluded from our calculations. High-frequency bid-ask quotes are reported with millisecond timestamps and quotes are updated on average every minute. However on some dates, for several ISINs across the four countries, no quotes have been reported between 9am to 12pm. For those cases the first quote in the order book after 12pm is used to replace the 9am to 12pm quotes. These cleaning exercises concern 182 “ISIN-days” out of a total of more than 44000 “ISIN-days”. In some instances it is also observed that, within the day, no quotes are placed in the order book for a time longer than an hour. Since for our purposes hourly bid-ask spread (BAS) averages are employed for the analysis, if that hour is missing the last bid-ask spread from the previous hour is used.

2.2 Describing the measures

Table 1 presents summary statistics on the liquidity measures per ISIN per day. The table illustrates the liquidity profile of the markets we consider, with infrequent trades and frequent quoting at tight spreads by market makers. The mean traded volume per ISIN ranges across countries from slightly less than EUR 1 million for Portugal to EUR 20 million for Italy. The rather low mean reflects many days without trades. The number of trades

⁹ Several studies (e.g. Fong et al. (2011), Schestag et al. (2013), Goyenko et al. (2006) and EBA (2013b)) find that the Amihud measure is a superior price-impact proxy when compared to other liquidity measures. It is the absolute value of the daily return on the asset, divided by the traded volume. $Amihud = Abs(R_{i,t}/Volume_t)$.

¹⁰ We calculate the return (R) in the Amihud price impact measure using the previous day’s closing mid-quote rather than the last traded price. This has advantages in our context (a market with low trading frequency): the conventional Amihud measure requires two consecutive trading days to be calculated. First, as we may not always have two consecutive trading days for the less liquid bonds, we would lose many observations with the conventional measure. Second, as the trading is infrequent, the return measure based on previous day trading would pick up much more noise and news that occurred between the two trades than an end-of-day mid-quote.

¹¹ Bid and ask quotes are collected at or before 5pm. For a description on the measure see Chung and Zhang (2014).

per day per ISIN ranges from a mean of 0.15 for Portugal to 3.98 for Italy. The distribution of the daily number of trades is skewed as reflected by the 0 median number of trades for all except Italy (for which it is 1). In each of the 4 countries, the daily volume for individual ISINs can be as high as several hundreds of millions of euros. The liquidity of the market is suggested by frequent quoting, varying between 45 and 76 per hour on average across all ISINs over the two years.¹² Median bid-ask spreads range from 9 to 31 basis points for Germany, Finland and Italy, pointing to liquid markets, but the standard deviation is high, up to multiples of the median, reflecting substantial variation over time and across ISINs. The high Portuguese bid-ask spread (415 basis points in the median) reflects an illiquid market, possibly due to sovereign debt sustainability concerns that forced the country to request EU/IMF financial assistance in Spring 2011. Its sovereign bond market remained stressed throughout the period with infrequent market trading, no primary bond issuances and high bid-ask spreads. For all countries, the very high maximum numbers for quote-slope and bid-ask spread reflect periods in which market makers perhaps have withdrawn their bids usually following or anticipating major events that can have an important price impact.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of liquidity measures.

Proxies	country	mean	std	min	median	max
Amihud	DE	3.27E-12	1.11E-11	0	1.09E-12	5.44E-10
	FI	1.42E-12	2.40E-12	0	5.76E-13	2.21E-11
	IT	7.14E-12	2.16E-11	0	1.44E-12	6.97E-10
	PT	3.10E-11	5.32E-11	0	1.26E-11	5.17E-10
Volume (million Euro)	DE	3.49	12.01	0	0	390.50
	FI	8.37	22.29	0	0	255.00
	IT	19.31	38.31	0	5	902.50
	PT	0.87	5.11	0	0	187.50
Trades	DE	0.72	2.47	0	0	71
	FI	1.00	2.57	0	0	29
	IT	3.98	6.94	0	1	124
	PT	0.15	0.78	0	0	30
Spreadendofday	DE	0.0017	0.0137	9.5838E-06	0.0007	1.1108
	FI	0.0024	0.0085	8.5500E-05	0.3088	0.0014
	IT	0.0056	0.0091	2.9900E-05	0.0029	0.3189
	PT	0.1060	0.2035	0.0030	1.9897	0.0617
Benchmarks	country	mean	std	min	median	max
BAS	DE	0.199	0.696	0.001	0.090	202.44
	FI	0.217	0.504	0.004	0.150	62.76
	IT	0.567	0.943	0.002	0.310	162.64
	PT	6.961	16.767	0.050	4.150	538.92
Quoteslope	DE	0.0064	0.0217	0.00003	0.0028	6.2799
	FI	0.0066	0.0152	0.00014	0.0046	0.0066
	IT	0.0180	0.0303	0.00006	0.0100	5.2719
	PT	0.2244	0.5431	0.00155	0.1345	18.2910
Quotesperhour ^A	DE	67	16	37	68	114
	FI	75	12	56	74	113
	IT	76	12	51	76	114
	PT	49	9	35	47	77

(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). Countries: Germany (DE), Finland (FI), Italy (IT) and Portugal (PT). Time period: 2011-2012.


(²) A: Average per bond over the 2 years

Source: MTS, authors' calculations

¹² Due to the market-maker commitments, quotes always are significant in volume terms (multiples of EUR 5 million).

Figure 1 shows boxplots of the high frequency measures hourly average over the trading day and across ISINs for the period 2011-2012. Each box reflects the variation of the hourly-average high-frequency liquidity benchmarks across ISINs and over time for the hour considered. Median, 5th, 25th, 75th, and 95th percentile are shown. Bid-ask spreads and quote slopes are somewhat higher and more dispersed during the first hour of trade. There seems to be slightly more dispersion in the number of quotes per hour between 12 p.m. and 2 p.m. The distribution of the bid-ask spread and the quote slope is clearly non-Gaussian with a very strong skewness, especially in Germany and Italy. No such skewness appears for the number of quotes per hour. In Portugal, there is consistently more active quoting in the afternoon after 1 pm than in the morning.

Figure 1. Box plots of the high frequency benchmarks



(¹) Box plot reflect variation across ISIN and over trading days in the period 2011-2012 for each liquidity benchmark per country at 8 hourly averages over the full trading day (9:00 and 17:20). The last bar reflects averages of measures between 16:00 and 17:20.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations

3 The relationship between liquidity benchmarks and proxies: An empirical investigation

We study the empirical relationship between benchmarks and proxies in several complementary ways. First, in a few examples we consider the extent to which our rankings of various sovereign bonds on the basis of their liquidity can be affected by the liquidity measure we use. Second, we compare and contrast lower-frequency and higher-frequency correlations across pairs of benchmarks and proxies. In particular, we assess the influential approach of assessing liquidity proxies by correlating monthly averages of proxies with monthly averages of benchmarks. Subsequently, we investigate the robustness of our analysis by studying the relationship between benchmarks and proxies in the frequency domain, and also by using MIDAS regressions. Finally, we discuss some of the implications of our findings.

In all the exercises that follow we consider 12 pairs, constructed from the 3 benchmarks and 4 proxies that were selected in Section 2. Amihud price impact, daily number of trades, daily traded volume and end-of-day spread are the four liquidity proxies. As benchmarks, we use the hourly averages of intraday quoted bid-ask spreads, the quote slopes and the number of quotes per hour.

3.1 Assessing liquidity using benchmarks and proxies: Some examples

As discussed earlier, when it comes to the question of using proxies instead of benchmarks the existing literature provides some comforting evidence. One would thus expect to find that our qualitative conclusions and rankings of assets on the basis of their liquidity do not change depending on whether we use benchmarks or proxies. However, this turns out not to be the case.

One example comes from the sovereign bonds of Germany and Finland. If we look at benchmarks (specifically the bid-ask spread and the quote slope) German bonds come out as more liquid than Finnish bonds in our sample and over the time period considered. However, this ranking is reversed if we look at proxies (in particular, Amihud, number of trades, and traded volume), according to which Finnish bonds are more liquid than their German counterparts over the same period.

Additional examples come from a recent market stress period. Specifically, we look at the period of October 31st 2011 to December 23rd 2011, a peak time for the Composite Indicator of Systemic Stress (CISS) of the European Central Bank (see Hollo et al. (2012)). For two of the weeks in that period (namely 11/7/2011-11/11/2011 and 12/5/2011-12/9/2011) if we were to mechanically apply the Amihud measure we would find the Portuguese sovereign bonds to be substantially more liquid than their Italian counterparts according to the Amihud measure, whereas these Italian bonds are vastly more liquid than the Portuguese bonds according to the bid-ask spread, and over the same two weeks. Furthermore, and over the entire crisis period, Italian bonds are clearly less liquid than either German or Finnish bonds according to the benchmarks, while being substantially more liquid than the same German and Finnish bonds over the same period, according to the number of trades and the traded volume. Examples such as the two just mentioned can be particularly troubling, as it is arguably during crisis times when we need accurate liquidity measures and assessments the most.

Such findings do raise a red flag regarding the widespread practice of using benchmarks and proxies interchangeably. However, they are based on particular examples, and could perhaps be viewed as circumstantial. We thus proceed in what follows to a more systematic analysis of these issues.

3.2 Monthly and daily correlations

We calculate the correlations of the monthly averages of the daily proxies and of the intraday benchmarks for the individual bond ISINs over the period 2011-2012 for all four countries, mimicking widespread practices in the existing literature, as discussed earlier. Then we calculate the correlations of the daily proxies with the daily averages of the intraday benchmarks, again for the individual bond ISINs of all countries over the same period. Results are presented in Table 2 for the averages for each pair across all bonds and in Figure 2 for the individual bonds.

The results, summarized in Table 2, are striking. Across countries and across pairs, daily correlations are substantially lower than monthly correlations in almost all cases (with the only exception being the three Amihud pairs for Portugal)¹³. Indeed monthly correlations are on average twice as high (Finland and Italy) or more than twice as high (Germany and Portugal) as the daily correlations.

If we look at levels of correlations, and leaving aside the end-of-day spread proxy for a moment, we observe that for the great majority of benchmark/proxy pairs we have monthly correlations above 20% (in absolute value), while almost none of the respective daily correlations are above 20% (in absolute value)¹⁴. Indeed it is only the pairs including Amihud that have daily correlations which are generally in excess of even 10%.

Furthermore, these results also illustrate how the choice of frequency can be consequential for the best proxy contest: For example, for the case of Germany, and on the basis of monthly correlations, the number of trades per day would be considered the best proxy for the bid-ask spread and the quote slope, while on the basis of daily correlations, Amihud performs better. Another example is Portugal: Volume wins the race on the basis of monthly correlations, whereas if we look at daily correlations the clear winner is Amihud.

When it comes to the proxy “end of the day spread,” note that its correlations with the benchmarks “intraday quoted bid-ask spreads” and “quote slope” can be expected to be very elevated at both the daily and the monthly frequencies. The benchmarks are based on the same variables P_{ask} and P_{bid} as the proxy, and are measured within the day, whereas the proxy is measured at the end of the day. If, as expected, there is persistence in the liquidity measures within the day, the average over the day will be highly correlated with the end of day proxy. The key point to notice here is that even with this proxy, our main empirical finding is confirmed: monthly correlations are substantially higher than their daily counterparts; indeed the average (across cases) ratio of monthly-to-daily correlations is higher with this proxy than with the other three proxies¹⁵.

The panels of Figure 2, which contain the respective individual bond results for all four countries, show that both the magnitude and the sign of differences between monthly and daily level correlations can vary substantially across individual bond ISINs. They also clearly corroborate the above findings: Monthly correlations are generally much higher than their daily counterparts¹⁶. In general, the average country-level patterns of Table 2 discussed above are consistent with what we observe at the individual ISIN level, across all twelve pairs.

¹³ Note that all correlations (both daily and monthly, for all pairs and countries) have the expected sign, except possibly for the pair between Amihud and quotes per hour, which has positive correlations for Germany and Finland, but negative for Italy and Portugal. This finding regarding the Amihud/quotes per hour pair is in line with existing literature (for instance Pelizzon et al. (2013) find that “...under conditions of stress...frequent quote revisions do not necessarily translate into higher liquidity”).

¹⁴ Specifically, we have monthly correlations in excess of 20% for seven out of nine pairs for Germany and Italy, six out of nine pairs for Portugal, and three out of nine for Finland. None of the daily correlations are above 20% for Germany and Finland, while two of them are above 20% for Portugal and Italy.

¹⁵ Note that even if we remove the case of monthly/daily correlations with the benchmark “quotes per hour” for Portugal (whose ratio is very high), the new average (across the remaining cases) ratio for this proxy is about the same as for the Amihud.

¹⁶ Similar to the country-level results, the one exception to this is the three Amihud pairs for Portugal, for which daily correlations are higher for many ISINs.

Table 2. Average correlations between proxies and benchmarks


		Daily				Monthly			
		Amihud	Trades	Volume	Spreadendofday	Amihud	Trades	Volume	Spreadendofday
DE	BAS	0.158	-0.083	-0.066	0.519	0.263	-0.269	-0.223	0.755
	Quoteslope	0.161	-0.082	-0.066	0.518	0.267	-0.268	-0.224	0.754
	Quotesperhour	0.147	0.027	0.020	0.168	0.241	0.039	0.027	0.315
FI	BAS	0.196	-0.047	-0.046	0.512	0.289	-0.069	-0.060	0.731
	Quoteslope	0.198	-0.048	-0.046	0.509	0.291	-0.067	-0.059	0.730
	Quotesperhour	0.110	0.016	0.017	0.053	0.285	0.061	0.063	0.117
IT	BAS	0.329	-0.187	-0.198	0.827	0.654	-0.318	-0.368	0.988
	Quoteslope	0.327	-0.183	-0.195	0.823	0.658	-0.308	-0.360	0.987
	Quotesperhour	-0.047	0.088	0.092	-0.021	-0.114	0.189	0.206	-0.032
PT	BAS	0.391	-0.113	-0.113	0.491	0.252	-0.361	-0.382	0.778
	Quoteslope	0.393	-0.112	-0.113	0.489	0.253	-0.360	-0.382	0.779
	Quotesperhour	-0.147	0.041	0.065	-0.015	-0.082	0.113	0.193	-0.204

(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour).

(²) Countries: Germany (DE), Finland (FI), Italy (IT) and Portugal (PT). Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations


Figure 2.1. Correlations between the liquidity proxies and benchmarks – Germany



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). Correlations have been ranked from low to high monthly correlation for each pair. The order does not necessarily reflect the same ISINs across graphs. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations


Figure 2.2. Correlations between the liquidity proxies and benchmarks – Finland



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). Correlations have been ranked from low to high monthly correlation for each pair. The order does not necessarily reflect the same ISINs across graphs. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations


Figure 2.3. Correlations between the liquidity proxies and benchmarks – Italy



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). Correlations have been ranked from low to high monthly correlation for each pair. The order does not necessarily reflect the same ISINs across graphs. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations

Figure 2.4. Correlations between the liquidity proxies and benchmarks – Portugal



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). Correlations have been ranked from low to high monthly correlation for each pair. The order does not necessarily reflect the same ISINs across graphs. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations

In a nutshell, we find here that correlations between benchmarks and proxies become substantially weaker as the frequency at which such relationships are examined becomes higher¹⁷. These results can be viewed as a warning against extrapolating to disparate contexts the influential practice of distilling the best proxies on the basis of substantial low-frequency correlations (and especially monthly correlations) between proxies and benchmarks. In general, this practice could lead to misleading results and conclusions when it does not give sufficient consideration to the specific context in question that necessitates measuring liquidity in the first place, and especially to the relevant time horizon for conversion into cash. In what follows we conduct a series of exercises whose primary goal is to further assess and robustify the above results and conclusions.

3.3 The frequency domain: Coherences between benchmarks and proxies

We seek here to get a more complete picture of the relationship between liquidity benchmarks and proxies at various frequencies by considering the frequency domain. Specifically, we look at the pairwise coherences between benchmarks and proxies. Using notation such as in Hamilton (1994), we have that the coherence $h_{YX}(\omega)$ at frequency ω between benchmark X and proxy Y is as follows:

$$h_{YX}(\omega) = \frac{[c_{YX}(\omega)]^2 + [q_{YX}(\omega)]^2}{s_{YY}(\omega)s_{XX}(\omega)}$$

where $c_{YX}(\omega)$ is the cospectrum (i.e., the real component of the cross-spectrum) and $q_{YX}(\omega)$ the quadrature spectrum (i.e., the imaginary component of the cross-spectrum) between X and Y, while $s_{YY}(\omega)$, $s_{XX}(\omega)$ are the spectra of Y and X, respectively (both assumed to be different from 0). Thus the coherence accounts for both in-phase and out-of-phase cycles, and if it is large¹⁸ at frequency ω , then it can be said that benchmark X and proxy Y share significant cycles at that frequency.

Figure 3 depicts coherences, based on daily data, for nine pairs of proxies (number of trades, volume, and end-of-day spread) and benchmarks (BAS, quote slope, and quotes per hour), for all four countries, for two bonds per country – the ones having the minimum or maximum benchmark/proxy monthly correlations¹⁹ (as discussed in the previous section). We do not include the coherences based on the Amihud measure. As this variable is highly irregularly spaced, the task of interpreting the coherences, and in particular the task of attributing different frequencies to, say, monthly cycles in a way that would be consistent across bonds would be highly problematic.

Note that each frequency ω is associated with cycles of period $\frac{2\pi}{\omega}$. So, for instance, a month corresponds to a value of about 0.27 to 0.35 (depending on how many trading days we have in a month) in the horizontal axis of these figures.


If there was little loss associated with the strategy discussed earlier of looking at monthly correlations between benchmarks and proxies, then the coherences corresponding to monthly cycles would be high compared to coherences elsewhere. However, this is not the case: Examining all the coherences for all the pairs across benchmark/proxy pairs and countries, we conclude that for the great majority of cases, there are many peaks at various other cycles, which are as high or higher than any peaks observed around the monthly cycle.

¹⁷ Note that this general finding is preserved even if we measure associations between benchmarks and proxies using an alternative measure such as Kendall's tau, that is free of linear correlations' parametric assumptions. These results are available from the authors.

¹⁸ The coherence can be shown to be a number between 0 and 1, assuming that X and Y are covariance-stationary with absolutely summable autocovariance matrices (Hamilton (1994)).

¹⁹ Including here the (hundreds of) figures for all the pairs would take too much space; the remaining figures are available from the authors.


Figure 3.1. Coherence plots of the liquidity measures - Germany



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). For each benchmark/proxy pair the top (bottom) panel represents the individual German sovereign bond with the minimum (maximum) monthly correlation for that pair. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations


Figure 3.2. Coherence plots of the liquidity measures - Finland



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). For each benchmark/proxy pair the top (bottom) panel represents the individual Finnish sovereign bond with the minimum (maximum) monthly correlation for that pair. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations


Figure 3.3: Coherence plots of the liquidity measures - Italy



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). For each benchmark/proxy pair the top (bottom) panel represents the individual Italian sovereign bond with the minimum (maximum) monthly correlation for that pair. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations

Figure 3.4. Coherence plots of the liquidity measures - Portugal



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). For each benchmark/proxy pair the top (bottom) panel represents the individual Portuguese sovereign bond with the minimum (maximum) monthly correlation for that pair. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations

While these exercises in the frequency domain can be viewed as a robustness check on the comparisons between correlations of the previous section, they still suffer from one potentially key deficiency, namely that they are always based on daily observations (or daily averages, for the cases of the benchmarks). We turn to this issue next.

3.4 Modeling the dynamic relationship between benchmarks and proxies: A MIDAS approach

The analysis of the previous sections clearly illustrates how one issue that has been largely ignored in the existing literature, namely the frequency aspect of the various liquidity measures, and in particular the practice of averaging out information, can substantially affect our results and conclusions. Of course, even higher-frequency daily correlations are susceptible to such criticisms as they rely on daily averages of the benchmarks, and thus average out potentially valuable intra-day information. One may think that daily averaging of benchmarks is unavoidable in any investigation of their relationship with proxies, given that proxies are defined at a daily (or lower) frequency.

However, recent econometric literature offers an answer to this and similar challenges encountered when faced with mixed-frequency data. Mixed Data Sampling, or MIDAS regressions (see, e.g., Andreou et al. (2010), Ghysels et al. (2004)) allow us to handle situations where the dependent variable is of a different (lower) frequency than the explanatory variable(s), in a way that is both parsimonious, and data-driven. In this section we look at the dynamic relationship between benchmarks and proxies using MIDAS techniques, which deal with mixed-frequency issues without averaging out (too much) information coming from intra-day data. We employ a MIDAS approach whose low

frequency (for the proxies) is daily and whose high frequency is hourly (so we compute, for every trading day 8 hourly averages of the higher frequency benchmark data²⁰).

More specifically, we estimate standard MIDAS models of the following form:

$$Y_t = \mu + \beta \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} w_{n-i}(\theta) X_{t,n-i} + \varepsilon_t,$$

where t and i are indexes for the lower and higher frequencies, respectively, and $w_{n-i}(\theta)$ are the *MIDAS weights*, a function of unknown parameters θ (to be estimated, together with parameters μ and β , using Nonlinear Least Squares). We consider various weighting functions that are common in the literature. For instance, in the exercises that follow we use an exponential Almon lag polynomial specification: $w_i^{almon}(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \frac{e^{\theta_1 i + \theta_2 i^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^n e^{\theta_1 i + \theta_2 i^2}}$.

We estimate the above specification for all twelve pairs of benchmarks and proxies discussed above, and for all countries and all possible bonds per pair. The panels of Figure 4 present the R^2 s per bond, for all the pairs, for the four countries. The R^2 s vary, but are very low in general²¹.

One can usefully think of these MIDAS regressions as revisiting the daily correlations discussed earlier in a way that does not discard (too much) high-frequency information of the benchmarks²². Theoretical results established in the literature (Andreou et al. (2010)) imply in our context that when we replace daily averages of benchmarks with the benchmarks themselves, we gain in asymptotic efficiency. This is likely to lead to higher R^2 s as well in regressions with finite samples. Indeed, thinking in terms of univariate regressions at the daily frequency, one could make the case that the daily correlations presented earlier are so low, because of the argument in Andreou et al. (2010): We average out the high frequency variable. With our MIDAS regressions we remove this averaging, but we still get R^2 s that are very low. So, we robustify here our earlier results of low daily correlations.

We can make this statement that the " R^2 s are very low" more specific to our context by considering for each of our 48 country/pair cases the medians of the ratios, computed for all bonds, of the R^2 s from these MIDAS regressions to the squares of the daily correlations. The country averages of these median ratios are about five times lower than their counterpart ratios of the squares of the monthly correlations over the squares of the daily correlations²³.


²⁰ While constructing hourly averages entails some loss, averaging out some information is inevitable in a MIDAS context given the highly irregular frequencies of the raw benchmark data.

²¹ The exceptions are the pairs "end of the day spread"/"intraday quoted bid-ask spreads" and "end of the day spread"/"quote slope" whose R^2 s are expected to be high, for the reasons discussed in Section 3.2.

²² We still discard high frequency information, since we are employing hourly averages of the benchmarks.

²³ Note that this is true even for the "end of the day spread", for three of the four countries. The exception is Italy, for which this ratio is (only) slightly less than 1.


Figure 4.1. R^2 's of MIDAS regressions – Germany



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). R^2 's have been ranked from high to low for each pair. The order does not necessarily reflect the same ISINs across graphs. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations


Figure 4.2. R^2 's of MIDAS regressions – Finland



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). R^2 's have been ranked from high to low for each pair. The order does not necessarily reflect the same ISINs across graphs. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations


Figure 4.3. R^2 's of MIDAS regressions – Italy



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). R^2 's have been ranked from high to low for each pair. The order does not necessarily reflect the same ISINs across graphs. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations

Figure 4.4. R²'s of MIDAS regressions – Portugal



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). R²'s have been ranked from high to low for each pair. The order does not necessarily reflect the same ISINs across graphs. Time period: 2011-2012.


Source: MTS, authors' calculations

It would also be interesting to examine the intraday MIDAS weights and look for evidence of possible patterns in the within-day relationship between benchmarks and proxies. After all, there is evidence (see Pelizzon et al. (2013)) on the existence of intraday patterns of individual liquidity measures. Figure 5 provides a sample of plots of such weights for bonds having the minimum or maximum benchmark/proxy monthly correlations (as discussed in

Section 3.2).²⁴ The MIDAS weights are on the vertical axis, and hours (eight per trading day on the horizontal axis). Upon examining all the figures (for all bonds, countries and pairs), we conclude that there is a wide spectrum of intra-day patterns in these weights, with no strong regularity in the weight patterns observed across benchmark/proxy pairs and countries.²⁵

One key message from the above exercises is that even when the intra-day variability of liquidity benchmark measures is accounted for, the empirical evidence on a possible relationship between benchmarks and proxies remains very weak. Indeed, these results, in conjunction with the results from the correlations exercises above, suggest that the empirical relationship between benchmarks and proxies becomes weaker as the frequency over which this relationship is examined becomes higher.

Figure 5.1. MIDAS weights-Germany




(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). MIDAS weights are on the vertical axis, and hours (eight per trading day) on the horizontal axis. For each benchmark/proxy pair the top (bottom) panel represents the individual German sovereign bond with the minimum (maximum) monthly correlation for that pair. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations

²⁴ As in the previous section with the coherence figures, including the (hundreds of) figures for all the pairs would take too much space; the remaining figures are available from the authors.

²⁵ Regarding possible patterns or stylized facts that emerge from these figures, the following can be said: First, and for the cases of Finland, Germany, and Italy, weights with higher magnitudes tend to appear more in the first half of the trading day than in the second half, whereas for Portugal the weights are about evenly split. Second, for Italy and for Portugal, there is a majority of panels where there is more than one non-zero weights. Conversely, for Finland, there is a clear majority of panels where there is only one non-zero weight. Finally, the respective results for Germany are more evenly split.


Figure 5.2. MIDAS weights – Finland



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). MIDAS weights are on the vertical axis, and hours (eight per trading day) on the horizontal axis. For each benchmark/proxy pair the top (bottom) panel represents the individual Finish sovereign bond with the minimum (maximum) monthly correlation for that pair. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations


Figure 5.3. MIDAS weights - Italy



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). MIDAS weights are on the vertical axis, and hours (eight per trading day) on the horizontal axis. For each benchmark/proxy pair the top (bottom) panel represents the individual Italian sovereign bond with the minimum (maximum) monthly correlation for that pair. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations

Figure 5.4. MIDAS weights - Portugal



(¹) Liquidity proxies: (i) Amihud (ii) daily volume (Volume) (iii) daily number of trades (Trades) and, (iv) end of the day spread (Spreadendofday). Liquidity benchmarks: (i) bid ask spread (BAS) (ii) quote slope (Quoteslope) (iii) number of quotes per hour (Quotesperhour). MIDAS weights are on the vertical axis, and hours (eight per trading day) on the horizontal axis. For each benchmark/proxy pair the top (bottom) panel represents the individual German sovereign bond with the minimum (maximum) monthly correlation for that pair. Time period: 2011-2012.

Source: MTS, authors' calculations

Overall, it is quite clear by now that the frequency issue is crucial; for instance, and as discussed earlier, proxies should not be considered as adequate substitutes for benchmarks regardless of the time frame considered. This is a realization that is not evident in the existing literature and which could have some significant policy implications, especially in the context of the current Basel III/LCR framework. We turn to a brief discussion of such implications next.

3.5 Implications of the results

These results have implications for findings in the liquidity literature, for policy tasks related to banking regulation and supervision and for banks' liquidity management. As banks' LCR liquidity buffers may only be used in case of financial instability and require conversion into cash in a matter of days during stressed market conditions, any accurate approach to assessing assets and asset classes that qualify as (extremely) high quality and liquid needs to take account of higher frequency dynamics and behavior under market stress conditions. Those conditions are particularly badly captured by correlations of monthly aggregates, as monthly aggregates average out higher-frequency information that is relevant when there is a need to sell assets within a short timeframe and under non-average conditions.

Liquidity proxies should not be assessed in a general and abstract way, but rather against the particular needs of the context in question; the specific reasons that call for liquidity measurement in the first place need to be examined. The relevant timeframe for conversion into cash needs to be considered so as to take account of the appropriate degree of higher frequency dynamics. This is likely to be particularly relevant in the currently evolving context of Basel III/LCR.

4 Conclusions

One central goal of the expansive literature on liquidity is to identify good measures of liquidity per se. This goal has acquired increased significance in the last few years, in the wake of the financial crisis and the new Basel requirements on banks. Much of the recent literature has approached this task by investigating the relationship between benchmarks and proxies through monthly (or even lower-frequency) correlations. In this paper we critically assess such standard practices. We compare correlations between (monthly and daily averages of) proxies and benchmarks, we look at their coherences as well, and also we propose MIDAS regressions as a way of investigating the bilateral relationships between proxies and benchmarks without averaging out potentially valuable intra-day information.

We demonstrate that higher-frequency information that is ignored by the influential practice of considering monthly averages is actually consequential in the sovereign bond context, and that the relationship between such liquidity benchmarks and proxies can become substantially thinner as the frequency becomes higher. Thus, such standard practices for assessing liquidity proxies - and ceteris paribus for assessing the liquidity of assets and asset classes - may lead to misleading conclusions on liquidity when, for instance, there is a need to convert sovereign bonds into cash within a short amount of time. In general, any liquidity proxies need to be assessed against the particular needs and timeframe of the liquidity context being considered.

References

- Aitken, M. and C. Comerton-Forde, 2003. "How should liquidity be measured?" *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 11 (1): 45–59.
- Amihud, Y., 2002. "Illiquidity and stock returns: cross-section and time-series effects." *Journal of Financial Markets* 5 (1): 31–56.
- Andreou, Ghysels, and Kourtellos, 2010. "Regression models with mixed sampling frequencies," *Journal of Econometrics*, 158, 246–261.
- Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, 2013. "The Liquidity Coverage Ratio and Liquidity Risk Monitoring Tools." <http://www.bis.org/publ/bcbs238.htm>.
- Beber, A., M. Brandt, and K. Kavajecz, 2009. "Flight-to-Quality or Flight-to-Liquidity? Evidence from the Euro-Area Bond Market." *Review of Financial Studies* 22 (3): 925–957.
- Chung, K.H and H. Zhang, 2014. "A simple approximation of intraday spreads using daily data", *Journal of Financial Markets*, 17, 94–120.
- Dobrev and Szerzen, 2010. "The Information Content of High-Frequency Data for Estimating Equity Return Models and Forecasting Risk," *Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System International Finance Discussion Papers* Number 1005, September 2010.
- Dunne, P., M. Moore, and R. Portes, 2006. "European government bond markets: Transparency, liquidity, efficiency." Centre for European Policy Research, May 2006. <http://qcite.qub.ac.uk/handle/123456789/12811>.
- Earne J. and L. Sherk, 2013. "Funding." *The New Microfinance Handbook: A Financial Market System Perspective*, J. Ledgerwood, with J. Earne and C. Nelson (eds.), Chapter 16.
- European Banking Authority (2013a). "Report on Impact Assessment for Liquidity Measures under Article 509 (1) of the CRR," December 20.
- European Banking Authority, (2013b), "Report on appropriate uniform definitions of extremely high quality liquid assets (extremely HQLA) and high quality liquid assets (HQLA) and on operational requirements for liquid assets under Article 509(3) and (5) CRR," *European Banking Authority Report*, December 2013 (<http://www.eba.europa.eu/documents/10180/16145/EBA+BS+2013+413+Report+on+definition+of+HQLA.pdf>).
- Fong, K., C. Holden, and C. Trzcinka, 2011. "What Are The Best Liquidity Proxies For Global Research?" http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1558447.
- Galliani, C., G. Petrella and A. Resti, 2013. "The liquidity of European corporate and government bonds: drivers and sensitivity to different market conditions," <http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/111111111/32394/1/lbna26498enn.pdf>
- Ghysels, Santa-Clara and Valkanov, 2004. "The MIDAS touch: mixed data sampling regression models," *Discussion Paper, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and UCLA*.
- Goyenko, R., C Holden, and C. Trzcinka, 2009. "Do liquidity measures measure liquidity?" *Journal of Financial Economics* 92 (2): 153–181.
- Hamilton, James D., 1994: *Time Series Analysis*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Holden, C., 2009. "New low-frequency spread measures." *Journal of Financial Markets* 12 (4): 778–813.
- Hollo, D., M. Kremer and M. Lo Duca, 2012. "CISS - A Composite Indicator of Systemic Stress in the Financial System," *ECB Working Paper No. 1426*, March.
- De Jong, F. and J. Driessen, 2012. "Liquidity risk premia in corporate bond markets." *The Quarterly Journal of Finance* 2 (02). <http://www.worldscientific.com/doi/pdf/10.1142/S2010139212500061>.

Korajczyk and Sadka, 2007. "Pricing the commonality across alternative measures of liquidity," *mimeo*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.900363>.

Lesmond, D. and C. Trzcinka, 1999. "A New Estimate of Transaction Costs." *Review of Financial Studies*. doi:10.1093/rfs/12.5.1113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/rfs/12.5.1113>.

Pelizzon, L., M.G. Subrahmanyam, D. Tomio and J. Uno. 2013. "The Microstructure of the European Sovereign Bond Market: A Study of the Euro-zone Crisis," *mimeo*, *Copenhagen Business School*.

Roll, R., 1984. "A simple implicit measure of the effective bid-ask spread in an efficient market." *Journal of Finance*: 1127–1139.

Schestag, R, P. Schuster, and M. Uhrig-Homburg, 2013. "Measuring Liquidity in Bond Markets", <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2328370>

List of abbreviations and definitions

LCR Liquidity Coverage Ratio

MIDAS Mixed Data Sampling

MTS Mercato Telematico dei Titoli di Stato

List of figures

Figure 1. Box plots of the high frequency benchmarks.	9
Figure 2.1. Correlations between the liquidity proxies and benchmarks – Germany	13
Figure 2.2. Correlations between the liquidity proxies and benchmarks – Finland.....	14
Figure 2.3. Correlations between the liquidity proxies and benchmarks – Italy	15
Figure 2.4. Correlations between the liquidity proxies and benchmarks – Portugal.	16
Figure 3.1. Coherence plots of the liquidity measures - Germany	18
Figure 3.2. Coherence plots of the liquidity measures - Finland.....	19
Figure 3.3. Coherence plots of the liquidity measures - Italy	20
Figure 3.4. Coherence plots of the liquidity measures - Portugal.....	21
Figure 4.1. R ² 's of MIDAS regressions – Germany.	23
Figure 4.2. R ² 's of MIDAS regressions – Finland	24
Figure 4.3. R ² 's of MIDAS regressions – Italy.....	25
Figure 4.4. R ² 's of MIDAS regressions – Portugal	26
Figure 5.1. MIDAS weights.-Germany	27
Figure 5.2. MIDAS weights.- Finland.....	28
Figure 5.3. MIDAS weights.- Italy.	29
Figure 5.4. MIDAS weights.- Portugal	30

List of tables

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of liquidity measures.	8
Table 2. Average correlations between proxies and benchmarks	12

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union
Free phone number (*): 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11
(*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet.
It can be accessed through the Europa server <http://europa.eu>

How to obtain EU publications

Our publications are available from EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>),
where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents.
You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

JRC Mission

As the science and knowledge service of the European Commission, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to support EU policies with independent evidence throughout the whole policy cycle.



EU Science Hub
ec.europa.eu/jrc



@EU_ScienceHub



EU Science Hub - Joint Research Centre



Joint Research Centre



EU Science Hub

