

Levy Economics Institute  
30<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference



**MONETARY AND  
CAPITAL MARKETS**

# **Climate Change, Monetary Policy and Financial Stability: Fiddling While Rome Burns?**

**MAY 4, 2023**

William Oman

International Monetary Fund

Monetary and Capital Markets Department

The views expressed in this presentation are those of the author and should not be attributed to the IMF, its Executive Board, or its management.

# Debates on the role central banks and financial supervisors in the age of climate change are intense

So far, two issues have been assessed largely in isolation:

- Growing ecological threats to price stability and financial stability
- Ongoing redefinition of the role and actions of central banks (large asset purchases, liquidity provision, etc.)

In [Oman, Salin, and Svartzman \(2022\)](#), we identify **three main normative approaches** to the practices of central banks and financial supervisors (CBFS) with regards to ecological issues – ordered by rising scale of their response:

1. **Risk-based approach:** address climate insofar as it poses risks to monetary/financial stability
2. **Proactive central banks and financial supervisors**
3. **Evolutionary perspective** on role of central banks and financial supervisors
  - ▶ A less common view is that CBFS should refocus on “core mission” as the “first-best” solution is carbon pricing

Each approach rests on different underlying conceptions of the **world, money, finance, the state and value**

These assumptions are **historically and ideologically situated**

This raises the question of the **origins of central bank mandates** and the theories/beliefs that support them

# View 1 – Central banks and financial supervisors as guardians of financial stability

**Rationale – implicitly assumes money neutrality, efficient financial markets, market-fixing state**

- Financial system resilience to climate-related risks is within CBFS's mandate
- Climate change could affect CBs' ability to deliver on price stability
- **CBFS can contribute to transition by assessing physical/transition risks to price/financial stability**

## Proposals

- Measure climate-related risks to financial and price stability
- Forward-looking scenario analyses (climate stress tests), Basel framework
- Monetary policy: assess implications of climate for design of monetary regimes

## Debates and potential limitations

- CBs may directly or indirectly contribute to build-up of climate-related risks (double materiality)
- Clim. risks hard to measure; good measurement does not naturally lead good capital reallocation
- **Therefore, unclear that CBFS would be able to deliver on their price and financial stability mandate**

# View 2 – Climate-proactive central banks and financial supervisors

**Rationale – assumes money non-neutral, financial markets not efficient, market-shaping state**

- CBFS have significant power over finance, which has significant power over the economy
- Climate-related radical uncertainty requires precautionary approach
- **CBFS can trigger systemic change, and should play proactive role to green financial system**

## Proposals

- Regulated financial institutions required to submit low-carbon transition plans
- Differentiated interest rates, double materiality
- “Green” QE, CB purchases of low-carbon bonds issued by public investment banks

## Debates and potential limitations

- Could lead CBs to aim to resolve social problems that should fall on governments
- CBs’ actions need to be accompanied by measures in real economy
- There could be clashes between existing objectives and environmental objectives (greenflation)
- **Unclear CBs could deliver on inflation mandate, change in CB mandate likely needed**

# View 3 – Evolutionary role of central banks and the state in the economy

## Rationale – views money as social institution, finance as unstable, state as key for coordination

- Dilemma: CBs may need to work on Views 1-2, but can't substitute for other actors' insufficient actions
- CBFS and financial system are exposed to Green Swans – calling for policy coordination, system change
- **CBFS transformation necessary but part of broader institutional change, requiring evolutionary perspective**

## Proposals

- CBFS could play a new role within the policy framework
  - ▶ Coordination with other policy institutions (but fiscal, industrial, sufficiency policies need to be in place)
- CBs would support governments by keeping borrowing costs low
- Direct monetary financing may be valid option

## Debates and potential limitations

- Issue of CB independence and compatibility of proposals with existing CB mandates
- CBs have limited ability to address other ecological crises & are affected by ecological limits (growth)
- Need to consider interactions between real & monetary-financial sides of economy
- **May require democratic debate on balance between CBs' inflation goals & environmental objectives**

# Do tipping points mean we are in a planetary emergency?

All three views may be affected in profound ways by an unacknowledged development – we may already be in an ecological emergency ([Lenton et al. 2020](#)):

$$E = R \times U = p \times D \times \tau / T$$

- Define **emergency** (E) as product of **risk** and **urgency**
- **Risk** (R) defined by insurers as **probability** (p) multiplied by **damage** (D)
- **Urgency** (U) defined in emergency situations as **reaction time to an alert** ( $\tau$ ) divided by **intervention time left to avoid a bad outcome** (T)
- Situation is an emergency if **both risk and urgency are high**
- If **reaction time is longer than intervention time left** ( $\tau / T > 1$ ), we have lost control

# State of planetary emergency could have major implications for decision under uncertainty...

**Climate change poses a big challenge to decision under uncertainty** ([Hansen 2022](#))

- Model **misspecification** could unravel insights/overtake predictions in significant ways
- Need to explore model misspecification indicates the limitations of our **body of knowledge**

**With great power (to destabilize the Earth system) comes great responsibility:**

**Ethical “obligation to know” our impacts faces limits & unpredictability** ([Dupuy 2022](#))

- Objective and **structural complexity of ecosystems** – unknowable tipping points
- Unpredictable limits to the **substitutability of natural inputs with artificial inputs**

**The concept of financial risk could become less relevant** as risk compensation/insurance cannot occur when damages are global (e.g., global cascade of tipping points) ([Bourg 2022](#))

# ... leading to crucial open questions on the role of central banks – do they need a “Plan B”?

**Bottom line:** Are efforts by central banks to maintain old mandates and old monetary policy frameworks in the face of existential ecological challenges akin to **“fiddling while Rome burns”**? (William White)

**What is the right philosophical attitude** to decide the role of central banks?

- Existing policy frameworks assume Earth system stability – this likely no longer applies
- What is the right **ethics** to decide on the right policy framework for the “age of catastrophes”?
- Normative assessment must anticipate **retrospective ethical judgment of present choices** ([Dupuy 2022](#))
  - ▶ “No regrets” policies appear inadequate – not conservative enough

**What hierarchy of objectives** should guide the choice of policy rules and frameworks?

- In **1930s**, microeconomic goals were subordinated to macroeconomic goals (**Great Depression**)
- In **2020s**, does macroeconomics need to be subordinated to ecology? (**climate/ecological crisis**)
  - ▶ *“The economy is a wholly owned subsidiary of the environment, not the reverse”* – Herman Daly

**What would this “inversion” mean for central banks – do they need a “Plan B”?** (closest to View 3)

- **Revisiting their evolutionary role?** Greater focus on longer-run effects of monetary policy, coordination?
- Does planetary emergency justify **“wartime financing” role for central banks?**
- Does **backward induction** justify **credit control now?** (likely last resort to avoid tipping points)
  - ▶ E.g., U.S. 1977 Reform Act requires Fed to *“maintain long run growth of monetary & credit aggregates commensurate with the economy’s long run potential to **increase production** [...]”*
- Would this “Plan B” require giving CBs a **new mandate, or a new institutional configuration?**



**Thank you**