DIW BERLIN

2033

Discussion Papers

The Energy-Price Channel of (European) Monetary Policy

Gökhan Ider, Alexander Kriwoluzky, Frederik Kurcz and Ben Schumann

Opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect views of the institute.

The energy-price channel of (European) monetary policy[*]

Gökhan Ider[†] Alexander Kriwoluzky[‡] Frederik Kurcz[§] Ben Schumann [¶]

March 9, 2023

Abstract

This study examines whether central banks can combat inflation that is caused by rising energy prices. By using a high-frequency event study and a Structural Vector Autoregression, we find evidence that the European Central Bank (ECB) and the Federal Reserve (Fed) are capable of doing so by affecting domestic and global energy prices. This "energy-price channel" of monetary policy plays an important role in the transmission mechanism of monetary policy. As many major sources of energy, such as oil, are priced in dollars, fluctuations in the domestic exchange rate vis-a-vis the dollar crucially shapes the transmission of monetary policy to energy prices. On the one hand an appreciation of the euro against the dollar lowers local energy prices (in euro) through cheaper imports. On the other hand lower import prices raise energy demand and thereby increase global energy prices (in dollars). Our counterfactual analysis demonstrates that both effects are present, but the latter effect is stronger than the former.

Keywords: inflation, energy prices, monetary policy transmission mechanism
JEL Codes: C22, E31, E52, Q43

[†]DIW Berlin, Mohrenstrasse 58, 10117 Berlin, gider@diw.de
[‡]Corresponding author: DIW Berlin, Mohrenstrasse 58, 10117 Berlin, Germany, and Freie Universität Berlin, Garystraße 21, 14195 Berlin, Germany, akriwoluzky@diw.de, +49 30 89789 430.
[§]DIW Berlin, Mohrenstrasse 58, 10117 Berlin, fkurcz@diw.de
[¶]DIW Berlin, Mohrenstrasse 58, 10117 Berlin, bschumann@diw.de

1 Introduction

Inflation has recently made a comeback, with a sharp rise in 2021, particularly after Russia's invasion of Ukraine, as shown in Figure 1. One key debate in the euro area has been about whether the ECB's instruments are effective in this situation, given that energy prices are the main driver of inflation. Those who argue that monetary policy is ineffective against energy-price driven inflation often suggest that the euro area should be considered a small open economy (SOE) in the global energy market, where changes in its demand would not affect the price of energy goods globally.[1] Furthermore, they contend that the demand for energy is independent of monetary policy, as households require heating and transportation. Additionally, while an appreciation of the euro against the dollar may lead to cheaper import prices of oil and other energy goods, which are largely traded in dollars, there is a strong doubt that this price decrease will be passed on to consumers due to market frictions. In contrast, this debate has not taken place in the United States (US) where it is assumed that monetary policy has an effect on the global price of energy goods.

In this paper, we investigate the role of energy prices for the transmission of monetary policy empirically. In line with the discussion, we focus on the euro area as the centre of the debate, and use the US mainly as a reference point. We begin with a high-frequency event study, where we regress changes in the oil price on monetary policy surprises, using both US and euro area data. In this study and throughout the paper, we use the crude oil price as a stand-in for global energy prices, due to the dominant role of oil in the global generation of energy. We find that a monetary policy tightening in both currency areas decreases the global oil price, with the effect being similar in magnitude. This finding suggests that, like the US, the euro area is not a small open economy and that both have an impact on the global price of energy goods. To examine the role of the exchange rate in the euro area, we add an interaction term of monetary policy surprises and the EUR-USD exchange rate changes to the regression. Interestingly, we find that the coefficient is significant and positive, indicating that while the appreciated euro leads to lower local prices in the euro area, the stimulated demand for oil in the euro area pushes up the global price.

To differentiate between the countervailing effects at work and quantify the importance of the change in energy prices for the transmission of monetary policy, we first estimate a Bayesian proxy structural Vector Autoregression (VAR) model for the euro area. The model includes an interest rate, the industrial production index, the headline consumer price index, the energy price index, a credit spread, the Brent oil price as well as the EUR-USD exchange rate. We then estimate a similar VAR model for the US to contextualize the results for the

---

[1]When describing the ECB's New Area Wide model Christoffel, Coenen, and Warne (2008) state: "...the estimated version maintains the simplifying assumption that the euro area is a small open economy, motivated by the aforementioned fact that the ECB/Eurosystem staff projections are made conditional on assumptions regarding external developments.".

Figure 1: Energy prices drive euro area inflation

euro area. The results show that the energy price indeces respond more strongly than the headline price index, suggesting that energy prices play an essential role in the transmission of monetary policy through the energy-price channel in the euro area as well as in the US.

Importantly, the identified VAR model allows us to conduct counterfactual experiments to distinguish between the different ways the energy-price channel works in the euro area. In the first counterfactual experiment, we ask what the effects of an ECB monetary policy shock would be if the global energy price does not respond to the monetary tightening. Comparing the counterfactual scenario to the baseline impulse responses allows us to assess the implications of the SOE assumption for the euro area. In the second counterfactual scenario, we assume that the euro does not appreciate against the dollar after an ECB monetary policy tightening. By doing so we estimate the net effect that the euro appreciation has on the local (import) and the global (market) energy prices. Notably, the response of the global oil price in this counterfactual is larger and the decline of the HICP energy price index is stronger than in the baseline VAR model. Hence, "the global price effect of the exchange rate", i.e. the change in the global price of oil that stems from a stronger demand in the euro area due to its appreciated exchange rate, outweighs the effect of lower local prices due to the exchange rate pass-through. This result is corroborated by a third counterfactual scenario, in which we constrain the counterfactual response of the global oil price response to equal to its estimated impulse response from the VAR model, while at the same time assuming that the exchange rate does not appreciate. The counterfactual impulse response functions of the euro area energy price index and the headline CPI decline less in line with the exchange rate pass-through intuition. Therefore, we conclude that there indeed is a "local price effect of the

exchange rate" in place, in other words, the cheaper import prices in the euro area due to an appreciation of the euro is passed on to the consumer.

The results of the SVAR model and the counterfactual exercises show that (i) the response of the global oil price to a euro area monetary tightening is sizable and negative, which contradicts the SOE assumption for the euro area; (ii) the global price effect of the exchange rate, i.e. the price effect that is a result of the increased energy demand in the euro area due to the appreciation of the euro, is important and dominates the local price effect of the exchange rate; (iii) the appreciation of the euro against the dollar is passed through to consumer energy prices in the euro area, thus the local price effect of the exchange rate is present. We conclude that the observed fall in the global oil price stems from a simple decline in energy demand in the economy alongside the fact that neither the US nor the euro area is a small open economy, as the global oil price falls after an ECB monetary tightening despite the positive effect of the euro appreciation.

Lastly we demonstrate that the energy price channel also has an international dimension as it shapes the international spillovers of monetary policy. In particular, we show that because a monetary policy tightening by the Fed lowers global energy prices, prices for energy goods in the euro area decline despite the dollar appreciation. In a counterfactual scenario where the energy-price channel is absent, the fall in euro area energy prices and headline price level induced by the Fed tightening is found to be smaller.

This paper is related to the literature on the intersection of monetary policy and energy prices. While there exists a vast literature on the macroeconomic effects of energy price shocks and their implications for monetary policy, research on how monetary policy impacts energy prices is notably scarce. A seminal work in this literature is Bernanke et al. (1997), who study the role of monetary policy in postwar US business cycles and its interaction with oil price shocks. More recently, there has been a growing interest in how monetary policy can respond to energy-driven inflation. Gornemann, Hildebrand, and Kuester (2022) argue, through the lens of a standard New Keynesian model of a small open economy, that there is a strong case for a central bank to focus on the headline inflation rate instead of the core inflation rate in an environment of scarce energy. Degasperi, Hong, and Ricco (2023) study the global transmission of US monetary policy, and show that commodity and oil prices decline in response to a contractionary monetary policy shock by the Fed.

This paper makes two novel contributions to this literature. First, we document that contractionary ECB monetary policy decreases the global oil price, which, in turn, lowers energy and consumer prices in the euro area. The energy-price channel is a previously unreported, and yet an important channel of ECB monetary policy transmission. Second, we show that the EUR-USD exchange rate is an important determinant for the impact of ECB policy on the global oil price and the domestic energy prices in the euro area. This also is a previously

undocumented transmission channel of ECB monetary policy through the exchange rate. Although our findings are based on empirical evidence for the euro area economy, our first contribution theoretically holds for any economy that is not a SOE in the global markets (as shown for the US economy), and our second contribution theoretically applies to any economy that is not a SOE with a currency other than the US dollar. Moreover, this paper contributes to the literature on the spillovers of US monetary policy (Georgiadis, 2016; Dedola, Rivolta, and Stracca, 2017; Breitenlechner, Georgiadis, and Schumann, 2022; Degasperi, Hong, and Ricco, 2023) by quantifying, through counterfactual scenarios, the importance of the energy-price channel for the transmission of US monetary policy spillovers to the euro area inflation dynamics.

The paper is structured in the following way. Section 2 sets out a simple model to illustrate how the energy channel of monetary policy can influence the economy in theory. In Section 3, we establish that US as well as euro area monetary policy shocks influence the global oil price in a high-frequency study. The following Section 4 investigates how this effect plays out in a dynamic setting. Afterwards, in Section 5, we distinguish between the different effects monetary policy in the euro area has on energy prices by estimating different counterfactual scenarios. In Section 6, we investigate the international aspect of the energy-price channel by considering the spillover effects of US monetary policy to the euro area. The final section concludes.

2 A stylized open economy model with energy imports

This section presents a simple open economy to illustrate through which the energy-price channel of monetary policy can influence the economy. The starting point is a standard closed economy, three equation New-Keynesian model for the home economy H.

$$y_{H,t} = \mathbf{E}_t(y_{H,t+1}) - \frac{1}{\sigma_\nu}\left(i_{H,t} - \mathbf{E}_t(\pi^C_{H,t+1})\right) \tag{1}$$

$$\pi_{H,t} = \beta\mathbf{E}_t(\pi_{H,t+1}) + \kappa_\nu y_{H,t} \tag{2}$$

$$i_{H,t} = \phi(\pi^C_{H,t}) + \epsilon_{i,t} \tag{3}$$

Equations (1) and (2) are the standard log-linearized dynamic IS and New-Keynesian Phillips curve block, with $y_{H,t}$ denoting (domestic) output, $i_{H,t}$ the nominal interest rate of the home central bank, $\pi_{H,t}$ the inflation rate of the domestically produced goods and $\pi^C_{H,t+1}$ the inflation rate of the aggregate consumption basket defined below.

We complement the closed economy model with a highly stylized open economy dimension, where we assume that the home country H imports energy goods from the foreign country F. The *global* market price of these energy goods —expressed in foreign currency— is denoted by

$p_{F,t}^{E,global}$, whereas the exchange rate is denoted by e_t. We express the exchange rate as amounts of foreign currency per unit of domestic currency, such that an increase of e_t corresponds to an appreciation of the domestic currency.

$$p_{H,t}^{E,local} = p_{F,t}^{E,global} - \alpha_1 e_t \tag{4}$$

$$p_{H,t}^{C} = n(p_{F,t}^{E,local}) + (1-n)p_{H,t} \tag{5}$$

$$y_{H,t}^{E} = \alpha_2(p_{H,t}^{C} - p_{F,t}^{E,local}) + \alpha_3 y_{H,t} \tag{6}$$

$$p_{F,t}^{E,global} = \alpha_4 y_{H,t}^{E} + \gamma y_{F,t}^{E} \tag{7}$$

$$\mathbf{E}(e_{t+1}) - e_t = i_{F,t} - \alpha_5 i_{H,t} \tag{8}$$

Equation 4 defines the *local* price of energy import goods, which is measured in the home currency. Here, $\alpha_1 \in (0,1)$ measures the degree of exchange rate pass-through. If $\alpha_1 = 1$ all energy goods are priced and sticky in the foreign currency, which corresponds to the producer currency pricing (PCP) paradigm. If $\alpha_1 < 1$, some of the energy goods are priced and sticky in the home currency, which limits the impact the exchange rate has on the *local* import price. Equation 5 is the price of the aggregate home consumption basket where n defines the proportion of the basket that corresponds to the energy imports. Equation 6 defines the home country´s demand for energy imports as a function of the overall activity and the relative price. In order to keep the model tractable and circumvent the need to model the foreign economy explicitly we assume that the global price of energy —measured in foreign currency— is an upward sloping function of the home country's $y_{H,t}^{E}$ and foreign country's $y_{F,t}^{E}$ energy demand as shown in 7. Lastly Equation 8 is a standard UIP equation, which implies that the home currency appreciates if the home central bank increases its interest rates as long as $\alpha_5 > 0$.

This minimal set of equation allows us to flesh out the assumptions underlying the different channels through which a central bank can influence global and local energy prices. From Equation 6 it becomes clear that a sufficient condition for the central bank to be able to affect the global energy price is the assumption that $\alpha_4 \neq 0$. In this case, as the country is not a small open economy, changes in the home country's economic activity ($y_{H,t}$) due to a monetary policy shock influence global energy prices ($p_{F,t}^{E,global}$). More precisely, a rise in interest rates, which causes a fall in domestic activity and thereby leads to a fall in the demand for energy as long as energy consumption is somewhat proportional to economic activity (i.e. $\alpha_3 > 0$). This activity implied fall in the demand for energy causes a fall in the global price of energy.

Moreover, the rise in the interest rate leads to an appreciation of the exchange rate as long as $\alpha_5 > 0$. This appreciation has two, possibly opposing effects with respect to the local energy price and also drives a wedge between the evolution of the local and the global energy

price. First, an appreciation of the exchange rates lowers the local energy price irrespective of the global price as long as there is some exchange rate pass-through (i.e. $\alpha_1 > 0$). This is the "local price effect of the exchange rate". Second, this fall in the local price transmits to an increase in the home country's energy demand if the demand for energy is not completely price inelastic (i.e. $\alpha_2 > 0$). This causes an increase in the global price of energy, which puts upward pressure on the local price. This is the "global price effect of the exchange rate".

Table 1 summarizes the model assumption necessary in order for the central bank to be able to influence the global and local energy prices.

Effect on global price	Large open Economy ($\alpha_4 \neq 0$) + Elastic demand (α_2 & $\alpha_3 \neq 0$)
Effect on local price	FX-pass-through ($\alpha_1 \neq 0$) + FX appreciation ($\alpha_5 \neq 0$)

Table 1: Necessary assumptions for a central bank to influence global and local energy prices.

3 Monetary policy and oil prices - a high frequency analysis

In this section, we analyze whether US and euro area monetary policy surprises have an impact on the global oil price, specifically the Brent crude oil price, which we use as a stand-in for the global energy price in our model.[2] In order to establish a point of reference, we start with the US monetary policy event study. Most researchers would agree that the US is a large open economy and if any monetary policy decisions should affect the global oil price, it would have to be the ones by the Federal Reserve. Afterwards, we repeat the exercise with European data and add changes of the EUR-USD exchange rate to the regression to investigate its effect on the global oil price as well.

3.1 High-frequency data for the US and the euro area

We construct a measure of the monetary policy surprise along the lines of Jarociński and Karadi (2020) and use it as a proxy for the monetary policy shock. We follow Jarociński and Karadi (2020) for the subsequent reasons. First, the maturity of the interest rate futures used to measure the policy surprise is the same for the US and the euro area: the three month Overnight Index Swap (OIS) rate for the ECB, and the three-month-ahead federal funds future rate for the FED.[3] Second, the authors introduce a simple method, the "poor man's sign restrictions", to purge the surprises of any central bank information effects to generate

---

[2]In the appendix B.1 we show that results are robust to using the natural gas price (Dutch TTF) instead of the Brent oil price.

[3]The intraday variation in the three month OIS rate around ECB policy announcements is provided by the EA-MPD database from Altavilla et al. (2019). The intraday variation in the three-month-ahead federal funds future rate around FOMC announcements is provided by Gürkaynak, Sack, and Swanson (2005).

"pure" monetary policy surprises.[4] Third, this method is well established and commonly used in the literature, and does not require an individual specification for each country. Following the seminal work of Gürkaynak, Sack, and Swanson (2005), we measure the US monetary policy surprises over a 30-minute window around the FOMC announcement. Analogously to the Fed, we use the same tight window around ECB policy announcements.

We use tick data from the Refinitiv Tick History database to compute the variation in the Brent crude oil price in the narrow windows around the ECB's and the Fed's policy announcements. More precisely, we measure the price variation in the ICE Brent crude oil front-month futures (LCOc1), which is the benchmark global spot price quoted in the financial news, and has the highest liquidity. We closely follow the methodology outlined in the online appendix of Altavilla et al. (2019) to measure a pre- and post-announcement price. For the euro area, we additionally use the Dollar-euro exchange rate variation around policy announcements of the ECB.

3.2 Event study for US monetary policy

In order to study the effects of US monetary policy on global oil prices, we estimate the following high-frequency event study regression:

$$p_t = \alpha + \beta mps_t + \epsilon_t \tag{9}$$

where p_t is the variation in the Brent crude oil price, and mps_t is the FED monetary policy surprise for each FOMC announcement in day t. Table 2 presents the results for the FED event study regressions (Equation 9) with different policy surprises. The first column is for the regression with the "pure" monetary policy surprise (three-month-ahead federal funds future rate with "poor man's sign restrictions") as in Jarociński and Karadi (2020). The second column is for the regression with the orthogonalized policy surprise from Bauer and Swanson (2022). The event study regressions cover the longest sample that data is available for. Due to the availability of high frequency data on the ICE Brent crude oil front-month futures (LCOc1), the sample starts in 1996 and spans the period where policy surprises are available for both countries.[5]

---

[4]Additionally, as a robustness check for the event study regression for the Fed, we use the orthogonalized monetary policy surprises provided by Bauer and Swanson (2022). Regrettably, this design of monetary policy surprises is not available for the ECB policy announcements (yet).

[5]Intraday variations in both FED monetary policy surprises are available until December 2019. Furthermore, we exclude the few event days early in the sample where there are no LCOc1 trades in the tight window around the FOMC announcement.

	mps^{pm}_{FF4}	$mps^{\perp}$
$\hat{\beta}$	-2.15^{**}	-2.23^{***}
	(1.01)	(0.83)
R^2 (%)	2.21	3.21
Sample	1996:1-2019:12	1996:1-2019:12
N	187	187

Table 2: Coefficient estimates β from the Brent crude oil price event study regressions equation $p_t = \alpha + \beta mps_t + \epsilon_t$, where t indexes FOMC announcements.
Notes: Each column represents the use of a different monetary policy surprise as a regressor. mps^{pm}_{FF4} is the change in the three-month-ahead federal funds future rate (FF4) with poor man's sign restrictions as in Jarociński and Karadi (2020). $mps^{\perp}$ is the orthogonalized monetary policy surprise uncorrelated with macroeconomic and financial data observed before the FOMC announcement from Bauer and Swanson (2022). Heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors are reported in parentheses.

We find that a contractionary monetary policy surprise by the FED decreases the global oil price. The coefficient, $\hat{\beta}$, is negative and significantly different from zero. This finding documents, as expected, that the US is not a small open economy in the global oil market, but an important player in the market.

3.3 Event study for the euro area

Does the result for the US carry over to the euro area? To answer this question we estimate a high-frequency event study regression for the ECB of the form:

$$p_t = \alpha + \beta mps_t + \phi mps_t e_t + \epsilon_t \tag{10}$$

where p_t is the intraday variation in the Brent crude oil price, mps_t is the "pure" ECB monetary policy surprise (i.e. poor man's three month OIS rate), and e_t is the intraday variation in the EUR-USD exchange rate for the tight window around the ECB policy announcement on day t.[6] Additional to the monetary policy surprise as a regressor, we include an interaction term for the monetary policy surprise with the intra-daily EUR-USD exchange rate variation around the policy decision in order to analyze the role of the EUR-USD exchange rate. We include the exchange rate surprise as an interaction term because it is a function of the monetary policy surprise. Therefore, simply augmenting the regression equation with

---

[6]We follow Jarociński and Karadi (2020) and exclude the three coordinated rate cuts among major central banks in our sample.

the EUR-USD as an independent regressor would yield biased estimates. In Appendix B.1 we show that the coefficient for the linear term β remains statistically significant when excluding the exchange rate interaction term as in our US specification.

Table 3 presents the results for the event study regression for the ECB (Equation 10) for different sample periods. The first column is for the longest sample that the data is available for the ECB monetary policy surprises. The second column is for the sample excluding the pandemic period. The third column is for a sample that starts in January 2002, as Altavilla et al. (2019), Andrade and Ferroni (2021), and Kerssenfischer (2022) exclude the sample prior to 2002 due to liquidity concerns for the euro area OIS contracts.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
$\hat{\beta}$	−2.05**	−1.69**	−2.51**
	(0.83)	(0.83)	(1.22)
$\hat{\phi}$	4.06***	4.17***	3.94***
	(0.70)	(0.69)	(1.35)
R^2 (%)	3.00	2.78	3.58
Sample	1999:1-2021:12	1999:1-2019:12	2002:1 - 2021:12
N	278	262	212

Table 3: Coefficient estimates β and ϕ from the Brent crude oil price event study regression equation $p_t = \alpha + \beta mps_t + \phi mps_t e_t + \epsilon_t$ where t indexes ECB policy announcements.
Notes: Each column presents the event study regression for a different sample period. mps_t is the high frequency change in the three month Overnight Index Swap (OIS) rate with poor man's sign restrictions as in Jarociński and Karadi (2020). Heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors are reported in parentheses.

We find, first, that a contractionary monetary policy surprise by the ECB leads to a decline in the global oil price. Interestingly, the size of the effect is of similar magnitude as for US monetary policy. Therefore, not only is the euro area not a small open economy, but, on the global oil market, it has an influence comparable to the one of the US. A second result is the significantly positive coefficient of the interaction term for monetary policy and the change in the exchange rate.[7] This result suggests that the global price effect of the exchange rate change is at work, as demand increases due to cheaper import prices after an appreciation of the Euro vis-a-vis the Dollar, which in turn leads to higher global oil prices.

---

[7]As a robustness check, we additionally estimate the same event study regressions replacing the EUR/USD exchange rate with the US Dollar index (DXY) to capture the total variation in the US-Dollar in the narrow event window around the ECB policy announcement. The results are robust to this specification.

4 The energy-price channel in a dynamic setting

Section 3 shows that US as well as euro area monetary policy have an immediate impact on the global oil price. In this section, we investigate how the immediate effects play out dynamically and whether they actually materialize at business cycle frequency. To this end, we set up and estimate a Bayesian Proxy SVAR (BP-SVAR) model for the US and the euro area. We first present the results for the euro area and afterwards for the US to put the euro area results into context.

4.1 The Bayesian Proxy SVAR model

In this section we briefly lay out the BP-SVAR model for the general case with $k \geq 1$ proxy variables and k structural shocks of interest. We keep the notation general as we also simultaneously identify an oil supply news shock in later stages of the paper.

Following the notation of Rubio-Ramirez, Waggoner, and Zha (2010), consider without loss of generality the structural VAR model with one lag and without deterministic terms

$$\boldsymbol{y}_t' \boldsymbol{A}_0 = \boldsymbol{y}_{t-1}' \boldsymbol{A}_1 + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t', \qquad \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim N(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{I}_n), \tag{11}$$

where $\boldsymbol{y}_t$ is an $n \times 1$ vector of endogenous variables and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ an $n \times 1$ vector of structural shocks. The BP-SVAR framework builds on the following assumptions in order to identify k structural shocks of interest: There exists a $k \times 1$ vector of proxy variables $\boldsymbol{m}_t$ that are (i) correlated with the k structural shocks of interest $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^*$ and (ii) orthogonal to the remaining structural shocks $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^o$. Formally, the identifying assumptions are

$$E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^* \boldsymbol{m}_t'] = \underset{(k \times k)}{\boldsymbol{V}}, \tag{12a}$$

$$E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^o \boldsymbol{m}_t'] = \underset{((n-k) \times k)}{\boldsymbol{0}}, \tag{12b}$$

and represent the relevance and the exogeneity condition, respectively.

Denote by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_t' \equiv (\boldsymbol{y}_t', \boldsymbol{m}_t')$, by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_\ell$ the corresponding $\tilde{n} \times \tilde{n}$ coefficient matrices with $\tilde{n} = n + k$, by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \equiv (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t', \boldsymbol{v}_t')' \sim N(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{I}_{n+k})$, where $\boldsymbol{v}_t$ is a $k \times 1$ vector of measurement errors (see below). The augmented structural VAR model is then given by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_t' \tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0 = \tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{t-1}' \tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_1 + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t'. \tag{13}$$

To ensure that the augmentation with equations for the proxy variables does not affect the

dynamics of the endogenous variables, the coefficient matrices $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_\ell$ are specified as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} \underset{(n \times n)}{\boldsymbol{A}_\ell} & \underset{(n \times k)}{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\ell,1}} \\ \underset{(k \times n)}{\boldsymbol{0}} & \underset{(k \times k)}{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{\ell,2}} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \ell = 0, 1. \tag{14}$$

The zero restrictions on the lower left-hand side block imply that the proxy variables do not enter the equations of the endogenous variables. The reduced form of the model is

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_t' = \tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{t-1}' \tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_1 \tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0^{-1} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t' \tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0^{-1}. \tag{15}$$

Because the inverse of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0$ in Equation (14) is given by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{A}_0^{-1} & -\boldsymbol{A}_0^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,2}^{-1} \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,2}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{16}$$

the last k equations of the reduced form of the VAR model in Equation (15) read as

$$\boldsymbol{m}_t' = \tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{t-1}' \tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_1 \begin{pmatrix} -\boldsymbol{A}_0^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,2}^{-1} \\ \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,2}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t' \boldsymbol{A}_0^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,2}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{v}_t'\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,2}^{-1}, \tag{17}$$

which shows that in the BP-SVAR framework the proxy variables may be serially correlated and affected by past values of the endogenous variables and measurement error.

Ordering the structural shocks so that $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t = (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{o\prime}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{*\prime})'$ yields

$$E\left[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \boldsymbol{m}_t'\right] = -\boldsymbol{A}_0^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,2}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \underset{((n-k) \times k)}{\boldsymbol{0}} \\ \underset{(k \times k)}{\boldsymbol{V}} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{18}$$

The first equality is obtained using Equation (17) and because the structural shocks $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ are by assumption orthogonal to $\boldsymbol{y}_{t-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_t$. The second equality is due to the exogeneity and relevance conditions in Equations (12a) and (12b). Equation (18) shows that the identifying assumptions imply restrictions on the last k columns of the contemporaneous structural impact coefficients in $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0^{-1}$. In particular, if the exogeneity condition in Equation (12b) holds, the first $n - k$ rows of the upper right-hand side sub-matrix $\boldsymbol{A}_0^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,2}^{-1}$ of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0^{-1}$ in Equation (16) are zero. From the reduced form in Equation (15) it can be seen that this implies that the first $n - k$ structural shocks do not impact contemporaneously the proxy variables. In turn, if the relevance condition in Equation (12a) holds, the last k rows of the upper right-hand side sub-matrix $\boldsymbol{A}_0^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,1}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,2}^{-1}$ of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0^{-1}$ are different from zero. From the reduced form in Equation (15) it can be seen that this implies that the last k structural shocks impact the proxy variables contemporaneously. The Bayesian estimation algorithm of Arias, Rubio-Ramírez, and

Waggoner (2021) determines the estimates of $\boldsymbol{A}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{0,\ell}$ such that the restrictions on $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_0^{-1}$ implied by Equations (12a) and (12b) as well as on $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}_\ell$ in Equation (14) are simultaneously satisfied, and hence the estimation identifies the structural shocks $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^*$.

The BP-SVAR framework of Arias, Rubio-Ramírez, and Waggoner (2021) has numerous advantages. In short: First, the BP-SVAR framework allows us to refrain from imposing potentially contentious recursiveness assumptions between the endogenous variables when multiple structural shocks are point-identified—as done below—with multiple proxy variables. Second, the single-step estimation of the BP-SVAR model is more efficient and facilitates coherent inference; in fact, the Bayesian set-up allows exact finite sample inference, and does not require an explicit theory to accommodate weak instruments. Third, the BP-SVAR framework is relatively flexible in that Equation (17) allows the proxy variables to be serially correlated and be affected by measurement error.

4.2   Data and specification

Our baseline monetary VAR model for the Euro Area contains seven variables and additionally a high-frequency surprise series to identify an ECB monetary policy shock. We follow a large literature on monetary policy high-frequency identification by including an interest rate as an indicator of the monetary policy stance, industrial production as a proxy for economic activity, a measure of the price level, as well as a credit spread (e.g., Gertler and Karadi (2015), Jarociński and Karadi (2020), and Bauer and Swanson (2022)). To this standard model we add an exchange rate, the oil price and a measure of consumer energy prices.

Specifically, the model includes the 1-year constant maturity yield on German Bunds as the monetary policy indicator. Since our sample contains a considerable period of time at the zero lower bound (ZLB), it is important to use a longer rate that remains a valid measure of the monetary policy stance at the ZLB. Economic activity is measured by the euro area Industrial production index (excluding construction). We use the (headline) Harmonized Index of Consumer Prices (HICP) as a measure the overall price level, and its energy component as as a stand-in for local energy prices in the euro area. The BBB corporate bond spread is used to capture financial conditions, a channel which has been found to be important in the monetary transmission (Gertler and Karadi (2015), Caldara and Herbst (2019)). We use the Brent crude oil price as a measure for the global oil price and the EUR-USD exchange rate, since oil is usually traded in dollars. We utilize the commonly used surprise series by Jarociński and Karadi (2020), the "poor man's" purged 3-month OIS rate difference over the monetary event window, as our monetary policy proxy. The VAR model for the US is very similar to the euro area. Instead of a credit spread we use the Excess Bond Premium by Gilchrist and Zakrajšek (2012), and the US NEER instead of the bilateral exchange rate. Our monetary policy proxy is taken from Bauer and Swanson (2022). All data is monthly

and enters the VAR in de-meaned log-levels ($\times 100$), except for the interest rate, the credit spread, and the proxies, which enter in levels. Further details on the dataset can be found in the appendix A.

The VAR for the euro area is estimated on a sample from January 1999 to December 2019, thus leaving out the extraordinary volatility in the data induced by the Covid-19 pandemic. The model has 12 lags and includes a constant. Finally, we use flat priors for estimating the VAR parameters. In addition, a relevance threshold is imposed to express the prior belief that the proxy is informative to identify monetary policy shocks. We set a prior $\gamma = 0.1$, imposing a threshold that the identified structural monetary policy shocks account for at least 10% of the variance in the proxy.[8]

4.3 Dynamic effects of a monetary policy shock

Figure 2 presents our baseline estimates of the effects of a one standard deviation contractionary monetary policy shock for the euro area. In case of the euro area, the 1-year yield of the Bund increases by roughly 3 basis points on impact, which quickly reverts back to zero and turns slightly negative, with an overall shape very similar to Jarociński and Karadi (2020). Industrial production falls strongly and remains depressed for about 1.5 years. Likewise the fall in the domestic price level is immediate, reaching a trough of about 0.07% after about 18 months. The credit spread (not shown) is mildly positive on impact after the monetary policy shock but does not respond significantly in our sample.[9] Turning to the exchange rate, as expected, the euro appreciates against the dollar by about one percent and remains elevated significantly for a year. Our main result in the VAR analysis is a sizable fall in the measures for local and global energy prices. The global oil price (in dollars) falls strongly by 2.5 percent and reverts back to zero within 10 months. Moreover, the local energy price index, measured by the HICP energy component, falls significantly and by much more than the headline consumer price index.

When estimating an analogous VAR model for the US a very similar picture emerges.[10] As shown in Figure 3 following a contractionary US monetary policy shock the global price of oil (in dollars) declines significantly, in line with weakening domestic demand in the US and an appreciation of the US NEER. Thus, just like in the case of the ECB, Fed decisions do in fact impact prices on the global market for energy goods.

---

[8]Compared to the 20% threshold of Arias, Rubio-Ramírez, and Waggoner (2021) (and the 'high-relevance' prior of Caldara and Herbst (2019)), this is a weak requirement. In a robustness exercise, we show that reducing the relevance condition to 0 does not change our results (figure 11 in the appendix).

[9]Due to space constraints we relegate the spreads for both the euro area and the US to figure 9 in the appendix.

[10]In contrast to the euro area model, the BP-SVAR model for the US is estimated on the longer sample from January 1990 to December 2019. The US results are robust to using the same sample for both countries as well as using the poor man's proxy of Jarociński and Karadi (2020) instead of the proxy by Bauer and Swanson (2022).

The finding of the dynamic model corroborates the results from section 3: both areas exert effects on the global energy price in comparable magnitude. Thus, we conclude that the fall in the oil price futures after a monetary contraction documented in the high-frequency event study also transmits to changes in the global price of oil at business cycle frequency.

Figure 2: Baseline Euro Area SVAR model

Notes: Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise credible sets. Horizon in months.

The results are shown to be robust to a number of alternative specifications. During the ZLB period it can be argued that the 2-year yield is a more accurate measure of the policy stance since it was less constrained (cf. Swanson and Williams (2014), Gertler and Karadi (2015)). Turning to the proxy, Miranda-Agrippino and Ricco (2021) and also Bauer and Swanson (2022) show that accounting for potential serial correlation in the proxy can significantly impact the results. Although our model already takes care of this issue at the (aggregated) monthly frequency, it is possible that there could be serial correlation at the ECB meeting frequency. Therefore, we estimate an AR(12) on the meeting-frequency data and use the residuals as our proxy instead.[11] To address concerns about the relevant information set regarding the global oil market, we extend the model to include global oil production, oil inventories, and global industrial production. Finally, the relevance prior was reduced to 0. As can be seen from figures 10 to 13 in the appendix, none of these change our results.

---

[11] With this approach, we lose observations in the proxy and therefore the sample in this specification starts in July 1999.

Figure 3: Baseline United States SVAR model

Notes: Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise credible sets. Horizon in months.

5   Dissecting the energy-price channel in the euro area

The previous sections have established that the energy-price channel is relevant, not only for the Fed, but for the ECB as well. Section 2 has outlined that the energy-price channel effects the economy in different ways. In this section, we conduct three counterfactual experiments to distinguish the importance of the different components of the energy-price channel.

In particular, we use Structural Shock Counterfactuals (SSC), Structural Scenario Analysis (SSA) and Minimum Relative Entropy (MRE) methods to simulate a counterfactual monetary policy shock. Although the three methods —which we describe in more detail below— may seem fundamentally different, they are indeed related. In particular, any counterfactual scenario can be characterized by (i) the *counterfactual* outcome that is supposed to be different from to the *factual/true* outcome and (ii) the circumstances that are allowed to change for the counterfactual outcome to materialize. While the three methods share the same counterfactual outcome, they fundamentally differ in the circumstances that are allowed to change.

5.1 Computing SVAR counterfactuals

The VAR model in Equation (11) can be iterated forward and re-written as

$$\boldsymbol{y}_{T+1,T+h} = \boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \boldsymbol{M}'\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{T+1,T+h}, \tag{19}$$

where the $nh \times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{y}_{T+1,T+h} \equiv [\boldsymbol{y}'_{T+1}, \boldsymbol{y}'_{T+2}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}'_{T+h}]'$ denotes future values of the endogenous variables, $\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h}$ an autoregressive component that is due to initial conditions as of period T, and the $nh \times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{T+1,T+h} \equiv [\boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{T+1}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{T+2}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{T+h}]'$ future values of the structural shocks. The $nh \times nh$ matrix $\boldsymbol{M}$ reflects the impulse responses and is a function of the structural VAR parameters $\boldsymbol{\psi} \equiv vec(\boldsymbol{A}_0, \boldsymbol{A}_1)$.

Assume for simplicity of exposition but without loss of generality that the VAR model in Equation (11)—which does not have deterministic components—is stationary and in steady state in period T so that $\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} = \boldsymbol{0}$. In this setting, an impulse response to the i-th structural shock over a horizon of h periods coincides with the forecast $\boldsymbol{y}_{T+1,T+h}$ conditional on $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{T+1,T+h} = [\boldsymbol{e}'_i, \boldsymbol{0}_{1\times n(h-1)}]'$, where $\boldsymbol{e}_i$ is an $n \times 1$ vector of zeros with unity at the i-th position. For example, for the impulse response to a monetary policy shock we have $\epsilon^{mp}_{T+1} = 1$, $\epsilon^{mp}_{T+s} = 0$ for $s > 1$ and $\epsilon^{\ell}_{T+s} = 0$ for $s > 0$, $\ell \neq mp$.

For later reference we follow Breitenlechner, Georgiadis, and Schumann (2022) and define the "contribution" of our channel of interest as the difference between the impulse responses of endogenous variables to a monetary policy shock in the baseline denoted by $\boldsymbol{y}_{T+1,T+h}$ and in a counterfactual denoted by $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h}$. The defining feature of the counterfactual is that the response of one or more variables is restricted to be at a specific value.

5.1.1 SSA/SSC counterfactuals:

For SSA/SSC counterfactuals the VAR model is unchanged in the counterfactual in terms of the structural parameters $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ and hence $\boldsymbol{M}$ in Equation (19). Therefore, in order for the impulse response $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h}$ to satisfy counterfactual constraints additional shocks in $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{T+1,T+h}$ must be allowed to materialise over horizons $T+1, T+2, \ldots, T+h$. Thus the structural shocks are the "circumstances" that are allowed to change in order for the counterfactual outcome to materialize.

Building on Waggoner and Zha (1999), Antolin-Diaz, Petrella, and Rubio-Ramirez (2021) show how to obtain $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h}$ subject to constraints on the paths of a subset of the endogenous variables

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{C}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h} = \overline{\boldsymbol{C}}\boldsymbol{M}'\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{T+1,T+h} \sim N(\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}_{T+1,T+h}, \overline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f), \tag{20}$$

where $\overline{\boldsymbol{C}}$ is a $k_o \times nh$ selection matrix, $\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}_{T+1,T+h}$ is a $k_o \times 1$ vector and $\overline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f$ a $k_o \times k_o$ matrix,

and subject to constraints on the structural shocks given by

$$\mathbf{\Xi}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{T+1,T+h} \sim N(\boldsymbol{g}_{T+1,T+h}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_g), \tag{21}$$

where $\mathbf{\Xi}$ is a $k_s \times nh$ selection matrix, $\boldsymbol{g}_{T+1,T+h}$ a $k_s \times 1$ vector, and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_g$ a $k_s \times k_s$ matrix. In our context, Equation (20) imposes the counterfactual constraint that the the response of the constrained variable is nil, and Equation (21) the constraint that some structural shocks may not be in the set of offsetting shocks that materialise along the impulse response horizon to enforce the counterfactual constraint. Depending on the structure of Equation (21) we call a counterfactual SSC or SSA. In particular, if only a specific subset of structural shocks is allowed to materialize then we call the counterfactual simulation a Structural Shock Counterfactual (SSC) and if *all* shocks can occur along the impulse response horizon we label it a Structural Shock Analysis (SSA).

Antolin-Diaz, Petrella, and Rubio-Ramirez (2021) show how to obtain the solution to the SSA/SSC problem in terms of a $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{T+1,T+h}$ which satisfies the counterfactual constraints. The counterfactual impulse response is then given by $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h} = \boldsymbol{M}'\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{T+1,T+h}$. While there may be many solutions to the problem, Antolin-Diaz, Petrella, and Rubio-Ramirez (2021) show that their proposed solution minimises the Frobenius norm of the deviation of the distribution of the structural shocks under the counterfactual from the baseline. Intuitively, this means the counterfactual shocks chosen are those that are minimally different in terms of mean and variance from the baseline and as such the counterfactual circumstances (the structural shocks) deviate as little as possible from the factual circumstances.[12]

5.1.2 MRE counterfactuals:

In the existing literature MRE is used to incorporate restrictions derived from economic theory into a conditional forecast (See Cogley and Sargent (2005), Robertson, Tallman, and Whiteman (2005) and Giacomini and Ragusa (2014) for forecasting applications.) Similar in spirit, we use MRE to generate a counterfactual conditional forecast based on our baseline conditional forecast in Equation (19) that represents the impulse responses to a monetary policy shock. As in the SSA/SSC counterfactuals our counterfactual scenario is characterized (i) by the counterfactual outcome that is restricted to be different than the factual outcome and (ii) the circumstances that are allowed to change. While the restrictions we place on the path of specific variables are the same for the SSA/SSC and MRE methods, the circumstances that are allowed to change are different. In particular, in the MRE counterfactual no additional structural shocks materialize over the horizon of the impulse response. The

---

[12]See Appendix D for further technical details and the specification of $\overline{\boldsymbol{C}}$, $\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}_{T+1,T+h}$, $\mathbf{\Xi}$, $\overline{\boldsymbol{g}}_{T+1,T+h}$, $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_g$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f$ in the baseline and the counterfactual conditional forecast in our application.

circumstances that are allowed to change rather are the impulse responses in the matrix $\boldsymbol{M}$ in Equation (19), which themselves are a function of the VAR parameters $\boldsymbol{\psi}$.

To be more precise, again conceive of an impulse response as the conditional forecast $\boldsymbol{y}_{T+1,T+h}$, where we have for $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{T+1,T+h}$ that $\epsilon_{T+1}^{mp} = 1$, $\epsilon_{T+s}^{mp} = 0$ for $s > 1$ and $\epsilon_{T+s}^{\ell} = 0$ for $s > 0$, $\ell \neq mp$. Our posterior belief about the actual effects of a monetary policy shock after h periods is given by

$$f(\boldsymbol{y}_{T+h}|\boldsymbol{y}_{1,T}, \mathcal{I}_a, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{T+1,T+h}) \propto p(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \times \ell(\boldsymbol{y}_{1,T}|\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathcal{I}_a) \times \nu, \tag{22}$$

where $p(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ is the prior about the structural VAR parameters, $\mathcal{I}_a$ our identifying assumptions, and ν the volume element of the mapping from the posterior distribution of the structural VAR parameters to the posterior distribution of the impulse response $\boldsymbol{y}_{T+h}$. MRE determines the posterior beliefs about the effects of a monetary policy shock $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+h}$ in a counterfactual VAR model with structural parameters $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ by

$$Min_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}} \ \mathcal{D}(f^*||f) \quad s.t.$$
$$\int f^*(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}})\widetilde{y}^{tar^*} d\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}} = E(\widetilde{y}^{tar^*}) = 0, \quad \int f^*(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}})d\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}} = 1, \ \ f^*(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}) \geq 0, \tag{23}$$

where $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$ is the Kullback-Leibler divergence—the 'relative entropy'—between the counterfactual and baseline posterior beliefs (the subscripts in Equation (23) are dropped for simplicity). In general, there are infinitely many counterfactual beliefs f^* that satisfy the constraint $E(\widetilde{y}_{T+h}^{tar^*}) = T_{t+h}$, where T_{t+h} is the counterfactual constraint. The MRE approach disciplines the choice of the counterfactual posterior beliefs f^* by requiring that they are *minimally* different from the baseline posterior beliefs f in an information-theoretic sense. Intuitively, MRE determines the counterfactual VAR model in which the constrained variable is at its target but whose dynamic properties in terms of impulse responses are otherwise minimally different from those of the actual VAR model.

5.2 Counterfactual I: the euro area as a SOE

In the first counterfactual, we ask how the economy would respond to an ECB monetary policy shock if the euro area were a small open economy. To this end, we simulate a counterfactual monetary policy shock that — as implicitly assumed in many models of the euro area — does not impact the global energy price as measured by the Brent oil price. For this counterfactual scenario, we employ the SSA, SSC, and MRE methods. While the SSA and MRE methods are implemented exactly as described above, the SSC counterfactual needs a bit more detail. In particular, we identify an additional oil supply news shock using the proxy variable of Känzig (2021) and impose that this shock materializes along the impulse horizon in order to

stabilize the response of the oil price.[13]

The results from this exercise for the MRE, SSA and MRE case are shown in Figure 4. Irrespective of the method employed it becomes apparent that the local energy price — as measured by the energy component of the HICP — and to a lower extent even aggregate HICP inflation in the euro area would react substantially less to a contractionary ECB monetary policy shock if this shock would not affect the global oil price. Thus, imposing the SOE assumption could potentially cause models to *underestimate* the impact central bank decisions could have on domestic energy and consumer prices. Thus, in order to fight inflationary pressures central banks of large open economies that perceive themselves as SOEs could feel pressured to hike interest rates by more than necessary in order to bring inflation back to target.

## 5.3 Counterfactuals II and III: the role of the exchange rate

Since the euro area is apparently not a small open economy, the role that the EUR-USD exchange rate plays in the energy-price channel of euro area monetary policy is twofold. Firstly, an appreciation of the euro causes euro area import prices of oil and other energy goods, which are priced and invoiced in dollars, to fall. If the fall in import prices is passed through to consumer prices, they should ceteris paribus also fall. We denote this effect as the local price effect of the exchange rate. On the other hand, the cheaper energy import price can translate into an increase in domestic demand for energy pushing up the global price and, in turn, the local price as well. We denote this effects as the global price effect of the exchange rate, as it works via the global energy price. An increase in the global energy price will, ceteris paribus, translate into an increase in a lower import/local price of these goods. Taken together, both price effects render the impact that an exchange rate appreciation has on the local price, a priori, unclear. In particular, an exchange rate appreciation could lower the local energy price if the exchange rate induced fall in the local price is larger than the demand induced rise in the global price. Or in other words: If the local price effect of the exchange rate dominates the global price effect, local energy prices will fall and vice versa.

In this section we again employ SVAR counterfactuals in order to first test which of the two price effects dominates the adjustment of local prices and second, assess if the weaker effect is actually present after all. Because the debate whether energy prices are only invoiced in dollars, but sticky in the currency of the producer — which is akin to a Producer Currency Pricing (PCP) assumption — or even priced and sticky in dollars — which corresponds to the Dominant Currency Pricing (DCP) assumption — is not yet settled, we focus on the euro area as the case is simpler (see Georgiadis and Schumann (2021) for a discussion). In particular, as long as the appreciation of the euro against the dollar translates into an appreciation of

---

[13]IRFs to the oil supply news shock are shown in B.3

Figure 4: Counterfactual I: the euro area as a SOE

Notes: Red lines refer to the MRE counterfactual, green lines to the structural scenario analysis counterfactuals. The second row shows the counterfactual using all shocks (SSA), the last row the counterfactual with the identified oil supply news shock (SSC). Notes: Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise credible sets. Horizon in months.

the euro against the currency of energy producers, the implications of PCP and DCP are identical for the local energy price of the euro area. For both paradigms an appreciation of the euro should, ceteris paribus, lead to a fall in the local energy import price index of the euro area. In the US case, it is more complicated because if energy prices would not only be invoiced but priced in dollars there would hardly be any pass-through of a dollar appreciation to US energy import prices, while at the same time under DCP a dollar appreciation also affects energy demand of non-US countries.[14]

Figure 5 shows the results from our counterfactual exercise where we simulate (by means of SSA and MRE) a monetary policy shock that does not appreciate the exchange rate.[15] The absence of the appreciation of the euro leads to a stronger fall in our proxy for the global energy price — the Brent crude oil price — in the counterfactual scenario than in the baseline. This is indicative evidence that euro area demand for energy goods is indeed price elastic and, again, that the energy demand from the euro area has sizable influence on global energy prices. In our model from Section 2 this translates into $\alpha_2 > 0$ and $\alpha_4 > 0$, respectively.

At the same time the local energy price, as measured by the HICP energy index, also falls in the counterfactual scenario more than in the baseline. At first sight this may seem counter intuitive because an appreciation of the exchange rate is usually believed to lower energy import prices. As such in a scenario where an appreciation is absent, local energy prices should rise. But, this partial equilibrium intuition — which is reflected in Equation 4 of the small scale open economy model in Section 2 — does not have to be a general equilibrium outcome due to the global price effect of the exchange rate. In our counterfactual scenario, the absence of the 1% appreciation of the euro from the baseline scenario coincides with a fall of the global energy price, as measured by the oil price in dollar,s by approximately 2%. Thus, using the simple energy import price index of Equation 4 and evaluating the equation after all forces played out in general equilibrium, one concludes that the local energy price does not need to rise in a scenario where the appreciation is absent if global energy prices are sensitive to changes in euro area demand. In fact our counterfactual scenarios indicate that local energy prices even fall more than in the baseline. This leads us to conclude that in equilibrium the global price effect of the exchange rate overcompensates the local price effect of the exchange rate for the euro area.

However, it is important to point out that our counterfactual scenario in Figure 5 does not indicate that there is no local price effect of the exchange rate, i.e. no exchange rate pass-through in the euro area. In fact if that would be the case, the ECB could not even

---

[14]We provide results for the US in the Appendix B.4. We illustrate that the dollar plays a unique role in the global energy markets and the counterfactual results are in line with the DCP paradigm of Gopinath et al. (2020).

[15]As we do not have a proxy variable to cleanly identify an exchange rate shock, we do not compute the SSC counterfactual for this exercise.

Figure 5: The role of the Euro appreciation

Note: Red lines refer to the MRE counterfactual, green lines correspond to the SSA counterfactual. Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise credible sets. Horizon in months.

trigger a global price effect by manipulating the exchange rate. In order to assess the existence of a local price effect and gauge its importance, we simulate a scenario where we force the counterfactual response of the Brent oil price to be the same as the baseline impulse response and at the same time impose that the euro area monetary policy does not appreciate the exchange rate. This counterfactual scenario allows us to analyze the effects of the exchange rate on the local energy price, as measured by the HICP energy index, while shutting off its effect on the global energy price as proxied by the Brent oil price in dollars. The results from this exercise are shown in Figure 6 and indicate that there indeed exists a local price effect of the exchange rate. In particular, a monetary policy shock, which has the same impact on the Brent oil price as in the baseline but does not appreciate the euro against the dollar, causes the HICP energy index to *rise* relative to the baseline. This suggests that the local price effect of the exchange rate is present and works along the lines of the partial equilibrium exchange rate pass-through intuition of Equation 4.

Figure 6: The local price effect of the exchange rate

Note: Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise credible sets. Red lines refer to the MRE counterfactual. Notice that the red dotted line lies by assumption exactly above the original blue impulse response for the Brent oil price.

6   From Washington with love

While the previous sections of the paper were concerned with the domestic effects of the energy-price channel of monetary policy, we demonstrate in this section that the energy-price channel also has an international dimension as it has implications for cross-border (inflation) spillovers and thereby the conduct of monetary policy. For instance, the recent surge in inflation in the euro area emerged against the backdrop of a slightly preceding inflation dynamic in the US, which caused the Fed to hike prior to the ECB. This led to a strong depreciation of the euro against the dollar, inviting the narrative that the FED tightening was somewhat responsible for inflation pressure in the euro area, especially for energy imports such as oil, which are traded in dollars. But this narrative does not account for the fact that the Fed's decision (i) reduces the US demand for energy products as it slows down economic activity in the US (ii) appreciates the dollar and thereby reduces non-US demand for energy products. As overall demand for energy goods falls, the global price of these goods should also fall which — at least in theory — could cause euro area energy import prices to fall despite the euro depreciation.

Therefore, in this section, we study to what extent the Fed actions contribute to euro area inflation and quantify the importance of the energy-price channels identified above. In order to do so we combine the US and euro area BP-SVAR models into one large, joint model: since we are interested in spillovers to euro area inflation, we use the US model as a baseline and add the euro area industrial production index, the headline price level, and the HICP energy component of the price level.[16]

Figure 7 presents the implications of a standard deviation Fed monetary policy tightening for the US and euro area economy as well as global energy markets. The impulse responses for the US are largely the same as in the baseline US model (figure 3). Again, the global oil price decreases by up to 2%. The Fed's contractionary shock clearly has sizable implications for the euro area: output and prices decrease strongly. Therefore, although it is of course true that the dollar appreciates, ceteris paribus a surprise tightening of US monetary policy leads to a *decline* in euro area inflation, both for energy and the headline index.

Obviously the fall in euro area energy import prices and consumer prices is not solely due to the impact that the Fed's decision has on the global oil price but also due to falls in other import and domestic prices. In order to gauge the role of the global oil price response in shaping the transmission of US monetary policy to euro area price indices, we again use the counterfactual methods put forward in Section 5.1. In particular we simulate a US monetary

---

[16]To reduce the dimensionality, we leave out the US energy price component of the CPI. Additionally, the US CPI price level enters the model in differences to avoid problems of a near-unit root. The impulse responses for US CPI are then cumulated. Due to the larger dimensionality of 9 variables, combined with a relatively short estimation period, we use an informative Normal-Wishart prior with a tightness hyperparameter of 0.2, which is in the range normally used in the literature.

Figure 7: US monetary policy spillovers to the euro area

Notes: Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation US monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise credible sets. Horizon in months.

policy shock that does not impact the global oil price. All three counterfactual methods paint a similar picture: the effect US policy has on the global oil price is an important transmission channel of the spillover to energy and consumer prices prices in the euro area. Thus an unexpected Fed tightening actually *lowers* inflation in the euro area and thereby reduces the pressure the ECB faces in times of high inflation in part due to the induced fall in global energy prices.

Figure 8: The international dimensions of the energy price channel of monetary policy

Note: Golden lines refer to the MRE counterfactual, red lines correspond to the SSA counterfactual, green lines to the SSC counterfactual. Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise credible sets. Horizon in months.

7   Conclusion

In conclusion, our study contributes to the ongoing debate about the effectiveness of monetary policy in addressing inflation when it is driven by energy prices. Our results provide evidence that not only can the ECB fight inflation caused by high energy prices, but that energy prices, similar to the US, play an important role in the transmission of monetary policy in general. We refer to that as the energy-price channel of monetary policy. For the euro area and the US this channel operates through changes of energy demand and a subsequent change in global

26

energy prices, which then affect the overall inflation rate.

As oil is traded in dollars, monetary policy in the euro area has two additional effects. Our analysis shows that while an appreciation of the euro against the dollar, ceteris paribus, leads to lower local prices in the euro area, the stimulated demand for oil in the euro area pushes up the global oil price. We denote the latter effect the global price effect of the exchange rate and the former the local price effect of the exchange rate. Although there is a local price effect of the exchange rate present, it is dominated by the global price effect.

Our findings have important implications for policymakers, especially at the ECB, who must take into account the complex interactions between monetary policy, local *and* global energy prices, and the broader economy.

We leave it to future research to address the implications of the energy-price channel of monetary policy for the trade-off that central banks of large open economies face when raising rates to fight (energy-related) surges in inflation. From the onset it seems like that the energy-price channel of monetary policy may mitigate the severity of the inflation-output trade-off that central banks face in the case of a supply shock because monetary decisions in large open economies can cause prices of energy goods — which are generally believed to be less sticky than prices of many other goods — to fall quickly.

References

Altavilla, Carlo, Luca Brugnolini, Refet S Gürkaynak, Roberto Motto, and Giuseppe Ragusa (2019). "Measuring euro area monetary policy". *Journal of Monetary Economics 108*, 162–179.

Andrade, Philippe and Filippo Ferroni (2021). "Delphic and odyssean monetary policy shocks: Evidence from the euro area". *Journal of Monetary Economics 117*, 816–832.

Antolin-Diaz, Juan, Ivan Petrella, and Juan F. Rubio-Ramirez (2021). "Structural scenario analysis with SVARs". *Journal of Monetary Economics 117*, 798–815.

Arias, Jonas E., Juan F. Rubio-Ramírez, and Daniel F. Waggoner (2021). "Inference in Bayesian Proxy-SVARs". *Journal of Econometrics 225* (1), 88–106.

Bauer, Michael D and Eric T Swanson (2022). "A reassessment of monetary policy surprises and high-frequency identification". Tech. rep. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Baumeister, Christiane and James D Hamilton (2019). "Structural interpretation of vector autoregressions with incomplete identification: Revisiting the role of oil supply and demand shocks". *American Economic Review 109* (5), 1873–1910.

Bernanke, Ben S, Mark Gertler, Mark Watson, Christopher A Sims, and Benjamin M Friedman (1997). "Systematic monetary policy and the effects of oil price shocks". *Brookings papers on economic activity 1997* (1), 91–157.

Breitenlechner, Max, Georgios Georgiadis, and Ben Schumann (2022). "What goes around comes around: How large are spillbacks from US monetary policy?" *Journal of Monetary Economics 131*, 45–60.

Caldara, Dario and Edward Herbst (2019). "Monetary policy, real activity, and credit spreads: Evidence from Bayesian proxy SVARs". *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics 11* (1), 157–92.

Christoffel, Kai Philipp, Günter Coenen, and Anders Warne (2008). "The new area-wide model of the euro area: a micro-founded open-economy model for forecasting and policy analysis".

Cogley, Timothy and Thomas J Sargent (2005). "Drifts and volatilities: monetary policies and outcomes in the post WWII US". *Review of Economic dynamics 8* (2), 262–302.

Dedola, Luca, Giulia Rivolta, and Livio Stracca (2017). "If the Fed sneezes, who catches a cold?" *Journal of International Economics 108*, S23–S41.

Degasperi, Riccardo, Seokki S Hong, and Giovanni Ricco (2023). "The Global Transmission of US Monetary Policy".

Georgiadis, Georgios (2016). "Determinants of global spillovers from US monetary policy". *Journal of international Money and Finance 67*, 41–61.

Georgiadis, Georgios and Ben Schumann (2021). "Dominant-currency pricing and the global output spillovers from US dollar appreciation". *Journal of International Economics 133*, 103537.

Gertler, Mark and Peter Karadi (2015). "Monetary policy surprises, credit costs, and economic activity". *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics 7* (1), 44–76.

Giacomini, Raffaella and Giuseppe Ragusa (2014). "Theory-coherent forecasting". *Journal of Econometrics 182* (1), 145–155.

Gilchrist, Simon and Egon Zakrajšek (2012). "Credit spreads and business cycle fluctuations". *American economic review 102* (4), 1692–1720.

Gopinath, Gita, Emine Boz, Camila Casas, Federico J Díez, Pierre-Olivier Gourinchas, and Mikkel Plagborg-Møller (2020). "Dominant currency paradigm". *American Economic Review 110* (3), 677–719.

Gornemann, Nils, Sebastian Hildebrand, and Keith Kuester (2022). "Limited Energy Supply, Sunspots, and Monetary Policy". Tech. rep. University of Bonn and University of Cologne, Germany.

Gürkaynak, Refet S, Brian Sack, and Eric Swanson (2005). "Do Actions Speak Louder Than Words? The Response of Asset Prices to Monetary Policy Actions and Statements". *International Journal of Central Banking 1* (1), 55–93.

Jarociński, Marek and Peter Karadi (2020). "Deconstructing monetary policy surprises—the role of information shocks". *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics 12* (2), 1–43.

Känzig, Diego R (2021). "The macroeconomic effects of oil supply news: Evidence from OPEC announcements". *American Economic Review 111* (4), 1092–1125.

Kerssenfischer, Mark (2022). "Information effects of euro area monetary policy". *Economics Letters 216*, 110570.

Miranda-Agrippino, Silvia and Giovanni Ricco (2021). "The transmission of monetary policy shocks". *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics 13* (3), 74–107.

Robertson, John C, Ellis W Tallman, and Charles H Whiteman (2005). "Forecasting using relative entropy". *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking 37* (3), 383–401.

Rubio-Ramirez, Juan F, Daniel F Waggoner, and Tao Zha (2010). "Structural vector autoregressions: Theory of identification and algorithms for inference". *The Review of Economic Studies 77* (2), 665–696.

Swanson, Eric T and John C Williams (2014). "Measuring the effect of the zero lower bound on medium-and longer-term interest rates". *American economic review 104* (10), 3154–85.

Waggoner, Daniel F and Tao Zha (1999). "Conditional forecasts in dynamic multivariate models". *Review of Economics and Statistics 81* (4), 639–651.

Appendix A   Data description

Variable	Description	Notes	Source
1-year yield	Germany Government 1 year yield	End of period	Macrobond Financial AB
2-year yield	Germany Government 2 year yield	End of period	Macrobond Financial AB
US/EUR	US-Dollar per Euro, spot rate	Monthly average of daily values	Macrobond Financial AB
Industrial Production	Euro Area Industrial Production excl. Construction		Eurostat
Brent oil price	Brent crude Europe Spot price FOB, US-Dollar per barrel	Monthly average of daily values	Energy Information Administration
CPI (headline)	Euro Area Harmonized Index of Consumer Prices	Seasonally adjusted using X13	Eurostat
HICP energy	Euro Area, HICP, Energy	Seasonally adjusted using X13	Eurostat
Credit spread	ICE BofA Euro High Yield Index Option-Adjusted Spread	Monthly average of daily values	FRED
Euro Area monetary policy proxy	3 month (monetary event window) OIS surprise	Calculated based on data and methodology by Jarociński and Karadi (2020)	Jarociński and Karadi (2020) and authors' calculations
Global oil production	Global oil production (million barrels/day)		Baumeister and Hamilton (2019)
Oil inventories	Change in global oil inventories		Baumeister and Hamilton (2019)
Global IP	Global industrial production		Baumeister and Hamilton (2019)
1-year yield (US)	US treasury 1 year yield	End of period	FRED
Industrial Production (US)	US Industrial Production		FRED
CPI (headline, US)	Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items in U.S. City Average		FRED
Excess bond premium	Excess bond premium	Monthly average of daily values	Gilchrist and Zakrajšek (2012)
US NEER (US)	US Nominal broad effective exchange rate	Monthly average of daily values	J.P. Morgan
US energy price index	Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Energy in U.S. City Average		FRED
Oil supply news proxy	Suprise in oil futures prices around OPEC announcements	Monthly sum of daily values	Känzig (2021)

Table 4: Detailed description of data used in the VAR analysis

Appendix B Further results

B.1 Additional high frequency event study results

Table 5: Coefficient estimates β from the Brent crude oil price event study regressions $p_t = \alpha + \beta mps_t + \epsilon_t$ for the ECB, where t indexes ECB policy announcements. *Notes:* Each column presents the event study regression for a different sample period. mps_t is the high frequency change in the three month Overnight Index Swap (OIS) rate with poor man's sign restrictions as in Jarociński and Karadi (2020). Heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors are reported in parentheses.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
$\hat{\beta}$	−2.10*	−1.80*	−3.48***
	(1.10)	(1.08)	(1.14)
R^2 (%)	1.48	1.07	2.60
Sample	1999:1-2021:12	1999:1-2019:12	2002:1 - 2021:12
N	278	262	212

Table 6: Coefficient estimates β from the natural gas price (Dutch TTF) event study regressions $p_t = \alpha + \beta mps_t + \epsilon_t$ for the ECB, where t indexes ECB policy announcements. p_t is the daily change of the relevant futures price, computed as the difference between the closing price of the ECB policy announcement day and the closing price of the previous day. *Notes:* Each column presents the event study regression for the combination of a different TTF maturity and a different sample period. mps_t is the high frequency change in the three month Overnight Index Swap (OIS) rate with poor man's sign restrictions as in Jarociński and Karadi (2020). Daily Dutch TTF price data is available from October 2007. Heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors are reported in parentheses.

|	1-month TTF	1-year TTF	1-month TTF	1-year TTF
$\hat{\beta}$	−17.42***	−12.32***	−13.85***	−13.41***
	(4.50)	(3.12)	(3.92)	(3.23)
R^2 (%)	2.68	2.61	1.39	2.69
Sample	2007:10-2019:12	2007:10-2019:12	2007:10-2021:12	2007:10-2021:12
N	127	127	143	143

B.2 Additional SVAR results

Figure 9: Left: Credit spread response to an ECB monetary policy tightening. This IRF completes the VAR shown in figure 2. Right: Excess Bond Premium response to a Fed monetary policy tightening. This IRF completes the VAR shown in 3. Notes: Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise probability bands. Horizon in months.


Figure 10: Euro Area model with HICP energy, 2-year Bund yield instead of 1-year Bund yield. Notes: Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise probability bands. Horizon in months.

Figure 11: Euro Area model with HICP energy, where the prior on the relevance of the shock for the proxy is set to 0.1%. Notes: Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise probability bands. Horizon in months.


Figure 12: Euro Area model with HICP energy, where the monetary policy proxy is purged of serial correlation at the meeting frequency (see text for details). Notes: Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise probability bands. Horizon in months.

Figure 13: Euro Area model with world oil production, inventories, and world industrial production. Notes: Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise probability bands. Horizon in months.

B.3 IRFs to an oil supply news shock

Figure 14: Baseline Euro Area SVAR model, oil supply news shock. Notes: Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation oil supply news shock, identified via the proxy of Känzig (2021). Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise probability bands. Horizon in months.

B.4 DCP and the unique role of the dollar in global energy markets

While our results for the Euro Area could potentially be interpreted as generally applicable for other large open economies, this may not hold true for the US due to the special status of the dollar in global energy markets. In particular global trade in commodities and energy products is largely *invoiced* in dollars (Gopinath et al. (2020)). To the extend that global energy prices are also *priced* in dollars —meaning the Dominant Currency Pricing (DCP) assumption also holds for trade in energy goods— an appreciation of the dollar vis-a-vis all currencies will have very little effects on the US import prices of energy goods. Taking the US as the home economy in our small model in Section 2, this corresponds to assuming that $\alpha_1 \approx 0$ in Equation 4. At the time an effective appreciation of the dollar alongside the DCP assumption will lead to an increase in the price of energy imports of non-US countries as energy prices are not only invoiced but also priced in dollar. As all currencies depreciate vis-a-vis the dollar non-US countries will see their import prices rise under DCP. Therefore an effective appreciation of the dollar could trigger a fall in global demand for energy as all non-US countries face higher energy import prices. Again in our model in section 2 this implies that the demand of the RoW for energy goods $y_{F,t}^E$ –which we have left unspecified so far— in 7 falls. As a consequence —under DCP— an effective appreciation of the dollar

should lead a *fall* in the global price and to a fall in the local energy import price of the US.

Under the Producer Currency Pricing (PCP) assumption the opposite would hold true and US import prices would fall. This implies that under PCP α_1 in Equation 4 would equal 1. In contrast to the DCP paradigm, the energy import prices non-US countries would remain stable under PCP if the dollar appreciates in effective terms despite the fact that exporters invoice their energy products in dollars. Recall that under PCP energy exporters want to keep their local currency (producer) price stable. As such they would change the amount of dollars they charge (invoice) in order to stabilize their producer price. Because the dollar appreciates in effective terms (i.e. against all other currencies) the import prices of the energy importing countries remain stable and the global demand for energy from the non US countries $y_{F,t}^E$ would not be a function of the dollar exchange rate. As a consequence —under PCP— an effective appreciation of the dollar should lead a *rise* in the global price because of an increase in demand from the US and to a fall in the local energy import price of the US.

Thus the pricing paradigms give to two contradicting predictions. By simulating a US monetary policy shock that does not appreciate the dollar we can assess these two predictions and their relative quantitative importance. The results from this exercise are shown in 15. As predicted by DCP and in contrast to the results for the Euro Area, the missing appreciation of the dollar coincides with a *rise* in the Brent oil price and an increase the US energy price index relative to the baseline. Again this is consistent with the notion that —as predicted by DCP— the appreciation of the dollar following a US monetary policy shock causes an increase in the energy import price indices of non-US countries and thereby a fall in the demand for oil and other commodities. Thus if the appreciation does not happen, the global demand for oil is higher relative to the baseline and therefore the oil price falls by less than in the baseline.

DCP not only predicts that global energy prices should fall following an appreciation of the dollar but also that —conditional on global energy prices— local energy prices should not move one for one with the exchange rate. In particular, if energy exports to the US would only be invoiced but also priced in dollar, then an appreciation of the dollar by 1% should not ceteris paribus lead to an immediate and similarly sized fall in the energy import prices if the global price of the respective energy goods remains constant. Therefore we again simulate a US monetary policy shock that does not appreciate the exchange while imposing that the response of the global oil price is the same as in the baseline. As such the difference of the response of the local energy price — as measured by US energy import price index — between the baseline and the counterfactual impulse response should solely be due to the missing appreciation of the dollar. This allows us to inspect the importance of the exchange rate for US local energy prices and thereby assess if the DCP assumption does not only seem to hold for non-US countries but also for US energy imports. As shown in Figure 16 this is indeed the case. Conditional on the same path for the global oil price the US energy price index is hardly different between the baseline and the counterfactual, where the US monetary

Figure 15: The role of the dollar appreciation

Note: Red lines refer to the MRE counterfactual, green lines correspond to the SSA counterfactual. Impulse response functions to a one standard deviation monetary policy shock. Point-wise posterior means along with 68% and 90% point-wise probability bands. Horizon in months.

policy shock does not appreciate the dollar.

Figure 16: The local price effect of the dollar

Appendix C   The SSA framework of ADPRR

Building on the work of Waggoner and Zha (1999), the SSA framework of Antolin-Diaz, Petrella, and Rubio-Ramirez (2021), henceforth ADPRR) provides a rigorous and general treatment on how to impose specific paths on observables in a VAR model as conditional forecasts with and without constraints on the set of offsetting—or 'driving'—shocks. Denoting by $\boldsymbol{y}'_{T+1,T+h} \equiv [\boldsymbol{y}'_{T+1}, \boldsymbol{y}'_{T+2}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}'_{T+h}]$ the $1 \times nh$ vector that stacks the future values of the observables over an horizon of h periods, the SSA framework of ADPRR consists of obtaining the distribution of the observables

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_y, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y), \tag{24}$$

where the $nh \times 1$ vector vector $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h}$ contains the values of all observables—i.e. both those whose paths are constrained and those whose paths are unconstrained—under the conditional forecast. The $nh \times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}_y$ contains the corresponding means of the distribution of the observables in $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h}$ under the conditional forecast, and the $nh \times nh$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y$ the associated uncertainty.

In the framework of ADPRR, structural scenarios involve

(i) 'conditional-on-observables forecasting', i.e. specifying paths for a subset of observables in $\boldsymbol{y}_{T+1,T+h}$ that depart from their unconditional forecast, and/or

(ii) 'conditional-on-shocks forecasting', i.e. specifying the subset of (and potentially a path for) the structural shocks $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{T+1,T+h}$ that are allowed to depart from their unconditional

distribution to produce the specified path of the observables in (i);

Both the case in which the path of observables under (i) and the case in which the path of structural shocks under (ii) is constrained can be laid out based on Equation (24). The goal is to determine $\boldsymbol{\mu}_y$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y$ such that the constraints under (i) and (ii) are satisfied simultaneously.

Assume the structural parameters of the VAR model are known. The future values of the observables are given by

$$\boldsymbol{y}_{T+1,T+h} = \boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \boldsymbol{M}'\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{T+1,T+h}, \tag{25}$$

where the $nh \times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h}$ represents the deterministic component due to initial conditions and the autoregressive dynamics of the VAR model, and the $nh \times nh$ matrix $\boldsymbol{M}'$ the impact of future structural shocks.

Under (i), 'conditional-on-observables forecasting' can be written as

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{C}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h} = \overline{\boldsymbol{C}}\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \overline{\boldsymbol{C}}\boldsymbol{M}'\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{T+1,T+h} \sim N(\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}_{T+1,T+h}, \overline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f). \tag{26}$$

where $\overline{\boldsymbol{C}}$ is a $k_o \times nh$ selection matrix, the $k_o \times 1$ vector $\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}_{T+1,T+h}$ is the mean of the distribution of the observables constrained under the conditional forecast and the $k_o \times k_o$ matrix $\overline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f$ the associated uncertainty. In turn, under (ii), 'conditional-on-shocks forecasting' can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{\Xi}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{T+1,T+h} \sim N(\boldsymbol{g}_{T+1,T+h}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_g), \tag{27}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ is a $k_s \times nh$ selection matrix, the $k_s \times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{g}_{T+1,T+h}$ the mean of the distribution of the shocks constrained under the conditional forecast and the $k_s \times k_s$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_g$ the associated uncertainty.[17] Under invertibility we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{M}'^{-1}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h} &= \boldsymbol{M}'^{-1}\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{T+1,T+h}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Xi}\boldsymbol{M}'^{-1}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h} &= \boldsymbol{\Xi}\boldsymbol{M}'^{-1}\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \boldsymbol{\Xi}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{T+1,T+h}, \tag{28} \\
\underline{\boldsymbol{C}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h} &= \underline{\boldsymbol{C}}\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \boldsymbol{\Xi}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{T+1,T+h}, \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\underline{\boldsymbol{C}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h} = \underline{\boldsymbol{C}}\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \boldsymbol{\Xi}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{T+1,T+h} \sim N(\underline{\boldsymbol{f}}_{T+1,T+h}, \underline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f), \tag{30}$$

with $\underline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_g$.

Based on Equations (26) and (30), we can combine the k_o constraints on the observables under 'conditional-on-observables forecasting' and the k_s constraints on the structural shocks

---

[17]For the conditional forecast that underlies an impulse response function to the i-th shock in period $T+1$ we have

$$\boldsymbol{\Xi} = \boldsymbol{I}_{nh}, \quad \boldsymbol{g}_{T+1,T+h} = [\boldsymbol{e}_i', \boldsymbol{0}_{n(h-1)\times 1}']_{nh\times 1}', \quad \boldsymbol{\Omega}_g = \boldsymbol{0}_{nh\times nh},$$

where $\boldsymbol{e}_i$ is an $n \times 1$ vector of zeros with unity at the i-th position.

under 'conditional-on-shocks forecasting' by defining the $k \times nh$, $k = k_o + k_s$, matrices $\boldsymbol{C} \equiv [\overline{\boldsymbol{C}}', \underline{\boldsymbol{C}}']'$ and $\boldsymbol{D} \equiv [\boldsymbol{M}\overline{\boldsymbol{C}}', \boldsymbol{\Xi}']'$ to write

$$\boldsymbol{C}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h} \;=\; \boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \boldsymbol{D}\widetilde{\epsilon}_{T+1,T+h} \sim N(\boldsymbol{f}_{T+1,T+h}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_f), \tag{31}$$

where the $k \times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{f}_{T+1,T+h} \equiv [\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}'_{T+1,T+h}, \underline{\boldsymbol{f}}'_{T+1,T+h}]'$ stacks the means of the distributions under the 'conditional-on-observables forecasting' ($\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}_{T+1,T+h} = \overline{\boldsymbol{C}}\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h}$) and the 'conditional-on-shocks forecasting' ($\underline{\boldsymbol{f}}_{T+1,T+h} = \underline{\boldsymbol{C}}\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \boldsymbol{g}_{T+1,T+h}$), and the $k \times k$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_f \equiv diag(\overline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f, \underline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f)$.[18]

Based on the combination of 'conditional-on-observables forecasting' and 'conditional-on-shocks forecasting' in Equation (31), we can derive the solutions for $\boldsymbol{\mu}_y$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y$. Define

$$\widetilde{\epsilon}_{T+1,T+h} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\epsilon, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon), \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon = \boldsymbol{I} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}_\epsilon, \tag{32}$$

so that the $nh \times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}_\epsilon$ and the $nh \times nh$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\epsilon$ represent the deviation of the mean and the variance of the structural shocks under the conditional forecast from their values in the unconditional forecast. Given Equations (31) and (32), we have

$$\boldsymbol{f}_{T+1,T+h} \;=\; \boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \boldsymbol{D}\boldsymbol{\mu}_\epsilon, \tag{33}$$
$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}_f \;=\; \boldsymbol{D}(\boldsymbol{I} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}_\epsilon)\boldsymbol{D}'. \tag{34}$$

The solutions for $\boldsymbol{\mu}_\epsilon$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon$ are given by

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_\epsilon \;=\; \boldsymbol{D}^*(\boldsymbol{f}_{T+1,T+h} - \boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h}), \tag{35}$$
$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon \;=\; \boldsymbol{D}^*\boldsymbol{\Omega}_f\boldsymbol{D}^{*\prime} + (\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{D}^*\boldsymbol{D}\boldsymbol{D}'\boldsymbol{D}^{*\prime}), \tag{36}$$

where the $nh \times k$ matrix $\boldsymbol{D}^*$ is the Moore-Penrose inverse of $\boldsymbol{D}$.[19] Equation (35) shows that the path of the implied future structural shocks under the conditional forecast depends on its deviation from the unconditional forecast. In turn, Equation (36) shows that the variance of the implied future structural shocks depends on the uncertainty the researcher attaches to the conditional forecast; if the uncertainty is zero, then $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_f = \boldsymbol{0}$ as $\overline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f = \underline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_g = \boldsymbol{0}$, and hence $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon = 0$, meaning that a unique, certain path $\boldsymbol{\mu}_\epsilon$ for the structural shocks is implied by the conditional forecast.[20]

Finally, as

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h} = \boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \boldsymbol{M}'\widetilde{\epsilon}_{T+1,T+h}, \tag{37}$$

---

[18]Note that $\underline{\boldsymbol{f}}_{T+1,T+h}$ refers to the mean of $\underline{\boldsymbol{C}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h} = \boldsymbol{\Xi}\boldsymbol{M}'^{-1}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h}$ and hence not just of a path of some observable(s). Instead, $\boldsymbol{\Xi}\boldsymbol{M}'^{-1}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{T+1,T+h}$ are the values of the observables that are implied by a specific path of the structural shocks assumed under 'conditional-on-shocks forecasting'.

[19]ADPRR discuss the properties of the solutions under different values for k relative to nh.

[20]As discussed in ADPRR, the researcher could impose that the uncertainty under the conditional forecast is identical to that of the unconditional forecast, i.e. set $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_f = \boldsymbol{D}\boldsymbol{D}'$.

and given Equations (35) and (36) we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\mu}_y &= \boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h} + \boldsymbol{M}'\boldsymbol{D}^*(\boldsymbol{f}_{T+1,T+h} - \boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{b}_{T+1,T+h}), & (38)\\
\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y &= \boldsymbol{M}'\boldsymbol{M} - \boldsymbol{M}'\boldsymbol{D}^*(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_f - \boldsymbol{D}\boldsymbol{D}')\boldsymbol{D}^{*\prime}\boldsymbol{M}. & (39)
\end{aligned}
$$

Again, when $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_f = \boldsymbol{0}$ then $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y = \boldsymbol{0}$, and there is no uncertainty about the path of the observables under the conditional forecast.

It is useful to discuss how the framework of ADPRR is parsed in the context of our paper. Recall that we constrain the effect of a monetary policy shock on the target variable to be zero, and we assume this occurs due either the oil supply shock (in the SSC case) or all shocks (in the SSA case). Ordering the oil price last in $\boldsymbol{y}_t$, the monetary policy shock first and the oil supply shock last in $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$, and denoting by $\boldsymbol{e}_i$ a $n \times 1$ vector of zeros with unity at the i-th position, for 'conditioning-on-observables forecasting' we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{\boldsymbol{C}} &= \boldsymbol{I}_h \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_n', & (40)\\
\overline{\boldsymbol{f}}_{T+1,T+h} &= \boldsymbol{0}_{h\times 1}, & (41)\\
\overline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f &= \boldsymbol{0}_{h\times h}. & (42)
\end{aligned}
$$

The intuition underlying Equations (40) and (41) is that in the conditional forecast that underlies the impulse response we constrain the oil price (ordered at the n-th position in $\boldsymbol{y}_t$) to be zero over all horizons $T+1, T+2, \ldots, T+h$, and Equation (42) indicates that we do not allow for any uncertainty. In turn, for 'conditioning-on-shocks forecasting' we have

$$
\boldsymbol{\Xi} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{e}_1' & \boldsymbol{0}_{1\times n(h-1)} \\ (\boldsymbol{0}_{n-3\times 1}, \boldsymbol{I}_{n-3}, \boldsymbol{0}_{n-3\times 2}) & \boldsymbol{0}_{n-3\times n(h-1)} \\ \boldsymbol{0}_{(h-1)(n-2)\times n} & \boldsymbol{I}_{h-1} \otimes (\boldsymbol{I}_{n-2}, \boldsymbol{0}_{n-2\times 2}) \end{bmatrix}_{h(n-2)\times nh} \quad (43)
$$

$$
\underline{\boldsymbol{f}}_{T+1,T+h} = \boldsymbol{g}_{T+1,T+h} = [1, \boldsymbol{0}_{1\times n-3}, \boldsymbol{0}_{1\times(n-2)(h-1)}]', \quad (44)
$$

$$
\underline{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_f = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_g = \boldsymbol{0}_{h(n-2)\times h(n-2)}. \quad (45)
$$

The first row in Equation (43) selects the monetary policy shock ordered first in $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ and the first row in Equation (44) constrains it to be unity in the impact period $T+1$; the second row in Equation (43) selects the non-monetary policy and the non-oil supply shocks ordered from position 2 to $n-3$ in $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ and the second entry in Equation (44) constrains them to be zero in the impact period $T+1$; the third row in Equation (43) selects the monetary policy and the non-oil supply shocks and Equation (44) constrains them to be zero over horizons $T+2, T+3, \ldots, T+h$. It is furthermore interesting to consider—recalling that

$\underline{C} \equiv \Xi M'^{-1}$—the stacked matrices C and D in Equation (31)

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{C}_{h \times hn} \\ \underline{C}_{h(n-2) \times hn} \end{bmatrix}_{h(n-1) \times hn}, \qquad D = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{C}M' \\ \Xi \end{bmatrix}_{h(n-1) \times nh}. \tag{46}$$

Note that the fact that C and D are not square and full rank reflects that at every horizon we have potentially many free shocks to impose one constraint, implying a multiplicity of solutions. ADPRR show that the solution chosen in this case—obtained using the Moore-Penrose inverse of D—minimises the Frobenius norm of the deviation of the distribution of the structural shocks under the conditional forecast from the baseline, i.e. μ_ϵ from 0 and Σ_ϵ from I. Note that C and D become square and full rank if h additional constraint are imposed.

Appendix D   Implementation of the MRE approach

The posterior distribution of the impulse responses $f(\cdot)$ is approximated by N draws obtained from a Bayesian estimation algorithm. Following the importance sampling procedure of Arias, Rubio-Ramírez, and Waggoner (2021), the re-sampled draws from the BPSVAR for $y_{T+1,T+h}$ constitute an unweighted and independent sample from the posterior distribution $f(\cdot)$, and as such are assigned a weight of $w_i = 1/N$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. The counterfactual posterior distribution $f^\star(\cdot)$ can be approximated by assigning different weights w_i^* to the draws from the baseline posterior.

The relative entropy (or distance) between the approximated posterior distributions is measured by

$$\mathcal{D}(f^*, f) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i^\star log\left(\frac{w_i^\star}{w_i}\right). \tag{47}$$

The goal of the MRE approach is to determine the counterfactual weights w^* that minimise $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$ subject to

$$w_i^\star \geq 0, \qquad \forall\, i = 1, 2, ..., N, \tag{48}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i^* = 1, \tag{49}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i^* g(y_{T+1,T+h}^{(i)}) = \bar{g}, \tag{50}$$

where $y_{T+1,T+h}^{(i)}$ are the impulse responses to a Monetary policy shock as defined in the main text. Equation 49 reflect that the weights are probabilities, and Equation 50 that the counterfactual posterior distribution shall satisfy some constraint.

In particular, in our application for Equation (50) we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} y_{tar^*,T+h}^{(i)} w_{i,h}^* = T_{t+h}, \tag{51}$$

where $y_{tar^*,T+h}^{(i)}$ denotes the impulse response of the constrained variable to the monetary policy shock at horizon h associated with the i-th draw. Notice that—consistent with the baseline posterior for which we report point-wise means and elsewhere in the paper as well as in line with Giacomini and Ragusa (2014)—we apply the MRE approach separately at each impulse response horizon $T+1, T+2, \ldots, T+h$.

As shown by Robertson, Tallman, and Whiteman (2005) and Giacomini and Ragusa (2014), the weights of the counterfactual posterior distribution $\boldsymbol{w}_h^*$ can be obtained numerically by tilting the weights of the baseline posterior distribution $\boldsymbol{w}_h$ using the method of Lagrange. In particular, the weights of the counterfactual posterior distribution are given by

$$w_{i,h}^* = \frac{w_{i,h} \exp\left[\lambda_h g(y_{tar^*,T+h}^{(i)})\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} w_{i,h} \exp\left[\lambda_h g(y_{tar^*,T+h}^{(i)})\right]}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, N, \tag{52}$$

where λ_h is the Lagrange multiplier associated with the constraint $g(y_{ip^*,T+h}^{(i)}) = y_{ip^*,T+h}^{(i)} = 0$. It can be shown that the Lagrange multiplier can be obtained numerically as

$$\lambda_h = \underset{\tilde{\lambda}_h}{\arg\min} \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_{i,h} \exp\left\{\tilde{\lambda}_h \left[g(y_{ip^*,T+h}^{(i)})\right]\right\}. \tag{53}$$