

# Plausibility of Local Currency Contribution to the CMIM

**Soyoung Kim and Woongji Im**

This study assesses the plausibility of local currency contribution to the Chiang Mai Initiative Multilateralization (CMIM) arrangement. First, we investigate the (net) demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves because introducing local currency contribution is efficient only when sufficient demand exists. The main results are as follows. i) Substantial demand exists for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves. ii) The size of the demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves is large in comparison with the size of the maximum withdrawal from CMIM. iii) Net demand for local currencies in CMIM tends to be positive. Second, the stability of local currencies is analyzed by calculating the exchange market pressure index because costs of local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements can be high if local currencies are unstable. The results suggest that several currencies of ASEAN+3 members are as stable as popular non-U.S. international currencies for various sub-periods. The results in terms of stability of the currency, internationalization of currency, and liberalization of capital account transactions, indicate that the Japanese yen, Chinese yuan, and Korean won could first be considered eligible for local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements. Overall, the results may support the idea of introducing local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements.

*Keywords:* Local currency contribution, CMIM, Demand for local currencies, Stability of currency, Exchange market pressure index, ASEAN+3, Foreign exchange reserves

*JEL Classification:* F15, F33, F26, F55

Soyoung Kim, Professor, Department of Economics, Seoul National University, 1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 08826, Republic of Korea. (Email) [soyoungkim@snu.ac.kr](mailto:soyoungkim@snu.ac.kr), (Tel.) +82-2-880-2689; Woongji Im, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Economics, Seoul National University, 1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 08826, Republic of Korea. (Email) [ungbee@snu.ac.kr](mailto:ungbee@snu.ac.kr).

Financial support from AMRO is acknowledged. The research was a part of the research project on "Local Currency Contribution to the CMIM." The findings,

interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this material represent the views of the author(s) and are not necessarily those of the ASEAN+3 Macroeconomic Research Office (AMRO) or its member authorities. Neither AMRO nor its member authorities shall be held responsible for any consequence of the use of the information contained herein. We would like to thank an anonymous referee for valuation comments and suggestions.

[*Seoul Journal of Economics* 2020, Vol. 33, No. 3]

DOI: 10.22904/sje.2020.33.3.007

## I. Introduction

The Chiang Mai Initiative Multilateralization (CMIM) is a multilateral currency swap arrangement among the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the People's Republic of China (including Hong Kong, China), Japan, and Korea (ASEAN+3) with the purpose of addressing balance of payment and/or short-term liquidity difficulties in the region and supplementing existing international financial arrangements.<sup>1</sup>

In May 2000, the Chiang Mai Initiative (CMI) was launched by the ASEAN+3 countries as a bilateral currency swap arrangement. CMI was later upgraded to CMIM, which came into effect on 24 March 2010 with a total size of 120 billion U.S. dollars. Since then, various amendments were added to the CMIM for improvements. For example, the total size was doubled in 2014, and an overarching legal basis for conditionality was introduced in 2020 for the CMIM to support members in addressing their risks and vulnerabilities through policy recommendations and financial support.

An interesting issue to be considered for CMIM is local currency contribution to the CMIM arrangements. That is, currently, U.S. dollars is used in the CMIM for liquidity support but local currencies may be further considered. This study assesses the plausibility of local currency contribution to the CMIM arrangements.

Using local currencies in the arrangement is efficient and reduces costs if receiving members need local currencies to settle trade or finance matters when faced with balance of payments and/or short-term liquidity difficulties. Using local currencies directly is more efficient

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 1 for a more detailed explanation.

and less costly than exchanging local currencies for U.S. dollars, providing members can decrease the burden of drawing on foreign exchange reserves. In addition, various externalities exist, such as promoting trade and financial integration in the region and weakening the over-dependence on the U.S. dollar. However, the arrangement can generate costs if receiving members do not need local currencies when they are faced with balance of payments and/or short-term liquidity difficulties. In such cases, this process is inefficient and costly because receiving members need to exchange local currencies for U.S. dollars. Furthermore, exchanging local currencies for U.S. dollars may result in the instability of local currencies and increase the possibility of contagion. A detailed discussion about benefits and costs of local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements is provided in Section II.

Next, we investigate whether receiving members need local currencies in CMIM. To address the issue, we first consider whether the demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves is sufficient. The demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves for ASEAN+3 is inferred by combining the demand for foreign exchange reserves and information on local currency usage in the region. We estimated the demand for foreign exchange reserves with various measures according to past studies<sup>2</sup>. They are three months of imports, 100 percent of short-term debt, 20 percent of M2, and the IMF rule. The demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves is calculated by multiplying measures for demand for foreign exchange reserves by relevant local currency composition ratios. Information on local currency usage in the region such as currency composition data for short-term debt, foreign liabilities, and other portfolio liabilities and invoicing currency data for exports are used to calculate local currency composition ratios. We find substantial demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves. The size of the demand is sufficiently large compared with the size of the maximum withdrawal from CMIM. This result may support the idea of introducing local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements.

The net demand for local currencies in CMIM arrangements is also inferred by subtracting estimated actual foreign exchange reserves in the sense that demand for local currencies can be fully met with their own foreign exchange reserves, and members do not need other

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix 2 for a more detailed explanation.

facilities to cover the demand for local currencies if so. We find that net demand for local currency in CMIM tends to be positive, possibly suggesting that local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements is acceptable, even after considering the current level of local currencies in actual foreign exchange reserves. We discuss this issue in detail in Section III.

Stability of local currencies is further examined using the exchange market pressure index because the costs of local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements can depend on such stability. We find several currencies of members quite stable. Currencies of China, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam are as stable as popular non-U.S. international currencies even using conservative measures. In recent years, the currencies of China, Japan, and Korea have been as stable as those of the U.K., Canada, and the E.U., and even more stable than those of Australia and Switzerland. The currencies of Myanmar, Vietnam, and Hong Kong have also been as stable as those of Australia and Switzerland.

In addition, the internationalization of a currency and the liberalization of capital account transactions are considered because they are important in implementing local currency contributions to CMIM arrangements. In terms of level of internationalization, the Japanese yen is first and the RMB, Singapore dollar, Hong Kong dollar, and Korean won follow in order. The degree of capital controls in these economies is low except for RMB. These issues are covered in Section IV. Conclusions with summaries are provided in Section V.

## **II. Benefits and Costs of Local Currency Contribution to CMIM Arrangements**

### *A. Benefits*

First, concrete demand for local currencies is possible. If local currencies are used in settling trade and finance matters, then ASEAN+3 members may need local currencies to address balance of payments and/or short-term liquidity difficulties. When members need local currencies, they can obtain local currencies by exchanging U.S. dollars (provided by CMIM arrangements). However, using local currencies directly is more efficient and less costly than exchanging local currencies for U.S. dollars. In addition, the value of U.S. dollars against local currencies fluctuates over time, such that local currency

## ***PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM***<sup>441</sup>

contribution to the CMIM arrangements is worthwhile at times when local currencies are needed.

Second, providing members can decrease the burden of drawing on foreign exchange reserves because they can provide their currencies. This factor is likely to be important during crisis periods when receiving members experience crisis and providing members are subject to contagion risks. Drawing on foreign exchange reserves can increase the contagion risks of providing members, such that providing members may be reluctant to draw on foreign exchange reserves and CMIM arrangements may not work well when receiving members experience crisis. However, members are likely to provide their currencies without much hesitation if local currencies can be provided. Fundamentally, each member under CMIM arrangements may need to prepare foreign exchange reserves for potential drawing from other members, which involves costs (usual costs of holding foreign exchange reserves), but a country is not subject to such a cost if its currency can be used. Similarly, local currency contribution may help increase the size of CMIM when ASEAN+3 wants to increase the size of CMIM because providing members are likely to feel lower burdens by using their currencies in CMIM arrangements.

Third, various positive externalities are associated with introducing local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements. Introducing local currency contribution to CMIM may promote trade and financial integration in the region. This introduction could also promote local currency use in the region and reduce the region's overdependence on the U.S. dollar. This would be regarded as a positive signal for local currency use in the market.

### *B. Costs*

Introducing local currency contribution to CMIM can generate costs if receiving members do not need local currency when they face balance of payments and/or short-term liquidity difficulties. Providing currencies such as the U.S. dollar instead of local currencies is clearly a better option for receiving members if the local currency is not needed because they need to exchange local currencies for U.S. dollars, which is inefficient and costly. This process is costly in two aspects. First, receiving members need to pay the transaction costs of exchanging currencies. Second, given the size of local currencies arranged in CMIM,

receiving members may exchange local currencies for a lesser amount of U.S. dollars if local currencies depreciate against the U.S. dollar. Generally, the instability of local currency value (against currencies needed) is likely an incurred cost given that the amount of currencies needed (that can be obtained with local currencies) is uncertain. Local currencies' value can be unstable, especially during times when receiving members experience currency crisis, which can be contagious in the region.

In addition, as receiving members exchange local currencies for U.S. dollars (or currencies needed), local currencies are likely to depreciate against the U.S. dollar, possibly resulting in the instability of local currencies and increasing the possibility of contagion to members issuing local currencies. This potential problem can occur for providing members. If this problem occurs, then the second benefit of not drawing on foreign exchange reserves may disappear because this situation is similar to the case in which providing members draw on foreign exchange reserves and then purchase the same amount of foreign exchange reserves with local currencies. If each member decides not to prepare extra foreign exchange reserves, given that its currency can be used despite not being needed by receiving members (that is, they will exchange the local currency for currencies needed), then the currency of the providing member will be subject to extra depreciation pressure, possibly increasing the possibility of contagion risk.

If the size of the CMIM arrangements is defined in terms of U.S. dollars, then the stability of local currencies may not matter much for receiving members even when local currencies are used in CMIM because the receiving members can exchange local currencies with the same amount of U.S. dollars. However, ASEAN+3 may not pursue this arrangement because its arrangement is similar to using U.S. dollars (one difference may be that the transaction costs of exchanging local currencies for U.S. dollars fall into receiving members instead of providing members if arranged in such a way). In addition, if providing members do not prepare extra U.S. dollars for CMIM, then, as indicated previously, this situation can lead to the depreciation of local currencies and increase the chance of contagion to local currencies.

Costs are generated when receiving members do not need local currencies during the time of balance of payments and/or short-term liquidity difficulties. Furthermore, first and second benefits are likely to disappear if local currencies are not needed during the time

of balance of payments and/or short-term liquidity difficulties. That is, when receiving countries do not need local currencies, all types of costs are generated potentially, but first and second benefits are likely to disappear. Additionally, when the stability of the value of local currencies is low, the exchanging cost is likely high. More seriously, local currencies are likely to experience a currency crisis or abrupt changes in the value of currency when local currencies are subject to high foreign exchange market pressure (that is, under high speculative attacks). Therefore, to discuss the plausibility of local currency contribution to CMIM, this study will address the following questions.

- (a) Do ASEAN+3 members need local currencies when they face balance of payments and/or short-term liquidity difficulties?
- (b) Are the values of local currencies stable? Are local currencies subject to low exchange market pressure?

### **III. Demand for Local Currencies in Foreign Exchange Reserves and CMIM**

In this chapter, we discuss whether ASEAN+3 members need local currencies when they are faced with balance of payments and/or short-term liquidity difficulties. Foreign exchange reserves and CMIM play a similar role, so demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves for ASEAN+3 is discussed by combining the demand for foreign exchange reserves and information on local currency usage in the region. Finally, net demand for local currencies in CMIM arrangements is inferred by subtracting estimated actual foreign exchange reserves from demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves.

#### *A. Demand for Foreign Exchange Reserves*

To infer roughly the size of foreign exchange demand for ASEAN+3 members, we calculate various alternative measures for each ASEAN+3 member. First, we consider three traditional measures, namely, three months of imports, 100 percent of short-term debt, and 20 percent of M2. In addition, we consider a rule suggested by IMF (2011), which comprises the sum of 30 percent of short-term debt, 15 percent of other portfolio liabilities (long-term debt and equities), 5 percent of M2, and 5 percent of exports for flexible exchange rate regime; and the sum of 30 percent of short-term debt, 20 percent of other portfolio liabilities (long-

**TABLE 1**  
MEASURES FOR FOREIGN EXCHANGE RESERVE DEMAND  
(USD MILLIONS, 2017)

|             | Three months<br>of imports | 100% of short-<br>term debt | 20% of M2        | IMF rule  | Actual FX<br>Reserves |
|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Brunei      | 1,506                      | ..                          | 2,103            | ..        | 3,488                 |
| Cambodia    | <i>3,317</i>               | <i>1,727</i>                | 3,911            | 4,066     | 12,200                |
| Indonesia   | 48,375                     | 54,756                      | 80,999           | 73,592    | 130,203               |
| Lao P.D.R.  | <i>1,340</i>               | <i>710</i>                  | 516              | 1,344     | 1,270                 |
| Malaysia    | 56,249                     | 143,337                     | <i>77,365</i>    | 123,088   | 102,446               |
| Myanmar     | 3,495                      | 762                         | 7,018            | 5,715     | 5,214                 |
| Philippines | 20,951                     | 19,963                      | 49,551           | 33,179    | 81,565                |
| Singapore   | 140,367                    | 1,085,132                   | 84,011           | 477,552   | 279,902               |
| Thailand    | <i>77,689</i>              | <i>71,904</i>               | <i>103,640</i>   | 76,020    | 202,562               |
| Vietnam     | 56,811                     | 19,959                      | 69,497           | 65,786    | 49,497                |
| China       | 605,728                    | 1,109,306                   | 4,958,823        | 3,197,649 | 3,235,350             |
| Hong Kong   | 160,453                    | 1,048,002                   | <i>241,641</i>   | 601,363   | 431,442               |
| Japan       | 218,823                    | 2,584,425                   | <i>2,399,228</i> | 1,704,287 | 1,264,141             |
| Korea       | 166,220                    | 170,445                     | 447,682          | 272,642   | 389,248               |


Note: The IMF rule is 30 percent of short-term debt plus 15 percent of other portfolio liability (calculated as equity and portfolio funds share plus long-term debt securities as of 2017 June) plus 5 percent of M2 plus 5 percent of exports for flexible exchange rate regime countries. Multipliers for other exchange rate regime countries are 30 percent, 20 percent, 10 percent, and 10 percent, respectively. Short-term debt is calculated on a remaining maturity basis, but the figures for Cambodia, Lao P.D.R., Myanmar, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Japan are based on original maturity. However, some numbers (shown in italics) are calculated based on 2016 data, and others (underlined) are calculated based on 2010 data.

Source: IMF IFS/CPIS/WEO/ARA; WDI

term debt and equities), 10 percent of M2, and 10 percent of exports for other exchange rate regimes. The IMF rule is a more comprehensive measure given that it considers various additional factors.

Table 1 reports the size of four measures of foreign exchange demand for each ASEAN+3 country, together with the actual size of foreign exchange reserves. In certain cases, the sizes of foreign exchange reserve demand are fairly different across measures in each member. Among the four measures, 20 percent of the M2 measure shows the largest number in Brunei, Indonesia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, China, and Korea. However, the IMF rule measure has the highest numbers in Cambodia and Lao P.D.R., and 100 percent of short-term debt measure has the highest number in Malaysia,

**PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM445**



Note: The figure reports country-level averages of EIF, using value added weights

**FIGURE 1**  
 RATIO OF ACTUAL FOREIGN EXCHANGE RESERVES TO  
 DEMAND FOR FOREIGN EXCHANGE RESERVES

Singapore, Hong Kong, and Japan.

We can compare the number based on each of four measures with the actual holdings of foreign exchange reserves (which is reported in the last column of Table 1). For easy comparison, Figure 1 reports the ratio of actual foreign exchange reserves to demand for foreign exchange reserves based on each of four measures. When the ratio is larger than 1, actual foreign exchange reserves are larger than the demand for foreign exchange reserves calculated on the basis of each measure. In Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand, the actual foreign exchange reserves exceed the demand for foreign exchange reserves based on all four measures. In Myanmar, China, and Korea, the actual foreign exchange reserves exceed the demand based on three measures. For all members, the actual foreign exchange reserves exceed the demand based on at least one measure.

*B. Demand for Local Currencies in Foreign Exchange Reserves*

In this section, we discuss the demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves.

First, we present the types of information needed to infer the demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves, in addition to

information on the total reserve demand for foreign exchange reserves discussed in the previous section.

The demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves is likely to depend on local currency use in trade settlements in the sense that the demand for foreign exchange reserves is related to trade statistics, such as imports, exports, and current account, as discussed in the previous section. Foreign exchange reserves are needed to cover a certain period of imports. If local currency use in import settlements is large, then demand for local currency in foreign exchange reserves is large as well given that a large amount of local currencies would be needed to pay for imports.

Export earnings reflect the potential loss of foreign exchange provisions that can arise from a drop in external demand or terms of trade shock. If local currency use in export settlements is large, then the potential loss of local currency provisions is large; thus, the demand for local currency in foreign exchange reserves may be high.<sup>3</sup>

The demand for local currency in foreign exchange reserves is large if a large amount of local currency is needed to finance a current account deficit with a similar reason.<sup>4</sup> Additionally, the current account includes net investment income in addition to trade in goods and services. Thus, local currency use in net investment income flow must be considered.

In sum, information on local currency use in trade settlements is

<sup>3</sup> Export earnings may be regarded as a resource that can provide foreign exchange reserves to a country. When a member has high local currency use for exports, the member can receive more local currencies. Therefore, high local currency use in exports may not necessarily imply that the member needs more demand for local currency in foreign exchange reserves. Rather, high local currency use in exports may imply that the member has less demand for local currency in foreign exchange reserves given the size of exports. That is, exports provide local currencies instead of international reserve currencies. Thus, the member may need to accumulate more international reserve currencies in foreign exchange reserves. However, export earnings included in the IMF rule is the measure to reflect the potential loss of foreign exchange provisions. Thus, local currency use in export settlements is treated as positively related with demand for local currency in foreign exchange reserves.

<sup>4</sup> If the composition of local currency is different for credit and debit transactions, high local currency use in debit transactions implies high local currency demand in foreign exchange reserves, but high local currency usage in credit transactions does not necessarily imply high local currency demand in foreign exchange reserves.

## ***PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM447***

important to determine the demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves. High local currency use in imports implies a high demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves. High local currency usage in exports may be positively related to high demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves.

Second, local currency use in cross-border assets and liabilities is an important determinant of demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves. External liabilities, such as short-, medium-, and long-term debt, equities, and FDI, are indicators for demand for foreign exchange reserves because foreign investors are likely to sell these assets during a crisis. Therefore, when the local currency composition of external liabilities is large, demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves is large. Given that short-term debts are riskier and are likely sold more quickly than other external liabilities, the local currency composition of short-term debts is likely to be more important than that of other external liabilities.

Capital flight of domestic residents is another consideration. Domestic residents can sell liquid domestic assets and purchase foreign assets during crisis periods. If the current local currency composition of foreign assets can represent the composition of foreign assets that domestic residents would like to purchase during crisis, then the high local currency composition of foreign assets may suggest high demand for local currency in foreign exchange reserves.<sup>5</sup>

In sum, the local currency composition of foreign assets and liabilities is important to infer demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves. A high local currency composition of foreign liabilities and assets implies a high demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves.

We determine the demand for local currencies in foreign exchange

<sup>5</sup> However, foreign assets can be regarded as a resource for international reserve currencies during the crisis time. That is, domestic residents may sell foreign assets to obtain international reserve currencies in need during crisis. In that case, the high local currency composition of foreign liabilities may not necessarily suggest high demand for local currency in foreign exchange reserves. The high local currency composition of foreign liabilities given the size of foreign liabilities means that local currencies can be more easily obtained by selling foreign liabilities, but international reserve currencies can be obtained with more difficulties. Therefore, the high local currency composition of foreign liabilities may imply low demand for local currency in foreign exchange reserves.

reserves by inferring how much local currencies are likely needed in the demand for foreign exchange reserves based on various measures, as calculated in the previous section. This means we calculate the likely portion of local currency demand out of total demand for foreign exchange reserves calculated in the previous section and multiply the portion by the total demand for foreign exchange reserves to obtain demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves. The likely portion of local currency demand in total demand for foreign exchange reserves based on each measure is calculated thus.

We use the following information on local currency shares. For the three-month import measure, we use the local currency proportion data in import settlements. For the 100 percent short-term debt measure, we use the local currency composition data for foreign liabilities because obtaining the data is difficult on currency composition for short-term debt only. For the 20 percent of the M2 measure, we use the local currency composition data for foreign assets. For the IMF rule components, such as imports and short-term debts, the same data are used as explained above. For other portfolio liabilities in the IMF rule, we use the local currency composition data for foreign liabilities. For exports in the IMF rule, we use the local currency proportion data in export settlements.<sup>6</sup>

Relevant data on local currency shares are collected in the following way. For export and import local currency share data, we first use the survey data prepared by the ASEAN+3 Macroeconomic Research Office (AMRO). However, for Indonesia and Thailand, relevant data are collected from the web page of each central bank in which separate data for import and export shares are available. For the local currency composition of short-term debts and foreign liabilities, we first use the survey data. For the local currency composition of foreign asset data, we first use the survey data. Thereafter, we use CPIS data (Coordinated Portfolio Investment Survey from IMF) for Malaysia because the relevant data are unavailable from the survey. We use CPIS data for Thailand and the Philippines given that the survey data do not provide separate information for foreign assets and liabilities unlike CPIS data. When the relevant data are unavailable, the proportion in foreign exchange

<sup>6</sup> This procedure might overestimate the demand for local currencies to some extent if precautionary demand is high for US dollars.

## ***PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM*****449**

market turnover data is used to approximate the share of each currency.

Table 2 reports the demand for all local currencies in foreign exchange reserves in each ASEAN+3 member. The size in U.S. dollars and the size as a fraction of the maximum amount of withdrawal from CMIM are reported. The maximum amount of withdrawal from CMIM is also reported for each country. We compare the demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves with the maximum amount of withdrawal from CMIM to infer whether local currency demand is sufficient for CMIM arrangements. For instance, if the demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves is smaller than the size of potential CMIM withdrawal, then introducing local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements may not be desirable because demand for local currencies might not be sufficient. However, if the former is larger than the latter, then we may further consider local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements because of sufficient demand that can be compared with the size of potential CMIM withdrawal. In the last row (“Total”) of Table 2, the aggregates of all ASEAN+3 members are reported. For the 100 percent of short-term debt measure and the IMF rule, we report an additional number in brackets for the aggregate of all ASEAN+3 members. That number shows the aggregate, excluding Hong Kong and Singapore. Hong Kong and Singapore are huge offshore financial centers, meaning that their demand for foreign exchange might be exaggerated when assessed on the basis of the size of financial assets and liabilities. To avoid such potential problems, we report the additional aggregate number, excluding Hong Kong and Singapore, for two measures that are based on the size of financial assets and liabilities.

The total aggregate number for all ASEAN+3 members (shown in the last row of Table 2) suggests the demand for local currencies is far larger than the maximum amount of withdrawal from CMIM based on all measures, except for the first measure. On the basis of the first, second, third, and fourth measures, the demand for local currencies stands at 46 percent, 204 percent, 390 percent, and 282 percent of the maximum withdrawal from CMIM, respectively. The aggregate numbers for the two measures, excluding Hong Kong and Singapore, are still larger than 100 percent, at 106 percent and 260 percent, respectively. Given that the first measure tends to be out of date, this result suggests that the demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves is far

**TABLE 2**  
DEMAND FOR LOCAL CURRENCIES IN FOREIGN EXCHANGE RESERVES  
(USD MILLIONS, 2017)

|             | Three months of imports |      | 100% of short-term debt |                | 20% of M2 |        | IMF rule             |                | Maximum withdrawal (CMIM) |
|-------------|-------------------------|------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------|--------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Brunei      | 240                     | 80%  | ..                      | ..             | 335       | 112%   | ..                   | ..             | 300                       |
| Cambodia    | 528                     | 44%  | 275                     | 23%            | 623       | 52%    | 648                  | 54%            | 1,199                     |
| Indonesia   | 3,212                   | 15%  | 4,008                   | 18%            | 607       | 3%     | 3,583                | 16%            | 21,896                    |
| Lao P.D.R.  | 213                     | 71%  | 113                     | 38%            | 82        | 27%    | 214                  | 71%            | 300                       |
| Malaysia    | 3,844                   | 18%  | 22,574                  | 103%           | 4,936     | 23%    | 13,951               | 64%            | 21,896                    |
| Myanmar     | 557                     | 93%  | 121                     | 20%            | 1,118     | 186%   | 910                  | 152%           | 600                       |
| Philippines | 859                     | 4%   | 739                     | 3%             | 606       | 3%     | 944                  | 4%             | 21,896                    |
| Singapore   | 21,090                  | 96%  | 163,041                 | 745%           | 12,623    | 58%    | 71,752               | 328%           | 21,896                    |
| Thailand    | 5,671                   | 26%  | 8,125                   | 37%            | 15,053    | 69%    | 8,591                | 39%            | 21,896                    |
| Vietnam     | 9,049                   | 91%  | 581                     | 6%             | 2,022     | 20%    | 4,773                | 48%            | 9,917                     |
| China       | 12,115                  | 50%  | 154,569                 | 632%           | 690,955   | 2,826% | 419,156              | 1,714%         | 24,452                    |
| Hong Kong   | 24,168                  | 398% | 71,264                  | 1,172%         | 16,432    | 270%   | 46,170               | 759%           | 6,079                     |
| Japan       | 3,064                   | 12%  | 0                       | 0%             | 23,992    | 92%    | 6,668                | 26%            | 26,111                    |
| Korea       | 13,131                  | 41%  | 3,409                   | 11%            | 53,274    | 165%   | 16,048               | 50%            | 32,255                    |
| Total       | 97,741                  | 46%  | 428,819<br>(194,514)    | 204%<br>(106%) | 822,658   | 390%   | 593,408<br>(475,486) | 282%<br>(260%) | 210,694<br>(182,719)      |

Note: Figures are derived by multiplying demand for foreign exchange reserves by relevant local currency composition ratio. Demand for own currency is not counted. Invoicing currency data for import, currency composition data for short-term debt, currency composition data for foreign liabilities, currency composition data for other portfolio liabilities, and invoicing currency data for exports are used to calculate relevant local currency composition ratios for imports, short-term debts, M2, other portfolio liabilities (in the IMF rule) and exports (in the IMF rule), respectively. Currency invoicing and composition data are collected from Chapter 2, survey, and IMF CPIS. Foreign exchange reserves in local currency are estimated by applying the compositions of the RMB and yen in world international reserves (IMF COFER, 2017).

larger than the size of the maximum withdrawal in CMIM, which may provide a rationale for considering local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements.

The demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves tends to be lower for most individual members than for the aggregate results because aggregate results include huge local currency demand in China. Still, seven members record demand larger than the maximum withdrawal from CMIM based on at least one measure. The members are Brunei, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, China, Hong Kong, and Korea. In addition, only two members have a demand that is smaller than 50 percent of the maximum withdrawal from CMIM based on all measures, namely, Indonesia and the Philippines. The ratios of

**PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM451**

**TABLE 3**  
DEMAND FOR THE YEN IN FOREIGN EXCHANGE RESERVES  
(USD MILLIONS, 2017)

|             | Three months of imports |      | 100% of short-term debt |                | 20% of M2 |        | IMF rule             |                | Maximum withdrawal (CMIM) |
|-------------|-------------------------|------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------|--------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Brunei      | 240                     | 80%  | ..                      | ..             | 335       | 112%   | ..                   | ..             | 300                       |
| Cambodia    | 528                     | 44%  | 275                     | 23%            | 623       | 52%    | 648                  | 54%            | 1,199                     |
| Indonesia   | 3,212                   | 15%  | 4,008                   | 18%            | 607       | 3%     | 3,583                | 16%            | 21,896                    |
| Lao P.D.R.  | 213                     | 71%  | 113                     | 38%            | 82        | 27%    | 214                  | 71%            | 300                       |
| Malaysia    | 3,844                   | 18%  | 22,574                  | 103%           | 4,936     | 23%    | 13,951               | 64%            | 21,896                    |
| Myanmar     | 557                     | 93%  | 121                     | 20%            | 1,118     | 186%   | 910                  | 152%           | 600                       |
| Philippines | 859                     | 4%   | 739                     | 3%             | 606       | 3%     | 944                  | 4%             | 21,896                    |
| Singapore   | 21,090                  | 96%  | 163,041                 | 745%           | 12,623    | 58%    | 71,752               | 328%           | 21,896                    |
| Thailand    | 5,671                   | 26%  | 8,125                   | 37%            | 15,053    | 69%    | 8,591                | 39%            | 21,896                    |
| Vietnam     | 9,049                   | 91%  | 581                     | 6%             | 2,022     | 20%    | 4,773                | 48%            | 9,917                     |
| China       | 12,115                  | 50%  | 154,569                 | 632%           | 690,955   | 2,826% | 419,156              | 1,714%         | 24,452                    |
| Hong Kong   | 24,168                  | 398% | 71,264                  | 1,172%         | 16,432    | 270%   | 46,170               | 759%           | 6,079                     |
| Japan       | 3,064                   | 12%  | 0                       | 0%             | 23,992    | 92%    | 6,668                | 26%            | 26,111                    |
| Korea       | 13,131                  | 41%  | 3,409                   | 11%            | 53,274    | 165%   | 16,048               | 50%            | 32,255                    |
| Total       | 97,741                  | 46%  | 428,819<br>(194,514)    | 204%<br>(106%) | 822,658   | 390%   | 593,408<br>(475,486) | 282%<br>(260%) | 210,694<br>(182,719)      |

demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves to actual foreign exchange reserves for Indonesia and the Philippines range from 3 percent to 18 percent and from 3 percent to 4 percent, respectively, based on four measures. Overall, the results affirm substantial demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves compared with the size of the maximum withdrawal from CMIM for most ASEAN+3 members.

In Table 3, we calculate the demand for the Japanese yen in foreign exchange reserves. We see that more than half the demand for local currencies is in Japanese yen. The number for the sum of all ASEAN+3 members shows that the demand for the yen is far larger than the maximum withdrawal from Japan in CMIM based on three measures. In all members, except for Indonesia and the Philippines, demand for the yen is larger than 95 percent of the maximum withdrawal from Japan in the CMIM, based on at least one measure.

Table 4 reports the demand for the RMB in foreign exchange reserves. Demand for the RMB is smaller than that of the yen but still substantial based on the aggregate numbers, showing 9 percent to 78 percent of the maximum size of withdrawal from China. Demand

**TABLE 4**  
DEMAND FOR RMB IN FOREIGN EXCHANGE RESERVES  
(USD MILLIONS, 2017)

|             | Three months<br>of imports |      | 100% of short-<br>term debt |             | 20% of M2 |      | IMF rule           |              | Maximum<br>withdrawal from<br>China (CMIM) |
|-------------|----------------------------|------|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------|------|--------------------|--------------|--|
| Brunei      | 30                         | 35%  | ..                          | ..          | 42        | 49%  | ..                 | ..           | 86   |
| Cambodia    | 66                         | 19%  | 34                          | 10%         | 78        | 23%  | 81                 | 24%          | 342  |
| Indonesia   | 307                        | 5%   | 110                         | 2%          | 567       | 9%   | 262                | 4%           | 6,487                                      |
| Lao P.D.R.  | 27                         | 31%  | 14                          | 16%         | 10        | 12%  | 27                 | 31%          | 86   |
| Malaysia    | 521                        | 8%   | 2,858                       | 44%         | 502       | 8%   | 1,717              | 26%          | 6,487                                      |
| Myanmar     | 70                         | 41%  | 15                          | 9%          | 140       | 82%  | 114                | 67%          | 171  |
| Philippines | 63                         | 1%   | 20                          | 0%          | 34        | 1%   | 41                 | 1%           | 6,487                                      |
| Singapore   | 2,799                      | 43%  | 21,636                      | 334%        | 1,675     | 26%  | 9,522              | 147%         | 6,487                                      |
| Thailand    | 544                        | 8%   | 0                           | 0%          | 0         | 0%   | 37                 | 1%           | 6,487                                      |
| Vietnam     | 1,133                      | 40%  | 0                           | 0%          | 0         | 0%   | 438                | 15%          | 2,850                                      |
| China       | ..                         | ..   | ..                          | ..          | ..        | ..   | ..                 | ..           | ..   |
| Hong Kong   | 3,199                      | 178% | 0                           | 0%          | 0         | 0%   | 1,274              | 71%          | 1,796                                      |
| Japan       | 1,969                      | 18%  | 0                           | 0%          | 2,399     | 22%  | 1,270              | 12%          | 10,944                                     |
| Korea       | 1,662                      | 15%  | 1,704                       | 16%         | 41,187    | 376% | 11,462             | 105%         | 10,944                                     |
| Total       | 12,389                     | 21%  | 26,392<br>(4,756)           | 44%<br>(9%) | 46,634    | 78%  | 26,244<br>(15,449) | 44%<br>(30%) | 59,651<br>(51,368)                         |

for the RMB in each country is non-negligible. Except for Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand, demand for the RMB is larger than 20 percent of the maximum withdrawal from China in CMIM, based on at least one measure.

Table 5 reports the demand for other currencies in foreign exchange reserves (excluding the yen and RMB). The demand for other currencies is substantial as well. The aggregate demand is larger than the maximum size of withdrawals from other members in the CMIM based on two measures. The numbers based on the four measures are 16 percent, 80 percent (59 percent), 220 percent, and 141 percent (144 percent). Except for Korea, Indonesia, and the Philippines, the demand for local currency is larger than 20 percent of the maximum withdrawal from China in CMIM based on at least two measures.

Table 6 reports the aggregate ASEAN+3 demand for each local currency in foreign exchange reserves. Except for the Indonesian

**PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM453**

**TABLE 5**  
DEMAND FOR OTHER LOCAL CURRENCIES IN FOREIGN EXCHANGE RESERVES  
(USD MILLIONS, 2017)

|             | Three months of imports |      | 100% of short-term debt |              | 20% of M2 |       | IMF rule             |                | Maximum withdrawal from others |
|-------------|-------------------------|------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Brunei      | 47                      | 40%  | ..                      | ..           | 66        | 55%   | ..                   | ..             | 118                            |
| Cambodia    | 104                     | 22%  | 54                      | 11%          | 122       | 26%   | 127                  | 27%            | 473                            |
| Indonesia   | 1,082                   | 13%  | 230                     | 3%           | 0         | 0%    | 277                  | 3%             | 8,126                          |
| Lao P.D.R.  | 42                      | 35%  | 22                      | 19%          | 16        | 14%   | 42                   | 35%            | 118                            |
| Malaysia    | 1,969                   | 24%  | 4,220                   | 52%          | 3,863     | 48%   | 4,530                | 56%            | 8,126                          |
| Myanmar     | 109                     | 46%  | 24                      | 10%          | 219       | 93%   | 178                  | 75%            | 237                            |
| Philippines | 126                     | 2%   | 60                      | 1%           | 52        | 1%    | 93                   | 1%             | 8,126                          |
| Singapore   | 3,116                   | 38%  | 24,093                  | 296%         | 1,865     | 23%   | 10,603               | 130%           | 8,126                          |
| Thailand    | 388                     | 5%   | 5,033                   | 62%          | 4,514     | 56%   | 3,789                | 47%            | 8,126                          |
| Vietnam     | 1,774                   | 46%  | 94                      | 2%           | 327       | 8%    | 892                  | 23%            | 3,867                          |
| China       | 0                       | 0%   | 34,643                  | 256%         | 154,863   | 1146% | 92,954               | 688%           | 13,508                         |
| Hong Kong   | 3,622                   | 160% | 0                       | 0%           | 0         | 0%    | 1,442                | 64%            | 2,268                          |
| Japan       | 1,094                   | 7%   | 0                       | 0%           | 21,593    | 142%  | 5,398                | 36%            | 15,167                         |
| Korea       | 166                     | 2%   | 0                       | 0%           | 0         | 0%    | 0                    | 0%             | 9,023                          |
| Total       | 13,640                  | 16%  | 68,473<br>(44,381)      | 80%<br>(59%) | 187,501   | 220%  | 120,325<br>(108,280) | 141%<br>(144%) | 85,412<br>(75,017)             |

rupiah, Philippine peso, and RMB, aggregate demand for the currency of each member in foreign exchange reserves is larger than 100 percent of the maximum withdrawal from each member based on at least one measure. For those three members, the numbers are larger than 30 percent based on at least one measure.

In sum, demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves is substantial. The size of the demand is large in comparison with the size of the maximum withdrawal from CMIM. This result can support the idea of introducing local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements.

*C. Net Demand for Local Currencies in CMIM*

In this section, net demand for local currencies in CMIM arrangements is inferred by subtracting estimated actual foreign exchange reserves from demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves calculated in Section II.B. This net demand can represent the

**TABLE 6**  
 AGGREGATE DEMAND FOR EACH LOCAL CURRENCY IN FOREIGN EXCHANGE RESERVES  
 (USD MILLIONS, 2017)

|                         | Three months<br>of<br>imports |      | 100% of<br>short-term debt |                | 20% of M2 |      | IMF rule             |                | Maximum<br>withdrawal<br>from relevant<br>country (CMIM) |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------|------|----------------------|----------------|--|
| Indonesian<br>rupiah    | 404                           | 5%   | 2,331<br>(1,250)           | 28%<br>(17%)   | 5,320     | 64%  | 3,717<br>(3,178)     | 44%<br>(44%)   | 8,373<br>(7,270)   |
| Malaysian<br>ringgit    | 792                           | 9%   | 3,978<br>(2,041)           | 48%<br>(28%)   | 9,304     | 111% | 6,460<br>(5,493)     | 77%<br>(76%)   | 8,373<br>(7,270)   |
| Philippine<br>peso      | 261                           | 3%   | 1,626<br>(872)             | 19%<br>(12%)   | 3,709     | 44%  | 2,585<br>(2,209)     | 31%<br>(30%)   | 8,373<br>(7,270)   |
| Singapore<br>dollar     | 4,851                         | 58%  | 12,110<br>(12,110)         | 145%<br>(149%) | 47,639    | 569% | 30,446<br>(29,870)   | 364%<br>(367%) | 8,373<br>(8,134)   |
| Thai baht               | 2,205                         | 26%  | 4,254<br>(2,301)           | 51%<br>(32%)   | 9,443     | 113% | 6,801<br>(5,826)     | 81%<br>(80%)   | 8,373<br>(7,270)   |
| Chinese yuan            | 12,389                        | 21%  | 26,392<br>(4,756)          | 44%<br>(9%)    | 46,634    | 78%  | 26,244<br>(15,449)   | 44%<br>(30%)   | 59,651<br>(51,368)                                       |
| Hong Kong<br>dollar     | 1,992                         | 24%  | 21,213<br>(11,822)         | 256%<br>(158%) | 67,827    | 817% | 37,585<br>(33,453)   | 453%<br>(446%) | 8,302<br>(7,505)   |
| Japanese yen            | 71,712                        | 109% | 333,954<br>(145,378)       | 509%<br>(258%) | 588,523   | 897% | 446,839<br>(351,757) | 681%<br>(624%) | 65,632<br>(56,333)                                       |
| Korean won              | 3,046                         | 9%   | 19,423<br>(10,445)         | 59%<br>(37%)   | 44,202    | 135% | 30,818<br>(26,338)   | 94%<br>(94%)   | 32,816<br>(28,166)                                       |
| Other ASEAN<br>currency | 89                            | 4%   | 3,539<br>(3,539)           | 146%<br>(166%) | 56        | 2%   | 1,912<br>(1,912)     | 79%<br>(90%)   | 2,430<br>(2,130)   |
| Total                   | 97,741                        | 46%  | 428,819<br>(194,514)       | 204%<br>(106%) | 822,658   | 390% | 593,408<br>(475,486) | 282%<br>(260%) | 210,694<br>(182,719)                                     |

demand for local currencies in CMIM arrangements after excluding the demand that is satisfied by the actual holding of local currency foreign exchange reserves.

However, the exact information on actual local currency holdings in foreign exchange reserves is difficult to obtain. To roughly infer the size of local currencies in foreign exchange reserves, we simply multiply the actual reserve holdings by the local currency ratio in the world international reserves. For local currencies, we only consider Chinese yuan and Japanese yen in which the numbers are provided. However, this method is very rough, and the correct numbers can be different from the numbers calculated here. Thus, we opt to use these numbers as rough reference points only, without drawing a strong conclusion

**PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM455**

**TABLE 7**  
NET DEMAND FOR LOCAL CURRENCIES IN CMIM  
(USD MILLION, 2017)

|             | Three months of imports |       | 100% of short-term debt |        | 20% of M2 |        | IMF rule  |        | Maximum withdrawal (CMIM) | FX reserves in LCY |
|-------------|-------------------------|-------|-------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Brunei      | 27                      | 9%    | ..                      | ..     | 122       | 41%    | ..        | ..     | 300                       | 213                |
| Cambodia    | -218                    | -18%  | -471                    | -39%   | -123      | -10%   | -98       | -8%    | 1,199                     | 746                |
| Indonesia   | -4,750                  | -22%  | -3,954                  | -18%   | -7,355    | -34%   | -4,380    | -20%   | 21,896                    | 7,962              |
| Lao P.D.R.  | 136                     | 45%   | 35                      | 12%    | 4         | 1%     | 136       | 45%    | 300                       | 78                 |
| Malaysia    | -2,421                  | -11%  | 16,309                  | 74%    | -1,329    | -6%    | 7,686     | 35%    | 21,896                    | 6,265              |
| Myanmar     | 238                     | 40%   | -198                    | -33%   | 799       | 133%   | 591       | 99%    | 600                       | 319                |
| Philippines | -4,129                  | -19%  | -4,249                  | -19%   | -4,382    | -20%   | -4,044    | -18%   | 21,896                    | 4,988              |
| Singapore   | 3,973                   | 18%   | 145,924                 | 666%   | -4,494    | -21%   | 54,635    | 250%   | 21,896                    | 17,117             |
| Thailand    | -6,716                  | -31%  | -4,262                  | -19%   | 2,666     | 12%    | -3,796    | -17%   | 21,896                    | 12,387             |
| Vietnam     | 6,022                   | 61%   | -2,446                  | -25%   | -1,005    | -10%   | 1,746     | 18%    | 9,917                     | 3,027              |
| China       | -148,106                | -606% | -5,652                  | -23%   | 530,734   | 2,170% | 258,935   | 1,059% | 24,452                    | 160,221            |
| Hong Kong   | -2,216                  | -36%  | 44,880                  | 738%   | -9,952    | -164%  | 19,786    | 325%   | 6,079                     | 26,384             |
| Japan       | -13,202                 | -51%  | -16,265                 | -62%   | 7,727     | 30%    | -9,597    | -37%   | 26,111                    | 16,265             |
| Korea       | -10,672                 | -33%  | -20,395                 | -63%   | 29,470    | 91%    | -7,756    | -24%   | 32,255                    | 23,804             |
| Total       | -182,035                | -86%  | 149,043                 | 71%    | 542,882   | 258%   | 313,632   | 149%   | 210,694                   | 279,776            |
|             |                         |       | (-41,761)               | (-23%) |           |        | (239,211) | (131%) | (182,719)                 | (236,275)          |

Note: The figures are derived by subtracting estimated actual foreign exchange reserves from demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves. Demand for own currency is not counted. Invoicing currency data for import, currency composition data for short-term debt, currency composition data for foreign liabilities, currency composition data for other portfolio liabilities, invoicing currency data for exports are used to calculate relevant local currency composition ratios for imports, short-term debts, M2, other portfolio liabilities (in the IMF rule) and exports (in the IMF rule). Currency invoicing and composition data are collected from Chapter 2, survey, and IMF CPIS. Foreign exchange reserves in local currency are estimated by applying the compositions of RMB and yen in world international reserves (IMF COFER 2017).

based on these numbers.

Each member can decrease the size of actual local currency holdings when local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements is introduced if the net demand is small or negative. Therefore, a small or negative net demand is not necessarily a big hurdle for introducing local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements if sufficient demand for local currency in foreign exchange reserves exists, as shown in the previous section.

Table 7 reports the net demand for local currencies in CMIM arrangements based on four measures. The last column of Table 7 presents estimated numbers for actual local currency holdings. The estimated size of the actual foreign exchange reserves in local currencies tends to be smaller than the maximum withdrawal from CMIM in all members, except for China. The net demand for local currencies in

**TABLE 8**  
NET DEMAND FOR JAPANESE YEN IN FOREIGN EXCHANGE RESERVES  
(USD MILLIONS, 2017)

|             | Three months of imports |         | 100% of short-term debt |         | 20% of M2 |        | IMF rule  |        | Maximum withdrawal from Japan (CMIM) | FX reserves in yen |
|-------------|-------------------------|---------|-------------------------|---------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Brunei      | -8                      | -8%     | ..                      | ..      | 56        | 59%    | ..        | ..     | 96                                   | 171                |
| Cambodia    | -238                    | -62%    | -410                    | -107%   | -174      | -45%   | -157      | -41%   | 384                                  | 597                |
| Indonesia   | -4,546                  | -62%    | -2,700                  | -37%    | -6,329    | -87%   | -3,325    | -46%   | 7,283                                | 6,369              |
| Lao P.D.R.  | 83                      | 86%     | 15                      | 15%     | -6        | -6%    | 83        | 87%    | 96                                   | 62                 |
| Malaysia    | -3,657                  | -50%    | 10,485                  | 144%    | -4,441    | -61%   | 2,693     | 37%    | 7,283                                | 5,011              |
| Myanmar     | 123                     | 64%     | -173                    | -90%    | 504       | 262%   | 363       | 189%   | 192                                  | 2,55               |
| Philippines | -3,320                  | -46%    | -3,331                  | -46%    | -3,470    | -48%   | -3,180    | -44%   | 7,283                                | 3,990              |
| Singapore   | 1,483                   | 20%     | 103,620                 | 1,423%  | -4,610    | -63%   | 37,935    | 521%   | 7,283                                | 13,692             |
| Thailand    | -5,170                  | -71%    | -6,817                  | -94%    | 630       | 9%     | -5,144    | -71%   | 7,283                                | 9,909              |
| Vietnam     | 3,721                   | 116%    | -1,934                  | -60%    | -725      | -23%   | 1,023     | 32%    | 3,200                                | 2,421              |
| China       | -148,106                | -1,353% | -40,296                 | -368%   | 375,870   | 3,434% | 165,981   | 1,517% | 10,944                               | 160,221            |
| Hong Kong   | -3,758                  | -186%   | 50,160                  | 2,488%  | -4,672    | -232%  | 22,350    | 1,109% | 2,016                                | 21,104             |
| Japan       | ..                      | ..      | ..                      | ..      | ..        | ..     | ..        | ..     | ..                                   | ..                 |
| Korea       | -7,737                  | -63%    | -17,336                 | -141%   | -6,953    | -57%   | -14,454   | -118%  | 12,288                               | 19,040             |
| Total       | -169,129                | -258%   | 93,113                  | 142%    | 347,682   | 530%   | 205,998   | 314%   | 65,632                               | 240,841            |
|             |                         |         | (-60,667)               | (-108%) |           |        | (145,712) | (259%) | (56,333)                             | (206,045)          |

CMIM is still more than 100 percent of maximum withdrawal of CMIM based on the third and fourth measures for the aggregate of ASEAN+3, possibly suggesting sufficient demand for local currency use in CMIM arrangements, even after considering the existing local currency foreign exchange reserves. In all members, except for Cambodia, Indonesia, and the Philippines, net demand is positive based on at least one measure.

Table 8 reports the net demand for yen in CMIM arrangements. For the aggregate of ASEAN+3, net demand is 142 percent (-108 percent), 530 percent, and 314 percent (259 percent) of maximum withdrawal from Japan in CMIM arrangements based on the last three measures. For eight members, the net demand is larger than 80 percent of the maximum withdrawal from Japan in CMIM. The results generally confirm the substantial demand of many members for the yen.

Table 9 reports the net demand for RMB in CMIM arrangements. For the aggregate of ASEAN+3, the net demand is positive based on 20 percent of the M2 measure, although negative based on the other three measures. For members such as Lao P.D.R., Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, Vietnam, and Korea, the net demand is positive based on

**PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM457**

**TABLE 9**  
**NET DEMAND FOR RMB IN FOREIGN EXCHANGE RESERVES**  
**(USD MILLIONS, 2017)**

|             | Three months of imports |       | 100% of short-term debt |                | 20% of M2 |       | IMF rule             |                | Maximum withdrawal from China (CMIM) | FX reserves in RMB |
|-------------|-------------------------|-------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Brunei      | -13                     | -15%  | ..                      | ..             | -1        | -1%   | ..                   | ..             | 86                                   | 43                 |
| Cambodia    | -83                     | -24%  | -115                    | -33%           | -71       | -21%  | -68                  | -20%           | 342                                  | 149                |
| Indonesia   | -1,286                  | -20%  | -1,483                  | -23%           | -1,026    | -16%  | -1,331               | -21%           | 6,487                                | 1,593              |
| Lao P.D.R.  | 11                      | 12%   | -2                      | -2%            | -6        | -7%   | 11                   | 13%            | 86                                   | 16                 |
| Malaysia    | -733                    | -11%  | 1,604                   | 25%            | -752      | -12%  | 463                  | 7%             | 6,487                                | 1,254              |
| Myanmar     | 6                       | 3%    | -49                     | -29%           | 76        | 44%   | 50                   | 29%            | 171                                  | 64                 |
| Philippines | -935                    | -14%  | -978                    | -15%           | -964      | -15%  | -957                 | -15%           | 6,487                                | 998                |
| Singapore   | -626                    | -10%  | 18,211                  | 281%           | -1,750    | -27%  | 6,097                | 94%            | 6,487                                | 3,425              |
| Thailand    | -1,935                  | -30%  | -2,479                  | -38%           | -2,479    | -38%  | -2,442               | -38%           | 6,487                                | 2,479              |
| Vietnam     | 527                     | 18%   | -606                    | -21%           | -606      | -21%  | -168                 | -6%            | 2,850                                | 606                |
| China       | ..                      | ..    | ..                      | ..             | ..        | ..    | ..                   | ..             | ..                                   | ..                 |
| Hong Kong   | -2,081                  | -116% | -5,280                  | -294%          | -5,280    | -294% | -4,006               | -223%          | 1,796                                | 5,280              |
| Japan       | -14,296                 | -131% | -16,265                 | -149%          | -13,866   | -127% | -14,995              | -137%          | 10,944                               | 16,265             |
| Korea       | -3,101                  | -28%  | -3,059                  | -28%           | 36,424    | 333%  | 6,699                | 61%            | 10,944                               | 4,763              |
| Total       | -24,546                 | -41%  | -10,543<br>(-23,474)    | -18%<br>(-46%) | 9,699     | 16%   | -10,691<br>(-12,781) | -18%<br>(-25%) | 59,651<br>(51,368)                   | 36,935<br>(28,230) |

at least one measure, although negative numbers are found in many cases.

In sum, the net demand for local currency in CMIM, after subtracting estimated actual foreign exchange reserves, tends to be positive. This result suggests that room is available for introducing local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements, even after considering the current level of local currencies in actual foreign exchange reserves. However, this result should be interpreted with caution because the data used in this analysis, especially the estimates for actual foreign exchange reserves, are not perfect.

**IV. Stability of Local Currencies**

If certain parts of arranged local currencies are not needed by receiving the members when they experience balance of payments and/ or short-term liquidity difficulties, then this situation will be inefficient and costs will be involved. The receiving member will subsequently need to exchange local currencies for the currencies needed, such as USD. In

such a case, when local currencies are unstable, the cost is likely to be large.

First, we calculate the measure of volatility in the value or exchange rate of local currencies. If the value of local currencies is unstable, then receiving members would incur higher costs in exchanging local currencies for the currencies needed. However, this measure has one drawback. The volatility of the exchange rate is likely to depend on the exchange rate regime. For instance, if one member adopts a fixed exchange rate regime, then the volatility of the exchange rate is likely to be small, except during crisis. Nonetheless, this situation does not necessarily imply that the currency is stable. The country with a fixed exchange rate regime potentially has a greater chance of experiencing a currency crisis and the exchange rate volatility can be very high during such a crisis. Therefore, we consider the next measure.

Second, we calculate the exchange market pressure index. The measure captures total pressure on an exchange rate. Instead of simply considering exchange rate movements, the measure also considers the degree of foreign exchange management. Thus, the measure attempts to capture the size of the fundamental source of exchange rate instability that each member faces. For instance, we suppose, in a flexible exchange rate regime, the sales of domestic currency under an economic event leads to exchange rate depreciation. However, the sales of domestic currency do not lead to exchange rate depreciation in a fixed exchange rate regime in most cases. Instead, foreign exchange intervention is needed to prevent an exchange rate depreciation. Therefore, by considering exchange rate changes and the degree of foreign exchange market intervention, one may capture the total pressure on exchange rate or the size of the fundamental source of exchange rate instability that each country faces.

In addition, the exchange market pressure index has been widely used in past studies to measure the severity of speculative attacks and to define a currency crisis. If local currencies tend to be subject to large speculative attacks, then the currencies are more likely to experience a currency crisis and lose value, also leading to high costs for receiving and providing members (as their chance of crisis increases).

We mostly compare the stability of currencies of ASEAN+3 members with well-known international currencies, such as the Euro, U.K. pound, Canadian dollar, and Swiss franc, instead of U.S. dollars. First, to define the value of currency, a base currency is needed. Thus, we

## ***PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM459***

use the U.S. dollar as the base currency. Second, U.S. dollars are likely more stable than other currencies. Therefore, the results should be interpreted with caution.<sup>7</sup>

### *A. Stability for the Value of Local Currencies*

We first calculate the standard deviation of the growth rate of the value of local currencies. Ideally, we must consider the value of local currencies against the currencies needed for each country. However, we do not know the exact currency composition needed for each country. Therefore, we first consider the exchange rate of local currencies against the U.S. dollar because it is the representative international reserve currency. We also construct an effective exchange rate against the actual currency composition of foreign exchange reserves in the world, as reported in Currency Composition of Official Foreign Exchange (COFER) from IMF. In the first quarter of 2018, for allocated reserves, U.S. dollars, Euros, RMB, yen, pound sterling, Australian dollars, Canadian dollars, and Swiss francs take up 62.48 percent, 20.39 percent, 1.39 percent, 4.81 percent, 4.68 percent, 1.70 percent, 1.86 percent, and 0.17 percent, respectively. Other currencies make up 2.5 percent, but we do not know the exact currency composition in that category. Thus, we normalize the weights of each currency to sum up to 100 percent after excluding other currencies.

We calculate the standard deviation of the growth rate of these exchange rates for each ASEAN+3 member's currency. We also calculate the standard deviation for six world reserve currencies outside the region (U.S. dollars, Euros, pound sterling, Australian dollars, Canadian dollars, and Swiss francs) for comparison. By using monthly data, we calculate the standard deviation from 2000 to 2017. We also consider various sub-periods, such as after 2010 to check more recent trends. In addition, we consider 2007–2009 to check the stability during the global crisis period. To check the stability during the recent U.S. tapering, we consider 2013 to 2017 (including taper tantrum during 2013) and 2015 to 2017 (the periods of U.S. interest rate increase).

<sup>7</sup> The stability of currencies may change over time. In particular, although we include crisis periods like global financial crisis period, the stability of currencies may be different when the crash risks are high. Further research on the issue may be worthwhile.

**TABLE 10**  
STANDARD DEVIATION OF EXCHANGE RATE GROWTH

## (1) Exchange Rate Against the U.S. Dollar

|             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007–<br>2009 | 2013–<br>2017 | 2015–<br>2017 |             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007–<br>2009 | 2013–<br>2017 | 2015–<br>2017 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Thailand    | 1.4%         | 1.3%         | 1.4%          | 1.3%          | 1.2%          | U.K.        | 2.3%         | 2.1%         | 3.2%          | 2.1%          | 2.3%          |
| Myanmar     | 1.5%         | 1.7%         | 1.3%          | 1.9%          | 2.1%          | Switzerland | 2.4%         | 2.4%         | 2.6%          | 1.7%          | 1.8%          |
| Malaysia    | 1.5%         | 2.0%         | 1.6%          | 2.2%          | 2.5%          | Canada      | 2.0%         | 1.8%         | 3.2%          | 1.9%          | 2.3%          |
| Cambodia    | 0.6%         | 0.6%         | 0.6%          | 0.5%          | 0.5%          | Euro        | 2.4%         | 2.2%         | 2.9%          | 1.9%          | 2.1%          |
| Vietnam     | 0.9%         | 0.8%         | 0.9%          | 0.2%          | 0.3%          | Australia   | 3.0%         | 2.4%         | 4.9%          | 2.3%          | 2.2%          |
| Brunei      | 1.2%         | 1.2%         | 1.6%          | 1.1%          | 1.3%          | U.S.        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%          | 0.0%          | 0.0%          |
| Philippines | 1.5%         | 1.1%         | 2.1%          | 1.0%          | 1.0%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Laos        | 1.6%         | 0.5%         | 0.7%          | 0.5%          | 0.4%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Indonesia   | 3.0%         | 1.7%         | 4.1%          | 2.0%          | 1.6%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Singapore   | 1.2%         | 1.2%         | 1.5%          | 1.1%          | 1.3%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| China       | 0.5%         | 0.6%         | 0.5%          | 0.8%          | 0.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Japan       | 2.4%         | 2.3%         | 2.8%          | 2.5%          | 2.2%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Korea       | 2.4%         | 1.9%         | 4.1%          | 1.8%          | 1.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Hong Kong   | 0.1%         | 0.1%         | 0.2%          | 0.1%          | 0.1%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |

## (2) Effective Exchange Rate (Against World International Reserves)

|             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007–<br>2009 | 2013–<br>2017 | 2015–<br>2017 |             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007–<br>2009 | 2013–<br>2017 | 2015–<br>2017 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Thailand    | 1.2%         | 1.2%         | 1.1%          | 1.3%          | 1.2%          | U.K.        | 1.9%         | 1.8%         | 2.7%          | 1.9%          | 2.1%          |
| Myanmar     | 1.1%         | 1.5%         | 0.5%          | 1.8%          | 2.1%          | Switzerland | 1.9%         | 2.0%         | 1.9%          | 1.4%          | 1.5%          |
| Malaysia    | 1.4%         | 1.8%         | 1.1%          | 2.1%          | 2.3%          | Canada      | 1.7%         | 1.6%         | 2.7%          | 1.6%          | 2.0%          |
| Cambodia    | 0.9%         | 0.9%         | 1.0%          | 0.8%          | 0.9%          | Euro        | 1.7%         | 1.6%         | 2.1%          | 1.4%          | 1.6%          |
| Vietnam     | 1.1%         | 1.1%         | 1.1%          | 0.6%          | 0.6%          | Australia   | 2.6%         | 2.1%         | 4.2%          | 2.1%          | 2.0%          |
| Brunei      | 0.9%         | 0.9%         | 1.0%          | 0.9%          | 1.0%          | U.S.        | 0.7%         | 0.6%         | 0.8%          | 0.5%          | 0.6%          |
| Philippines | 1.5%         | 1.1%         | 1.9%          | 1.1%          | 1.0%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Laos        | 1.6%         | 0.7%         | 0.9%          | 0.7%          | 0.6%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Indonesia   | 2.9%         | 1.7%         | 3.6%          | 2.0%          | 1.6%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Singapore   | 0.9%         | 0.9%         | 0.8%          | 0.9%          | 1.0%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| China       | 0.7%         | 0.7%         | 0.8%          | 0.8%          | 0.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Japan       | 2.2%         | 2.2%         | 2.7%          | 2.3%          | 2.0%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Korea       | 2.2%         | 1.7%         | 3.6%          | 1.7%          | 1.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Hong Kong   | 0.7%         | 0.6%         | 0.8%          | 0.5%          | 0.6%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |

The results are reported in Table 10. As expected, they depend on the exchange rate regime. The volatility of the exchange rate tends to be very high for the free floating exchange rate regime. The floating exchange rate regime is adopted in countries/regions with the most

well-known international reserve currencies, such as the U.S., the U.K., Japan, Canada, Switzerland, and the E.U. The exchange rate volatility of those countries, except for the U.S., is fairly high. For the entire sample period, the standard deviation of exchange rate growth ranges from 2 to 2.4 percent for the exchange rate against the U.S. and from 1.7 percent to 2.2 percent for the effective exchange rate. For the period after 2010, they range from 1.8 to 2.4 percent and from 1.6 percent to 2.2 percent for the exchange rate against the U.S. and for the effective exchange rate, respectively. The value is low for the U.S. given that the exchange rate is mostly calculated against the value of its own currency. For the exchange rate against the U.S. dollar, the volatility of the exchange rate is not clearly larger than these numbers for any members. However, this situation does not necessarily mean that the currencies of these members are as stable as the more well-known international reserve currencies. These members tend to have used a more rigid exchange rate regime, which may explain low volatility. For the other three sub-periods, the results are similar. For all ASEAN+3 members, exchange rate volatility is not clearly larger than that of well-known international reserve currencies. Again, this result can be mostly explained by the differences in exchange rate regime.

#### *B. Exchange Market Pressure Index for Local Currencies*

We also calculate the exchange market pressure index. In past studies, the index is widely used to identify currency crisis periods by capturing total pressure on an exchange rate. This measure can represent the size of the fundamental sources of exchange rate instability that can be applied to different exchange rate regimes, as discussed earlier. If local currencies are subject to more pressure or huge speculative attacks, then the currencies are more likely to experience a currency crisis and lose their value. This situation implies that receiving members need to pay high costs when they exchange local currencies for the currencies needed. In addition, providing members are more likely to experience a crisis as they have more pressure in the foreign exchange market, and using local currencies may imply more chances of a crisis in providing members.

Various measures are suggested in past studies. Here, we use the four alternative measures of exchange market pressure. First, we use the simplest form, as follows:

$$EMP1 = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{IR_{t-1}}$$

where  $e_t$  is the exchange rate against the U.S. dollar and  $IR_t$  is exchange rate reserves (in U.S. dollars). This index sums the rate of exchange rate depreciation and the rate of reserve loss. The index captures total pressure on exchange rate from (net) sales of domestic currency. The sales of domestic currency would lead to an exchange rate depreciation if no foreign exchange intervention is conducted. If the central bank intervenes in the foreign exchange market to stabilize the exchange rate, then international reserves would suffer losses resulting from intervention. This simple index has been widely used in past studies, such as Aizenman and Binici (2016) and Aizenman, Lee, and Sushko (2012).

Second, in addition to foreign exchange market intervention, the monetary authority may increase the interest rate to stabilize the exchange rate. That is, an increase in the interest rate would fend off depreciation pressure on the exchange rate. Therefore, changes in the interest rate are added to the previous index.

$$EMP2 = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{IR_{t-1}} + (i_t - i_{t-1})$$

where  $i_t$  is domestic short-term interest rates. Sachs, Tornell, and Velasco (1996); Kaminsky, Lizondo, and Reinhart (1998); and Kaminsky and Reinhart (1999) added the short-term interest rate in the exchange rate market index.

The above indices are not formally derived from theoretical models. Thus, we also consider several indices derived from theoretical models. The third index is similar to the first one in having two components, namely, exchange rate and foreign exchange reserves. However, the international reserve changes are normalized by a monetary base. Girton and Roper (1977) contended that such normalization is consistent with the theoretical model, such as the monetary model of exchange rate.

$$EMP3 = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{M_{t-1} / e_{t-1}}$$

where  $M_t$  is the monetary base (in domestic currency).  $IR$  is expressed

in U.S. dollars, but  $M$  is expressed in domestic currency. Thus,  $M$  is divided by  $e$  to be expressed in U.S. dollars.

The fourth index is similar to the second one, in having three components, namely, exchange rate, foreign exchange reserves, and interest rate. However, the difference is found in two aspects. First, as in the third measure, foreign exchange reserve changes are normalized by a monetary base. Second, the interest rate changes are entered with a negative sign. Klaasen and Jager (2011) validated that the index can be derived from the monetary model. The index is also used in Aizenman and Binici (2016).

$$EMP4 = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{M_{t-1} / e_{t-1}} - (i_t - i_{t-1})$$

We calculate the average of absolute value of the index for each country for various sub-periods to show the stability of each currency during the considered periods. We use the average of absolute value because the non-zero value of the index implies the existence of pressure on exchange rate, and the size of (the absolute value of) the index shows the size of pressure on exchange rate. We calculate the standard deviation of the index and report the results in Appendix 3. The main implications of the results are not much different. As for the standard deviation of the exchange rate growth rate, we calculate the average of absolute value of the index for the currency of each ASEAN+3 member and six world reserve currencies outside the region, for 2000 to 2017, 2010 to 2017, 2007 to 2009, 2013 to 2017, and 2015 to 2017, by using monthly data.

The numbers for the U.S. indicate the role of the second component only because the first component (growth rate of the exchange rate) is zero. In addition, evaluating the size of the second component may not be meaningful for the U.S. Therefore, comparing the results for the U.S. with the results for other countries/regions is difficult. We first compare the results for the currencies of ASEAN+3 members with those for the Euro, which is the second-largest international reserve currency, making up more than 20 percent of world reserves. The average of absolute value of the exchange market index for the Euro is 2.9 percent and 2.2 percent for 2000 to 2017 and 2010 to 2017, respectively. Interestingly, several currencies show an even lower number for both periods, namely, currencies of the Philippines, Singapore, China, Japan,

Korea, and Hong Kong. In addition, the currencies of Thailand, Malaysia and Cambodia show similar numbers. For countries/regions with well-known international reserve currencies (U.K., Switzerland, Canada, the Euro area, and Japan), the average of absolute value of exchange market index ranges from 2.4 percent to 4.3 percent and from 2.1 percent to 4.6 percent for 2000 to 2017 and 2010 to 2017, respectively. Most ASEAN+3 members have an average value that is not greater than those numbers. Only three members have numbers larger than those ranges, namely, Myanmar for the period from 2000, and Brunei and Laos for both periods. For 2007 to 2009, 2013 to 2017 and 2015 to 2017, the results are similar in that the numbers for most ASEAN+3 members are not greater than those numbers.

**TABLE 11**  
AVERAGE OF ABSOLUTE VALUE OF EXCHANGE MARKET INDEX

$$(1) \text{EMPI} = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{IR_{t-1}}$$

|             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007-<br>2009 | 2013-<br>2017 | 2015-<br>2017 |             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007-<br>2009 | 2013-<br>2017 | 2015-<br>2017 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Thailand    | 2.5%         | 2.3%         | 3.3%          | 2.2%          | 2.4%          | U.K.        | 3.5%         | 2.7%         | 6.0%          | 2.7%          | 2.9%          |
| Myanmar     | 5.4%         | 3.9%         | 6.3%          | 4.5%          | 3.6%          | Switzerland | 4.3%         | 4.6%         | 5.2%          | 2.4%          | 2.6%          |
| Malaysia    | 2.7%         | 2.6%         | 3.6%          | 2.8%          | 2.9%          | Canada      | 2.4%         | 2.1%         | 3.7%          | 1.9%          | 2.1%          |
| Cambodia    | 2.4%         | 2.2%         | 3.3%          | 2.4%          | 2.1%          | Euro        | 2.9%         | 2.2%         | 4.5%          | 2.0%          | 2.3%          |
| Vietnam     | 3.8%         | 4.1%         | 4.3%          | 3.4%          | 3.1%          | Australia   | 7.7%         | 7.7%         | 9.7%          | 8.4%          | 9.4%          |
| Brunei      | 4.6%         | 5.8%         | 4.8%          | 5.0%          | 5.6%          | U.S.        | 2.0%         | 1.3%         | 4.0%          | 1.2%          | 1.2%          |
| Philippines | 2.6%         | 2.0%         | 3.4%          | 1.5%          | 1.4%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Laos        | 5.3%         | 6.9%         | 3.7%          | 7.2%          | 6.2%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Indonesia   | 3.8%         | 3.2%         | 4.7%          | 2.8%          | 2.8%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Singapore   | 2.1%         | 2.1%         | 2.7%          | 1.7%          | 1.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| China       | 2.1%         | 1.4%         | 2.8%          | 1.3%          | 1.5%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Japan       | 2.5%         | 2.1%         | 2.9%          | 2.1%          | 1.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Korea       | 2.6%         | 2.1%         | 4.1%          | 1.9%          | 1.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Hong Kong   | 1.2%         | 1.0%         | 2.4%          | 1.0%          | 1.1%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |

**PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM465**

$$(2) \text{ EMP2} = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{IR_{t-1}} + (i_t - i_{t-1})$$

|             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007-<br>2009 | 2013-<br>2017 | 2015-<br>2017 |             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007-<br>2009 | 2013-<br>2017 | 2015-<br>2017 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Thailand    | 2.5%         | 2.3%         | 3.4%          | 2.2%          | 2.4%          | U.K.        | 3.5%         | 2.7%         | 6.0%          | 2.7%          | 2.9%          |
| Myanmar     | 5.4%         | 3.9%         | 6.3%          | 4.5%          | 3.6%          | Switzerland | 4.3%         | 4.6%         | 5.2%          | 2.5%          | 2.7%          |
| Malaysia    | 2.7%         | 2.6%         | 3.6%          | 2.8%          | 2.9%          | Canada      | 2.4%         | 2.1%         | 3.7%          | 1.9%          | 2.1%          |
| Cambodia    | 2.4%         | 2.3%         | 3.4%          | 2.5%          | 2.1%          | Euro        | 2.8%         | 2.2%         | 4.5%          | 2.0%          | 2.3%          |
| Vietnam     | 3.9%         | 4.3%         | 4.7%          | 3.6%          | 3.4%          | Australia   | 7.7%         | 7.7%         | 9.6%          | 8.4%          | 9.4%          |
| Brunei      | 4.9%         | 5.8%         | 4.8%          | 5.0%          | 5.6%          | U.S.        | 2.0%         | 1.3%         | 4.1%          | 1.2%          | 1.2%          |
| Philippines | 2.7%         | 2.0%         | 3.5%          | 1.5%          | 1.4%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Laos        | 5.2%         | 6.8%         | 3.7%          | 7.2%          | 6.1%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Indonesia   | 3.9%         | 3.2%         | 4.8%          | 2.9%          | 2.8%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Singapore   | 2.1%         | 2.1%         | 2.8%          | 1.7%          | 1.8%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| China       | 2.1%         | 1.5%         | 2.8%          | 1.5%          | 1.5%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Japan       | 2.5%         | 2.1%         | 2.9%          | 2.1%          | 1.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Korea       | 2.6%         | 2.1%         | 4.1%          | 1.9%          | 1.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Hong Kong   | 1.3%         | 1.0%         | 2.5%          | 1.0%          | 1.2%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |

$$(3) \text{ EMP3} = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{M_{t-1} / e_{t-1}}$$

|             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007-<br>2009 | 2013-<br>2017 | 2015-<br>2017 |             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007-<br>2009 | 2013-<br>2017 | 2015-<br>2017 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Thailand    | 6.8%         | 7.1%         | 10.4%         | 5.8%          | 6.5%          | U.K.        | 1.7%         | 1.6%         | 2.2%          | 1.5%          | 1.6%          |
| Myanmar     | 1.5%         | 2.3%         | 1.0%          | 2.8%          | 2.1%          | Switzerland | 2.7%         | 3.2%         | 2.5%          | 2.4%          | 2.7%          |
| Malaysia    | 8.8%         | 6.6%         | 14.7%         | 5.3%          | 5.0%          | Canada      | 1.5%         | 1.4%         | 2.3%          | 1.5%          | 1.9%          |
| Cambodia    | 3.3%         | 3.0%         | 4.8%          | 3.3%          | 3.0%          | Euro        | 1.9%         | 1.7%         | 2.3%          | 1.4%          | 1.6%          |
| Vietnam     | 2.5%         | 2.3%         | 3.9%          | 1.9%          | 1.7%          | Australia   | 2.9%         | 2.4%         | 4.3%          | 2.5%          | 2.3%          |
| Brunei      | 5.1%         | 7.7%         | 3.9%          | 7.4%          | 8.4%          | U.S.        | 0.1%         | 0.1%         | 0.2%          | 0.1%          | 0.0%          |
| Philippines | 3.9%         | 3.2%         | 4.7%          | 1.9%          | 1.7%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Laos        | 7.7%         | 5.6%         | 6.0%          | 5.6%          | 5.4%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Indonesia   | 4.5%         | 3.9%         | 5.2%          | 3.3%          | 3.3%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Singapore   | 5.2%         | 3.9%         | 7.1%          | 2.6%          | 2.8%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| China       | 1.3%         | 1.1%         | 2.3%          | 1.0%          | 1.1%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Japan       | 1.9%         | 1.8%         | 2.3%          | 1.9%          | 1.7%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Korea       | 2.3%         | 1.9%         | 3.8%          | 1.7%          | 1.8%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Hong Kong   | 3.2%         | 1.8%         | 7.1%          | 1.9%          | 2.0%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |

$$(4) \text{ EMP4} = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{M_{t-1} / e_{t-1}} - (i_t - i_{t-1})$$

|             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007–<br>2009 | 2013–<br>2017 | 2015–<br>2017 |             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007–<br>2009 | 2013–<br>2017 | 2015–<br>2017 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Thailand    | 6.8%         | 7.1%         | 10.3%         | 5.8%          | 6.5%          | U.K.        | 1.8%         | 1.6%         | 2.4%          | 1.6%          | 1.6%          |
| Myanmar     | 1.6%         | 2.3%         | 1.0%          | 2.8%          | 2.1%          | Switzerland | 2.7%         | 3.2%         | 2.6%          | 2.4%          | 2.8%          |
| Malaysia    | 8.8%         | 6.6%         | 14.8%         | 5.3%          | 5.0%          | Canada      | 1.6%         | 1.4%         | 2.4%          | 1.5%          | 1.9%          |
| Cambodia    | 3.3%         | 2.9%         | 4.8%          | 3.3%          | 3.0%          | Euro        | 1.9%         | 1.7%         | 2.3%          | 1.4%          | 1.6%          |
| Vietnam     | 2.6%         | 2.5%         | 3.8%          | 2.3%          | 1.8%          | Australia   | 3.0%         | 2.4%         | 4.4%          | 2.5%          | 2.3%          |
| Brunei      | 5.6%         | 7.7%         | 3.9%          | 7.4%          | 8.3%          | U.S.        | 0.1%         | 0.1%         | 0.3%          | 0.1%          | 0.1%          |
| Philippines | 3.9%         | 3.2%         | 4.7%          | 1.9%          | 1.7%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Laos        | 7.7%         | 5.6%         | 6.0%          | 5.7%          | 5.4%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Indonesia   | 4.5%         | 3.9%         | 5.2%          | 3.2%          | 3.3%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Singapore   | 5.2%         | 3.9%         | 7.1%          | 2.6%          | 2.8%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| China       | 1.4%         | 1.2%         | 2.3%          | 1.1%          | 1.1%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Japan       | 1.9%         | 1.8%         | 2.3%          | 1.9%          | 1.7%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Korea       | 2.3%         | 1.9%         | 3.8%          | 1.7%          | 1.8%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Hong Kong   | 3.2%         | 1.8%         | 7.1%          | 1.9%          | 2.1%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |

The results based on the second index are similar to those from the first index. For all sub-periods, the numbers for the currencies of most ASEAN+3 members are not greater than those numbers of five international currencies. However, results based on the third and fourth indices are somewhat different in that fewer regional currencies have the numbers not greater than those numbers of the five international currencies.

On the basis of the third index, for countries with five better known international reserve currencies (U.K., Switzerland, Canada, E.U., and Japan), the average of the absolute value of the exchange market index ranges from 1.5 percent to 2.7 percent and from 1.4 percent to 3.2 percent for 2000 to 2017 and 2010 to 2017, respectively. Among ASEAN+3 members, five (Myanmar, Vietnam, China, Japan, and Korea) have an average value that is not greater than those numbers. From 2007 to 2009, the average of absolute value of the exchange market index ranged from 2.2 percent to 2.5 percent in the U.K., Switzerland, Canada, the E.U., and Japan. China and Japan have an average value that is smaller than those numbers. Korea, Brunei, and Vietnam show 3.8 percent to 3.9 percent, which is larger than those numbers but still smaller than the number for Australia (4.3 percent), which also has a popular international currency. The figure ranges from 1.4 percent

## ***PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM*****467**

to 2.4 percent and from 1.6 percent to 2.8 percent from 2013 to 2017 and from 2015 to 2017, respectively, in countries with five well-known reserve currencies. Among ASEAN+3 members, six members (Vietnam, the Philippines, China, Japan, Hong Kong, and Korea) show an average value that is not greater than those numbers.

When we consider periods after 2010 (2010 to 2017, 2013 to 2017, and 2015 to 2017), China, Korea, and Japan have numbers smaller than 2 percent, which are similar to the numbers for the U.K., Canada, and the E.U. In addition, the numbers are smaller than those for Switzerland and Australia. Myanmar, Vietnam, and Hong Kong also have numbers of approximately 2 percent, which is not clearly larger than those for Switzerland and Australia.

The results based on the fourth index are similar to those based on the third index. The results based on the third and fourth indices suggest that currencies of at least four members (China, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam) are as stable as popular non-U.S. international currencies for various sub-periods, including global financial crisis and recent periods of U.S. interest rate rise. In addition, currencies of members such as Myanmar, Brunei, the Philippines, and Hong Kong tend to be as stable as popular non-U.S. international currencies at least for certain sub-periods. As we obtained more positive results based on the first two indices, these results can be regarded as conservative conclusions based on all these indices.

Finally, we review the results based on various exchange market pressure indices. The most conservative results are based on the third and fourth indices, which are summarized as follows. Several currencies of ASEAN+3 members (China, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam) are as stable as popular non-U.S. international currencies for various sub-periods. In recent years, the currencies of China, Japan, and Korea have been as stable as those of the U.K., Canada, and the Eurozone, and even more stable than those of Australia and Switzerland. In recent years, currencies of other members, such as Myanmar, Vietnam, and Hong Kong, are also as stable as those of Australia and Switzerland.

### *C. Internationalization and Capital Controls*

In addition to the stability of the currency, several other features such as internationalization of the currency and liberalization of capital account transactions are important to implement local currency

contributions to CMIM arrangements. When currencies are more internationalized and members have more liberalized capital accounts, receiving members are likely to feel more comfortable receiving such currencies given that the management and exchange of such currencies are easier. In this regard, we discuss the degree of internationalization of each currency and the degree of capital controls in each member.

We report three popular measures of currency internationalization in Table 12. First, we consider the extent to which each currency is used in official foreign exchange reserves. The proportion of each currency in total international reserves globally is reported. Second, we consider the amount of international debt securities outstanding denominated in each currency. We report the proportions of international debt securities that are outstanding denominated in each currency in total international debt securities of the world. Then, we consider the size of turnover for each currency. The proportion of the size of turnover

**TABLE 12**  
VARIOUS MEASURES OF CURRENCY INTERNATIONALIZATION (PROPORTION, %)

|                   | Official foreign<br>exchange reserves |       | International debt<br>securities outstanding |       | Foreign exchange market<br>turnover |       |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|--|-------|-------------------------------------|-------|
|                   | 2014                                  | 2017  | 2010   | 2017  | 2010                                | 2016  |
| U.S. Dollars      | 63.67                                 | 62.72 | 31.66  | 45.07 | 84.86                               | 87.58 |
| Euros             | 21.03                                 | 20.15 | 46.93  | 39.20 | 39.04                               | 31.39 |
| Pounds sterling   | 4.07                                  | 4.54  | 9.87   | 8.27  | 12.88                               | 12.80 |
| Australian dollar | 2.11                                  | 1.80  | 1.43   | 1.19  | 7.59                                | 6.87  |
| Canadian dollar   | 1.99                                  | 2.02  | 1.53   | 0.59  | 5.28                                | 5.14  |
| Swiss franc       | 0.23                                  | 0.18  | 1.97   | 0.88  | 6.30                                | 4.80  |
| Chinese renminbi  | 1.11                                  | 1.22  | 0.08   | 0.43  | 0.86                                | 3.99  |
| Hong Kong dollar  | ...                                   | ...   | 0.33   | 0.37  | 2.37                                | 1.73  |
| Japanese yen      | 3.45                                  | 4.89  | 3.70   | 1.80  | 18.99                               | 21.62 |
| Korean won        | ...                                   | ...   | 0.01   | 0.00  | 1.52                                | 1.65  |
| Indonesian rupiah | ...                                   | ...   | 0.03   | 0.06  | 0.15                                | 0.20  |
| Malaysian ringgit | ...                                   | ...   | 0.03   | 0.01  | 0.28                                | 0.36  |
| Philippine peso   | ...                                   | ...   | 0.01   | 0.01  | 0.17                                | 0.14  |
| Singapore dollar  | 0.06                                  | ...   | 0.15   | 0.18  | 1.42                                | 1.81  |
| Thailand baht     | ...                                   | ...   | 0.01   | 0.02  | 0.19                                | 0.36  |

Note: “...” indicates that data are not available. Each foreign exchange transaction involves two currencies and the total share of all currencies in foreign exchange market turnover is 200 percent.

Source: IMF COFER (for 2017) and IMF survey on the holdings of currencies in official foreign currency assets (for 2014); BIS Quarterly Review; and BIS Triennial Central Bank Survey, Net-net basis, daily average in April, in percent.

for each currency in the size of total turnover in the foreign exchange market around the world is reported. These three measures are suggested in an IMF Staff Discussion Note by Maziad *et al.* (2011). They discussed “common measures of international use of a currency include a currency’s use as an international reserve asset; its use in invoicing and settlement of international transactions; and trading volumes in foreign exchange markets.” We report these three measures for certain ASEAN+3 members and countries with popular international currencies for comparison. We report the number for 2010 (or 2014) and 2017 (or 2016).

The Japanese yen is clearly one of the most popular international currencies in the world, following the U.S. dollar and the Euro, based on all three criteria. In 2016 or 2017, it was third in the world in terms of its share in global international reserves and in foreign exchange market turnover. Its share in international debt securities outstanding is fourth in the world. In addition, the RMB appears to be close to the level of minor international currencies such as the Swiss franc. The RMB is seventh in the world in terms of its share in global international reserves, just above the Swiss franc. Its share of international debt securities outstanding is below the other seven popular international currencies in foreign exchange market turnover rate is slightly lower than the Swiss franc and Canadian dollar. Among other local currencies, the Hong Kong dollar has a relatively high share in international debt securities outstanding, albeit slightly lower than that of China. The Hong Kong dollar also enjoys a higher of foreign exchange market turnover than other ASEAN+3 members’ currencies. The Singapore dollar and Korean won have relatively high shares in foreign exchange market turnover.

Table 13 reports the capital control measures constructed by Fernandez, Klein, Schindler, and Uribe (2016) for ASEAN+3 members and countries with popular international currencies. The measure of overall restrictions, inflow restrictions, and outflow restrictions are reported. The number is between 0 and 1. A higher number implies stronger restrictions. We report the measure for ASEAN+3 members and countries with popular international currencies. We consider Germany a representative country from the Euro area.

For the six countries with popular international currencies, the number of overall restrictions ranges from 0.05 to 0.35. Members such as Brunei, Singapore, Hong Kong, Japan, and Korea have

TABLE 13

CAPITAL CONTROL MEASURE (FERNANDEZ, KLEIN, SCHINDLER, AND URIBE, 2016)

|             | Overall restrictions | Inflow restrictions | Outflow restrictions |
|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| US          | 0.13                 | 0.10                | 0.15                 |
| Germany     | 0.30                 | 0.10                | 0.50                 |
| UK          | 0.05                 | 0.10                | 0.00                 |
| Switzerland | 0.35                 | 0.15                | 0.55                 |
| Canada      | 0.05                 | 0.10                | 0.00                 |
| Australia   | 0.18                 | 0.30                | 0.05                 |
| Brunei      | 0.05                 | 0.10                | 0.00                 |
| Cambodia    | ...                  | ...                 | ...                  |
| Indonesia   | 0.63                 | 0.65                | 0.60                 |
| Lao P.D.R.  | ...                  | ...                 | ...                  |
| Malaysia    | 0.88                 | 0.80                | 0.95                 |
| Myanmar     | 0.90                 | 0.90                | 0.90                 |
| Philippines | 0.88                 | 0.75                | 1.00                 |
| Singapore   | 0.13                 | 0.10                | 0.15                 |
| Thailand    | 0.73                 | 0.70                | 0.75                 |
| Vietnam     | 0.88                 | 0.85                | 0.90                 |
| China       | 0.80                 | 0.80                | 0.80                 |
| Hong Kong   | 0.05                 | 0.10                | 0.00                 |
| Japan       | 0.00                 | 0.00                | 0.00                 |
| Korea       | 0.15                 | 0.15                | 0.15                 |

similar numbers but others such as Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, and China have higher numbers, ranging from 0.63 to 0.90. The two Asian countries with the most popular currencies have highly different numbers. Japan has the lowest number of 0, showing the lowest degree of capital controls, whereas China's number stands at 0.80, suggesting a high degree of capital controls.

In sum, the Japanese yen is one of the most popular international currencies in the world with a liberalized capital account. Furthermore, the RMB's internationalization is at about the same level as for the Swiss franc, but a high degree of capital controls is still in place in China. The Singapore dollar, Hong Kong dollar, and Korean won are next in terms of their level of internationalization, and the degree of capital controls in these economies is low.

Finally, the results relating to currency stability, internationalization of the currency, and liberalization of capital account transactions indicate that the Japanese yen, the RMB, and the Korean won could

be considered first as being eligible for local currency contribution to CMIM.

## **V. Concluding Remarks**

This study investigates the plausibility of local currency contribution to Chiang Mai Initiative Multilateralization (CMIM) arrangements. The results are summarized as follows.

First, receiving members would need local currencies to settle trade or finance matters when faced with balance of payments and/or short-term liquidity difficulties, considering the estimated size of (net) demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves/CMIM. The demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves is inferred by combining the demand for foreign exchange reserves and information on local currency usage in the region. The results show substantial demand for local currencies in foreign exchange reserves. We further calculated the net demand for local currencies in CMIM arrangements by subtracting estimated actual foreign exchange reserves from the estimated demand for foreign exchange reserves. The results show that net demand for local currency in CMIM tends to be positive, further suggesting room for introducing local currency contribution to CMIM arrangements. These results may imply that some potential benefits can be achieved but some potential costs can be reduced by introducing local currency contribution to the CMIM.

Results on the stability of local currencies also tend to support local currency contribution to the CMIM arrangements. We calculated the exchange market pressure index. Some conservative results indicate that the currencies of several ASEAN+3 members (China, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam) are as stable as popular non-U.S. international currencies for various sub-periods. In recent years, the currencies of China, Japan, and Korea have been as stable as those of the U.K., Canada, and the E.U., and even more stable than those of Australia and Switzerland while the currencies of other members such as Myanmar, Vietnam, and Hong Kong, have also been as stable as those of Australia and Switzerland.

In addition, we investigate the internationalization of a currency and the liberalization of capital account transactions because they are important in implementing local currency contributions to CMIM arrangements. The Japanese yen is one of the most popular international currencies in the world with liberalized capital accounts.

The level of internationalization of the RMB is at approximately the same level as the Swiss franc, but China still has a high degree of capital controls in place. The Singapore dollar, Hong Kong dollar, and Korean won are next in terms of level of internationalization, and the degree of capital controls in these economies is low.

Finally, the results on currency internationalization and liberalization of capital account transactions in addition to the results relating to currency stability indicate that the Japanese yen, RMB, and the Korean won could first be considered eligible for local currency contribution to the CMIM arrangements.

*(Received 13 July 2020; Revised 25 July 2020; Accepted 25 July 2020)*

## References

- Aizenman J. and Binici, M. "Exchange Market Pressure in OECD and Emerging Economies: Domestic vs. External Factors and Capital Flows in the Old and New Normal." *Journal of International Money and Finance* 66 (2016): 65-87.
- Aizenman J. and Lee, J. "International reserves: precautionary versus mercantilist views, theory and evidence." *Open Economies Review* 18 (2007): 191-214.
- Aizenman J., Lee, J., and Sushko, V. "From the Great Moderation to the Global Crisis: Exchange Market Pressure in the 2000s." *Open Economies Review* 23 (No. 4 2012): 597-621.
- Aizenman J. and Marion, N. "The high demand for international reserves in the Far East: What is going on?" *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 17 (No. 3 2003): 370-400.
- Ben-Bassat, A. and Gottlieb, D. "Optimal international reserves and sovereign risk." *Journal of international Economics* 33 (Nos. 3-4 2012): 345-362.
- Calvo, G.A., Izquierdo, A., Loo-Kung, R. "Optimal holdings of international reserves: self-insurance against sudden stop." NBER Working Paper No. 18219 (2012).
- Cheung, YW. and Ito, H. "A cross-country empirical analysis of international reserves." *International Economic Journal* 23 (No. 4 2009): 447-481.
- Cheung, YW. and Qian, X. "Hoarding of international reserves: Mrs

## **PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM473**

- Machlup's wardrobe and the Joneses." *Review of International Economics* 17 (No. 4 2009): 824-843.
- Dooley, MP., Folkerts-Landau, D. and Garber, P. "An Essay on the Revived Bretton Woods System." NBER Working Paper No. 9971 (2003).
- Edison, H. "Are foreign exchange reserves in Asia too high?" *World Economic Outlook*, September 2003 (2003): 78-92.
- Fernandez, A., Klein, M.W., Schindler, M., and Uribe, M. "Capital Control Measures: A New Dataset." *IMF Economic Review* 64 (No. 3 2016): 548-574.
- Flood, R. and Marion, N. "Holding international reserves in an era of high capital mobility." IMF Working Paper No. 02/62 (2002): 1-53.
- Girton L., and Roper, D. "A Monetary Model of Exchange Market Pressure Applied to the Postwar Canadian Experience." *American Economic Review* 67 (1977): 537-548.
- Heller, H.R. "Optimal International Reserves." *Economic Journal* 76 (N. 302 1966): 296-311.
- International Monetary Fund. "Assessing Reserve Adequacy." IMF Policy Paper, February (Washington: International Monetary Fund) (2012).
- Kaminsky, G., Lizondo, S., and Reinhart, C. "Leading Indicators of Currency Crisis." IMF Staff Paper 45 (No. 1 1998): 1-48.
- Kaminsky, G., and Reinhart, C. "The Twin Crisis: The Causes of Banking and Balance-of-Payments Problems." *American Economic Review* 89 (No. 3 1999): 473-500.
- Klaassen, F., and Jager, H. "Definition-Consistent Measurement of Exchange Market Pressure." *Journal of International Money and Finance* 30 (No. 1 2011): 74-95.
- Maziad, S., Farahmand, P., Wang, S., Segal, S., and Ahmed, F., directed by U. Das and I. M. y Lago, "Internationalization of Emerging Market Currencies: A Balance between Risks and Rewards." IMF Staff Discussion Note, SDN/11/17 (2011).
- Obstfeld, M., Shambaugh, JC. and Taylor, AM. "Financial stability, the trilemma, and international reserves." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomic* 2 (No. 2 2010): 57-94.
- Sachs, J.D., Tornell, A., and Velasco, A. "Financial Crisis in Emerging Markets: The Lessons from 1995." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 1 (1996): 147-215.

## Appendix 1

### *Chiang Mai Initiative Multilateralization (CMIM)\**

The Chiang Mai Initiative Multilateralization (CMIM) is a Regional Financial Arrangement (RFA) for the ASEAN + 3. RFAs are mechanisms or agreements through which groups of countries mutually pledge financial support to countries experiencing financial difficulties in their regions.

In May 2000, The Chiang Mai Initiative (CMI) was launched by the ASEAN+3 countries as a regional currency swap arrangement to address the short-term liquidity difficulties in the region and to supplement existing international financial arrangements. CMI is composed of (a) the ASEAN Swap Arrangement (ASA) among ASEAN countries and (b) a network of bilateral swap arrangements among the ASEAN+3 countries.

CMIM came into effect on 24 March 2010 with a total size of USD 120 billion. The CMIM is a multilateral currency swap arrangement among ASEAN+3 members, governed by a single contractual agreement, while the CMI is a network of bilateral swap arrangements among the “Plus Three” and ASEAN-5 countries’ authorities. The core objectives of the CMIM are (i) to address balance-of-payments and short-term liquidity difficulties in the region and (ii) to supplement the existing international financial arrangements.

The CMIM was further strengthened in 2014 through the following amendments: (i) to double its total size of USD 240 billion from USD 120 billion, (ii) to introduce CMIM Precautionary Line, and (iii) to increase the IMF de-linked portion from 20% to 30%.

On 23 June 2020, another amendment came into effect. This amendment aims (i) to create more flexibilities for the financing period of the IMF Linked Portion of the CMIM to secure consistency with the IMF-supported programs and strengthen coordination mechanism with the IMF, (ii) to introduce an overarching legal basis for conditionality for the CMIM to support members in addressing their risks and vulnerabilities through policy recommendations as well as financial support, and (iii) to address other legal ambiguity issues.

\* Author’s compilation based on AMRO web page (<https://www.amro-asia.org/about-amro/amro-and-the-cnim/>)

## **Appendix 2**

### *Literature on Demand for Foreign Exchange Reserves*

Past studies have investigated demand for foreign exchange reserves, foreign exchange reserve adequacy, or optimal level of foreign exchange reserves. During the Bretton Woods period, the main role of foreign exchange reserves was as a buffer against real external shocks, such as export drops. Exchange rates were fixed, and international financial market integration was limited. Thus, such shocks had more important effects than did financial shocks. For instance, past studies suggested a simple rule of three months of imports as a guideline for an adequate level of foreign exchange reserves. In addition to such a simple rule, academic studies (such as Heller, 1966) analyzed the optimal level of foreign exchange reserves based on cost–benefit analysis. Although using the results of these studies in recent years has been difficult, basic ideas from these studies, such as cost–benefit analysis and dependency of foreign exchange reserve demand on country characteristics, continue to be considered essential elements for foreign exchange reserve demand.

The Tequila and Asian crises of the 1990s suggest that preparation for external financial shocks in addition to external real shocks is crucial. Since then, the precautionary role of foreign exchange reserves as a buffer against abrupt capital outflows has been emphasized. For instance, the Greenspan–Guiddoti rule (100 percent of short-term debt) has been suggested in such a context. In addition, many formal studies on the optimal level of foreign exchange reserves were conducted based on various theoretical models. Ben-Bassat and Gottlieb (1992) study optimal precautionary reserves for a borrowing country. Flood and Marion (2002) find that the buffer stock model has little explanation power on reserve holdings, while exchange rate stability matters. In addition, some studies argue emerging markets have excessive exchange rate reserve (Edison, 2003) and attempt to give reasons such as export promotion (Dooley, Folkerts-Landau, and Garber, 2003), higher crisis risk, loss aversion and/or higher fiscal liabilities (Aizenman and Marion, 2003), and financial integration and crises (Aizenman and Lee, 2007). Some studies focus on the change of motivation to hold reserves. Cheung and Ito (2009) show greater importance for financial factors and lesser importance for trade factors over time to explain

reserve holding. Obstfeld, Shambaugh, and Taylor (2010) argue that deeper financial integration and domestic financial depth and the fear of floating explain exchange rate reserve patterns.

After the Global Financial Crisis, studies have discussed that foreign exchange reserve adequacy depends on country characteristics, such as economic development. Cheung and Qian (2009) show that a “keeping up with the Joneses” effect in reserve holding. Cheung and Ito (2009) reveal that a developed economy tends to hold less reserve than does a developing economy. Calvo, Izquierdo, and Loo-Kung (2012) show that differences in reserves across regions and argues that they are partly explained by the perceived presence of a lender of last resort or characteristics such as being a large oil producer.

The IMF (2011) reviewed existing approaches to reserve adequacy and developed some new measures. It summarized the traditional measures as follows: import cover, short-term debt, broad money, GDP, and current account. The first is the size of imports that can be sustained for a period, such as three months of imports. That is, a country must pay reserve currencies for imports with foreign exchange reserves when other sources are unavailable. The second is the measure of the size of short-term debt, for example, 100 percent of short-term debt in the Greenspan–Guidotti rule. This measure means a country needs foreign exchange reserves to pay off short-term debts in a short period when short-term debts cannot be rolled-over and other sources are unavailable. The third is a fraction of broad money, such as M2, for example, 20 percent of M2. During a capital account crisis, the capital outflows of domestic deposits of residents are observed. This measure captures the risks of capital flight. The last is GDP. It is sometimes used, but no theoretical or empirical backing is available. GDP may be used as a scale factor in cross-country analysis. Finally, current account deficits (surpluses) imply that foreign exchange reserves are required (provided) if other sources are unavailable. For instance, an extension of the Greenspan–Guidotti rule is the size of short-term debt plus the current account deficit (if it is in deficit). IMF (2011) also mentioned a modified rule that considered the size of short-term debt minus the current account.

In addition to these traditional measures, the IMF (2011) suggested other measures that encompass a broad set of risks based on recent experience as follows: export earnings and medium- and long-term debt and equity liabilities. Export earnings reflect the potential loss

## PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM477

that could arise from a drop in external demand or terms of trade shock. External liability stocks, such as medium- and long-term debt and equities other than short-term debt, can be considered. Although short-term debt would be riskier, the sudden outflows of other external liabilities can lead to exchange rate depreciation and volatility in foreign exchange and financial markets. In addition, even FDI liabilities can be a source of drain, as observed in recent years.

### Appendix 3

#### *Standard Deviation of Exchange Market Index*

**TABLE A1**  
STANDARD DEVIATION OF EXCHANGE MARKET INDEX

$$(1) \text{ EMP1} = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{IR_{t-1}}$$

|             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007<br>-2009 | 2013<br>-2017 | 2015<br>-2017 |             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007<br>-2009 | 2013<br>-2017 | 2015<br>-2017 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Thailand    | 3.1%         | 2.9%         | 3.8%          | 2.7%          | 2.8%          | U.K.        | 4.8%         | 3.5%         | 7.8%          | 3.6%          | 4.0%          |
| Myanmar     | 10.2%        | 7.2%         | 11.8%         | 8.7%          | 5.6%          | Switzerland | 7.3%         | 7.8%         | 9.1%          | 3.0%          | 3.2%          |
| Malaysia    | 3.7%         | 3.8%         | 4.8%          | 3.7%          | 3.9%          | Canada      | 3.4%         | 2.6%         | 5.6%          | 2.4%          | 2.6%          |
| Cambodia    | 2.8%         | 2.7%         | 3.6%          | 3.0%          | 1.5%          | Euro        | 3.9%         | 2.8%         | 6.5%          | 2.5%          | 2.8%          |
| Vietnam     | 5.0%         | 5.6%         | 5.5%          | 4.8%          | 4.4%          | Australia   | 9.8%         | 9.9%         | 12.0%         | 10.8%         | 11.7%         |
| Brunei      | 7.6%         | 9.2%         | 8.1%          | 6.2%          | 7.0%          | U.S.        | 4.8%         | 1.7%         | 10.5%         | 1.5%          | 1.6%          |
| Philippines | 3.5%         | 2.8%         | 3.8%          | 1.9%          | 1.8%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Laos        | 7.3%         | 9.2%         | 4.7%          | 9.2%          | 8.0%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Indonesia   | 5.1%         | 4.1%         | 6.3%          | 3.5%          | 3.5%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Singapore   | 2.6%         | 2.6%         | 3.3%          | 2.0%          | 2.2%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| China       | 2.1%         | 1.9%         | 1.7%          | 1.8%          | 1.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Japan       | 3.4%         | 2.9%         | 3.3%          | 2.8%          | 2.6%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Korea       | 3.7%         | 2.6%         | 6.8%          | 2.3%          | 2.4%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Hong Kong   | 1.8%         | 1.3%         | 3.0%          | 1.4%          | 1.5%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |

$$(2) \text{ EMP2} = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{IR_{t-1}} + (i_t - i_{t-1})$$

|             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007<br>-2009 | 2013<br>-2017 | 2015<br>-2017 |             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007<br>-2009 | 2013<br>-2017 | 2015<br>-2017 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Thailand    | 3.1%         | 2.9%         | 3.9%          | 2.7%          | 2.8%          | U.K.        | 4.8%         | 3.5%         | 7.7%          | 3.6%          | 4.0%          |
| Myanmar     | 10.2%        | 7.2%         | 11.8%         | 8.7%          | 5.6%          | Switzerland | 7.4%         | 7.8%         | 9.0%          | 3.0%          | 3.3%          |
| Malaysia    | 3.7%         | 3.8%         | 4.8%          | 3.7%          | 3.9%          | Canada      | 3.4%         | 2.6%         | 5.5%          | 2.4%          | 2.6%          |
| Cambodia    | 2.9%         | 2.7%         | 3.7%          | 3.0%          | 1.5%          | Euro        | 3.9%         | 2.8%         | 6.4%          | 2.5%          | 2.8%          |
| Vietnam     | 5.3%         | 5.9%         | 6.0%          | 4.9%          | 4.7%          | Australia   | 9.8%         | 9.9%         | 12.0%         | 10.8%         | 11.7%         |
| Brunei      | 8.1%         | 9.2%         | 8.1%          | 6.2%          | 7.0%          | U.S.        | 4.8%         | 1.7%         | 10.5%         | 1.5%          | 1.6%          |
| Philippines | 3.6%         | 2.8%         | 3.9%          | 1.9%          | 1.8%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Laos        | 7.3%         | 9.2%         | 4.7%          | 9.2%          | 7.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Indonesia   | 5.2%         | 4.1%         | 6.4%          | 3.6%          | 3.6%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Singapore   | 2.6%         | 2.6%         | 3.3%          | 2.0%          | 2.1%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| China       | 2.1%         | 2.1%         | 1.7%          | 2.0%          | 2.0%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Japan       | 3.4%         | 2.9%         | 3.3%          | 2.8%          | 2.6%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Korea       | 3.7%         | 2.6%         | 6.7%          | 2.3%          | 2.4%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Hong Kong   | 1.8%         | 1.3%         | 3.0%          | 1.4%          | 1.5%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |

$$(3) \text{ EMP3} = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{M_{t-1} / e_{t-1}}$$

|             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007<br>-2009 | 2013<br>-2017 | 2015<br>-2017 |             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007<br>-2009 | 2013<br>-2017 | 2015<br>-2017 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Thailand    | 8.6%         | 8.9%         | 11.4%         | 7.3%          | 7.7%          | U.K.        | 2.3%         | 2.1%         | 3.2%          | 2.1%          | 2.3%          |
| Myanmar     | 3.6%         | 5.1%         | 1.3%          | 6.3%          | 3.1%          | Switzerland | 3.7%         | 4.3%         | 3.2%          | 2.9%          | 3.2%          |
| Malaysia    | 13.6%        | 11.9%        | 21.2%         | 7.8%          | 7.5%          | Canada      | 2.1%         | 1.8%         | 3.3%          | 1.9%          | 2.3%          |
| Cambodia    | 3.9%         | 3.4%         | 5.2%          | 3.8%          | 2.1%          | Euro        | 2.4%         | 2.2%         | 3.0%          | 1.9%          | 2.1%          |
| Vietnam     | 3.3%         | 3.2%         | 4.9%          | 2.8%          | 2.4%          | Australia   | 3.8%         | 3.0%         | 5.8%          | 3.1%          | 3.0%          |
| Brunei      | 8.7%         | 11.6%        | 6.3%          | 9.2%          | 10.3%         | U.S.        | 0.2%         | 0.1%         | 0.5%          | 0.1%          | 0.1%          |
| Philippines | 5.4%         | 5.0%         | 5.1%          | 2.6%          | 2.2%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Laos        | 10.9%        | 7.2%         | 7.9%          | 7.1%          | 6.9%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Indonesia   | 6.1%         | 5.1%         | 6.8%          | 4.1%          | 4.2%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Singapore   | 6.5%         | 5.0%         | 8.0%          | 3.2%          | 3.3%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| China       | 1.4%         | 1.5%         | 1.4%          | 1.4%          | 1.4%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Japan       | 2.5%         | 2.4%         | 2.9%          | 2.6%          | 2.3%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Korea       | 3.4%         | 2.4%         | 6.3%          | 2.1%          | 2.2%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Hong Kong   | 5.0%         | 2.4%         | 8.8%          | 2.6%          | 2.7%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |

**PLAUSIBILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY CONTRIBUTION TO THE CMIM479**

$$(4) \text{ EMP4} = \frac{e_t - e_{t-1}}{e_{t-1}} - \frac{IR_t - IR_{t-1}}{M_{t-1} / e_{t-1}} - (i_t - i_{t-1})$$

|             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007<br>-2009 | 2013<br>-2017 | 2015<br>-2017 |             | From<br>2000 | From<br>2010 | 2007<br>-2009 | 2013<br>-2017 | 2015<br>-2017 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Thailand    | 8.6%         | 8.9%         | 11.2%         | 7.2%          | 7.6%          | U.K.        | 2.4%         | 2.1%         | 3.4%          | 2.1%          | 2.3%          |
| Myanmar     | 3.6%         | 5.1%         | 1.3%          | 6.3%          | 3.1%          | Switzerland | 3.7%         | 4.3%         | 3.3%          | 2.9%          | 3.3%          |
| Malaysia    | 13.6%        | 11.8%        | 20.9%         | 7.8%          | 7.3%          | Canada      | 2.1%         | 1.8%         | 3.4%          | 1.9%          | 2.3%          |
| Cambodia    | 4.0%         | 3.4%         | 5.2%          | 3.8%          | 2.1%          | Euro        | 2.5%         | 2.2%         | 3.0%          | 1.9%          | 2.1%          |
| Vietnam     | 3.4%         | 3.3%         | 4.8%          | 3.1%          | 2.5%          | Australia   | 3.9%         | 3.0%         | 5.8%          | 3.0%          | 2.9%          |
| Brunei      | 9.3%         | 11.5%        | 6.2%          | 9.1%          | 10.1%         | U.S.        | 0.3%         | 0.1%         | 0.5%          | 0.1%          | 0.1%          |
| Philippines | 5.4%         | 5.0%         | 4.9%          | 2.6%          | 2.2%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Laos        | 11.0%        | 7.2%         | 7.8%          | 7.1%          | 6.8%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Indonesia   | 6.0%         | 5.0%         | 6.7%          | 4.0%          | 4.1%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Singapore   | 6.5%         | 5.0%         | 7.9%          | 3.2%          | 3.3%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| China       | 1.5%         | 1.6%         | 1.5%          | 1.4%          | 1.4%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Japan       | 2.5%         | 2.4%         | 2.8%          | 2.5%          | 2.2%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Korea       | 3.4%         | 2.4%         | 6.3%          | 2.1%          | 2.2%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |
| Hong Kong   | 5.0%         | 2.4%         | 8.7%          | 2.6%          | 2.7%          |             |              |              |               |               |               |

