

Decomposing the Term Structure of Interests Rates: Evidence from a Small Open Economy

Daniel Nathan*

October 3, 2018

Abstract

This paper uses Israeli data of inflation-indexed and nominal government bonds to estimate a discrete-time essentially affine term structure model. To estimate the model, I use a uniquely long-spanned sample of monthly real yields for the period of 01/1985–03/2018. The nominal yields data spans the period of 05/2001–03/2018. I document an unconditional upward sloping real term structure that the model ascribes to a rising real term premium while the average expected real short rates are relatively flat. A decomposition of the break-even inflation shows that the unconditional term structure of the inflation premium is increasing with maturity and most of the variance in the short end is due to expected inflation. However, in the long end, most of it is due to the inflation term premium.

*Bank of Israel, daniel.nathan@boi.gov.il. I thank Akiva Offenbacher for his discussion of this paper. I have benefited from discussions with Kobi Boudoukh, Eliezer Borenstein, Itamar Caspi, Greg Duffee, Inon Gamrasni, Roy Stein, Yossi Yakhin and the participants of the Annual Financial Market Liquidity Conference 2015, and the Bank of Israel research seminar. I thank Talya Tobolsky, Nadav Keinan, and Dafna Kobi for assisting me with the data. The views in this paper do not necessarily reflect the views of the Bank of Israel.

1 Introduction

This paper follows a number of recent studies in focusing on ex-ante real yields derived from inflation-indexed bonds. Given that standard asset pricing theory ascribes changes in nominal yields to either changes in real yields, expected inflation, or the inflation risk premium, inflation-indexed bonds have the potential to enrich our understanding of the determinants of bond yields. Furthermore, a wide array of market participants, ranging from policy makers such as central banks to professional investors, monitor both nominal and inflation-indexed bonds. One particular use of looking at both types of bonds is the difference between the nominal and inflation-indexed bonds with the same maturity, also known as the break-even inflation (BEI), which is used as a proxy for the expected inflation. However, as market participants, particularly central bank, know, the BEI also contains an inflation premium so that the “true” inflation expectations can deviate from the BEI.

This paper estimates a discrete-time essentially affine term structure model (ATSM) to explain the sources of variation in Israeli government yields, using monthly inflation-indexed government bond data for the period of 01/1985–03/2018 and nominal government bond data for the period of 05/2001–03/2008. ATSMs have the advantage to being both tractable and flexible enough to match the observed time-varying behavior of risk premia in the U.S. as shown by Dai and Singleton (2002).

The main contribution of the paper is the use of a long history of real rates data (since 1985) to properly estimate the model, as yields are highly persistent and thus make inference using ATSMs less reliable (e.g., Kim and Orphanides, 2012). Inflation-indexed bonds have been trading in Israel since the early '50s¹, making this bond market one of the older such markets (a feature it shares with the United Kingdom). The Israeli government bond market has been examined before. Kandel, Ofer, and Sarig (1996) studied inflation-indexed bonds to infer the magnitude of the inflation risk premium and Kahn, Kandel, and Sarig

¹More information can be found in the book *The Stock Exchange and the Investment in Securities* by Levy, Smith, and Sarnat.

(2002) have examined how monetary policy shocks affect real rates. More recently Stein (2011) estimated an ATSM using government inflation-indexed bonds exclusivity and employing an identification scheme to the latent factors so that they behave in accordance with macroeconomic variables.

Three characteristics make the Israeli bond market particularly well-suited to the current research:

1. **Issuance amount.** The amount of inflation-indexed bonds the Israeli treasury issues yearly remains high. Inflation indexed bonds still make up a substantial part of new issues, at around 30%.²
2. **Short real yields** - My data consists of real yields with maturities starting at one year. To the best of my knowledge, this is the first paper that estimates the real and nominal yield curves jointly using real rates with maturities of less than 4 years.
3. **Short indexation lag.** The indexation lag is at most a month and a half.³

The paper also contributes to empirical work on real yields, which has been carried out on relatively short sample periods and mostly in the U.S. and U.K. (Ermolov, 2017). For example, Piazzesi and Schneider (2006) document a downward sloping real yield curve for the U.K. for the period of 01/1983–03/2006, and an upward sloping real yield curve in the U.S. for the period of 01/1997–01/2006.

I find that four (latent) factors provide a good fit for both the real and nominal yield curves. In particular, I show that the real yield embedded in Israeli government inflation-indexed bonds reflect real yields that are less affected by illiquidity, which distinguishes the current paper from both Abrahams, Adrian, Crump, Moench, and Yu (2016) and D’Amico,

²The literature describes the U.K. market as issuing a high number of inflation-linked bonds (Bekaert and Wang, 2010), at around 20% in recent years. http://www.dmo.gov.uk/index.aspx?page=Gilts/Portfolio_Statistics.

³The reference CPI is the last known CPI before the bond was issued. If an inflation-indexed bond is issued on the 14th of a month, say in May, the last known reference CPI is the 15th of April (i.e., March’s inflation), which constitutes an inflation lag of one and a half months.

Kim, and Wei (2018) who adjust their model by adding a liquidity factor specific to Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities (TIPS). My main findings are as follows:

- The unconditional term structure of the inflation premium is increasing in maturity.
- Most of the variance in the break-even inflation in the short end is due to changes in the expected inflation. However, in the long end, most of it is due to the inflation term premium.
- Most of the variance in real yields is due to expected real short rates.
- The average expected real short rates are flat throughout the sample period.
- An increasing real term premium gives the unconditional real yield curve a positive slope.

The rest of the paper describes the analysis that led to these conclusions. Section 2 describes the data used for estimating the model in detail, and presents summary statistics. Section 3 motivates the choice of four factors. Section 4 describes the essentially affine term structure model I used. Section 5 presents the details of the estimation procedure. Section 6 presents the results. Section 7 reiterates the findings and describes limitations and avenues for further research.

2 Data

In contrast to U.S. and U.K. government bonds, Israeli government bonds are traded in the stock market and not over-the-counter. At present there is no repo market and market makers for government bonds were introduced in 2006⁴ (at first only for nominal bonds and later for inflation-indexed bonds). A striking feature of Israeli government bonds is that inflation-indexed bonds have been trading since the early 1950s, long before long-term

⁴See Gamrasni (2011) for a discussion of the effect of the introduction of market makers.

nominal bonds were introduced in the market in 1995. This is due to a history of double- and even triple-digit yearly inflation. The earliest period for which I have complete and reliable real yields data is from 01/1985 and it is of the form of end-of-month yield to maturities up until 01/1995. From 01/1995–03/2018 real yields are smoothed and calculated using a cubic spline method. Nominal bonds data spans the period of 05/2001–03/2018 and nominal yields are smoothed and calculated using the cubic spline method as well. Throughout the sample the yields are adjusted for carry (expectation of the nearest month realized inflation that has yet to be announced) and from 2008 onwards they are adjusted for seasonality (see Stein, 2012, for the methodology). Even though seasonal adjustment has only been carried out since 2008, this does not imply that before 2008 real yields were biased. Seasonality was likely less of an issue then because many inflation-indexed bonds had been trading in the market and seasonal effects of in neighboring maturities would have canceled each other out. In the past decade, there has been a consolidation of inflation-indexed bonds series, as can be seen in Figure 7. Both real and nominal yields have maturities of one, three, five, seven, and ten years. For the shorter end of the nominal yield curve (up to one year) I use zero coupon nominal yields, known as MAKAM yields, for the period of 05/2001–03/2018⁵. I also use the mean of the survey forecasts of Bank of Israel (BOI) interest rate of one month and one year ahead for the period of 05/2013–03/2018⁶. Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) provides seasonally adjusted monthly inflation data⁷ for the period of 06/2001–03/2018.

Table 1 presents summary statistics of the nominal and real yield curve. The real term structure is upward sloping with an average slope (ten minus one) of 93 basis points, and the nominal term structure is upward sloping as well (for a shorter period of 05/2001–03/2018) with an average slope of 219 basis points.

The term structure of the standard deviation of the changes of real yields is in general downward sloping. The nominal curve shows a similar trend. The term structure has a

⁵MAKAM data can be found at <http://www.boi.org.il/en/DataAndStatistics/Pages/SeriesSearchBySubject.aspx?Level=3&Id=41>.

⁶Twelve forecasters provide these forecasts to the BOI several times during the calendar month.

⁷See http://www.cbs.gov.il/ts/databank/databank_main_func_e.

hump in the three years to maturity and declines afterwards.⁸ Apart from the one year real rate, the term structure of standard deviation of the changes in the nominal rate is higher than the real rate. Roll (2004) documents this phenomenon also in the U.S. data. Roll's explanation is that expected inflation shocks cause nominal yields to increase their standard deviation. Table 1 also reveals that both real and nominal bonds have a high one-month autocorrelation, with a slower decay in long term real yields compared to their nominal counterparts. The time series in Figures 1, 2, and 3 reveal that all yields in Israel have decreased in the past 16 years. This has been a worldwide phenomenon.⁹ These time series also reveal that the BEI has decreased considerably from its high levels in the early 2000s, a period of high inflation, to its low levels of recent years.

3 Preliminary Analysis

3.1 Factor analysis

To choose the appropriate number of factors that help explain the term structure, I perform a PCA analysis. It is a common finding that three factors help explain the majority of variability of the U.S. nominal term structure. Performing a PCA analysis on the Israeli data for the period of 01/85–03/2018 for real yields and for the period of 05/2001–03/2018 for nominal yields confirms that this is also the case for Israel: three factors explain 98.2% and 98.6% of the variance of monthly changes in the real and nominal yields, respectively. However, as I am interested in modeling both the real and nominal curves, it is essential to do a PCA analysis combining both real and nominal yields. Performing PCA on monthly changes of both the real and nominal yield curves (as my real yields dataset starts a lot earlier I made sure that they both start at 05/2001 for the PCA analysis) yields that three factors can explain only 92% of the combined variance, while four and five factors can explain

⁸This latter empirical finding has been documented in Piazzesi (2001) for U.S. data, albeit for a different period. See Singleton (2009, chapter13) for a full discussion of this point.

⁹See for instance King and Low (2014).

96.3% and 98.18% of the variance, respectively. Obviously, three factors are not going to be enough to explain the combined term structure. On the other hand, five factors can explain as much variability as three factors can for the real and nominal parts separately. Nevertheless, I chose to model the combined term structure with four factors so to favor the parsimony of the model and avoid overfitting.¹⁰

3.2 Liquidity in the Israeli Government Bond Market

Several studies of the U.S. market, such as Sack and Elsassser (2002), Shen (2006), and D’Amico et al. (2018), conclude that prior to 2004, TIPS yields were too high. This suggests that there might have been a significant liquidity premium that has since declined. A recent paper by Fleckenstein, Longstaff, and Lustig (2014) shows that there are arbitrage opportunities in the TIPS market that were economically significant particularly during the financial crisis of 2008. The same conclusion is reached by Haubrich, Pennacchi, and Ritchken (2012), albeit in a different way. They estimate an affine term structure model, but use U.S. zero-coupon inflation swaps to infer real yields. They report large deviations between their estimated real yields and those of TIPS. These issues have prompted both D’Amico et al. (2018) and Abrahams et al. (2016) to add an extra liquidity factor which represents the lack of liquidity of TIPS relative to nominal Treasury securities. To determine whether similar mechanisms operate in the Israeli market, this section explores the role of illiquidity in determining real yields in the inflation-indexed bond market.

I follow D’Amico et al. (2018) and regress weekly 3-month, 2-year, and 10-year nominal yields on the 10-year BEI for the period of 05/2001–03/2018. If the 10-year real yield embedded in the 10-year inflation-indexed bond accurately captures the real yield, the BEI should contain the 10-year expected inflation and the inflation risk premium: two variables that are part of the 10-year nominal yield. This implies that regressing the 10-year BEI

¹⁰In ATSMS this is a real concern as shown in Duffee (2011). He shows that using more than three factors to estimate the nominal yield curve in the U.S. results in extremely high and unrealistic Sharpe ratios of expected excess returns.

on weekly 3-month, 2-year,10-year nominal yields should result in a high R^2 . The results (untabulated in the paper) show an R^2 of 87% for the whole period, much higher than the 6% reported in D’Amico et al. (2018). These results suggest that the variation in the real yields implied from inflation-indexed bonds is due to variation in the “true” real yields and support the notion that there is no need to add a specific factor that captures the lack of liquidity between inflation-indexed bonds and nominal bonds. This should come as no surprise as the amount the Israeli treasury issues yearly is still high. Looking at Figure 4, we see that inflation indexed bonds still make up a substantial part of new issues, at around 30%. For example, the U.K. is frequently cited in the literature as having a high percentage of its issues in indexed bonds, which has been around 20% in recent years¹¹. Furthermore, Figure 5 and 6 show a time series of the monthly average of the daily trading volume of nominal and inflation-indexed bonds from 2001 onwards and the monthly average of daily quoted spreads¹² divided by the midpoint price (in percentages) of inflation-indexed and nominal government bonds from 2005 onwards¹³. The figures show that even though the nominal market has a higher trading volume and a lower quoted spread, the difference is not so dramatic between them. For example, the ratio (as of June 2018) between the trading volume in the primary dealers market¹⁴ in the U.S. between the nominal and inflation-indexed markets is around 13, which indicates a much larger differences between the two markets. Daily quotes data from Bloomberg for July 2018, reveal that the ratio between the quoted half-spread of the 5-year on-the-run treasury and the 5-year on-the-run 5 TIPS was 7. For the 10-year maturity the ratio was 3.5. In contrast, in Israel it has been 2 on average for the whole period and for all maturities.

¹¹Data taken from <http://www.dmo.gov.uk/index.aspx?page=Gilts/Portfolio.Statistics>

¹²The daily quoted spreads are an average of all the quoted spreads in the limit order book.

¹³ The earliest period I have data for.

¹⁴Data from <https://www.newyorkfed.org/markets/gsds/search.html>.

4 The Affine Term Structure Model

Both affine models and macroeconomic models derive their equations from equilibrium (and no-arbitrage) assumptions. Whereas in macroeconomic models, the pricing kernel has the form

$$\frac{M_{t+1}}{M_t} = \frac{\beta U'(C_{t+1})}{U'(C_t)}, \quad (1)$$

where β is the subjective discount factor, and $U'(C)$ is the marginal utility of consumption, in affine models, as we shall see, the pricing kernel takes a different form. Many papers that decompose the term structure use ATSMs such as the one I use here. Duffie and Kan (1996) popularized ATSMs, and Duffee (2002) extended them to include time-varying prices of risk (and named them “essentially affine models”). Dai and Singleton (2002) show that the estimates of a three factor, essentially affine model, can match the dynamics of the time-varying risk premiums found by Fama and Bliss (1987), and Campbell and Shiller (1991) using U.S. nominal yields. My models is set in discrete time and builds on the model of D’Amico et al. (2018).¹⁵

4.1 Real Pricing Kernel

I start with the specification of the real short rate. I assume the real short rate is an affine function of four latent factors

$$r_t^R = \delta_0^R + \delta_1^{R'} X_t,$$

where δ_0^R is a scalar, δ_1^R is a (4×1) vector, and X_t are the latent factors that drive the real yields and have the following form

$$X_{t+1} = \mu + \Phi X_t + \Sigma e_{t+1}, \quad (2)$$

¹⁵For full details and derivation see Appendix B.

where μ is a (4×1) vector, ϕ is a (4×4) matrix, $\{e_t\}$ is a (4×1) i.i.d $N(0, I)$ process, I is a (4×4) diagonal matrix and Σ is a (4×4) matrix. The model is complete with the specification of the real pricing kernel

$$\frac{M_{t+1}^R}{M_t^R} = \exp \left(-0.5 \lambda_t^{R'} \lambda_t^R - r_t^R - \lambda_t^{R'} e_{t+1} \right), \quad (3)$$

where λ_t^R is a (4×1) vector of the real price of risk. In the essentially affine model, the price of risk can vary with the level of the state vector

$$\lambda_t^R = \lambda_0^R + \lambda_1^R X_t, \quad (4)$$

where λ_0^R is a (4×1) vector and λ_1^R is a (4×4) matrix. That is, the real price of risk is also an affine function of the latent factors and can change in magnitude and sign. After the real pricing kernel is specified, we can price real bonds at time t with n periods to maturity. Manipulation of the pricing equation (see Appendix B) shows that

$$y_{t,t+n}^R = A_n^R + B_n^{R'} X_t, \quad (5)$$

where $y_{t,t+n}^R$ is the continuously compounded yield at time t with maturity n , A_n^R is a scalar, and B_n^R is a (4×1) vector.

4.2 Nominal Pricing Kernel

As I a, jointly estimating both real and nominal bonds, I specify the nominal pricing kernel. I assume that the nominal short rate is an affine function of four latent factors

$$r_t^N = \delta_0^N + \delta_1^{N'} X_t, \quad (6)$$

where δ_0^N is a scalar, δ_1^N is a (4×1) vector, and X_t , the same latent factors that drive the real yields, also drive the nominal yields. The nominal pricing kernel has the form

$$\frac{M_{t+1}^N}{M_t^N} = \exp\left(-0.5\lambda_t^{N'}\lambda_t^N - r_t^N - \lambda_t^{N'}e_{t+1}\right), \quad (7)$$

where λ_t^N , the nominal price of risk, is a (4×1) vector. As in the case of the real price of risk, the nominal price of risk also varies with the state of the economy, i.e.,

$$\lambda_t^N = \lambda_0^N + \lambda_1^N X_t, \quad (8)$$

where λ_1^N is a (4×4) matrix.

The specification of the price process, π_t , links the nominal and real pricing kernels

$$\Pi_{t+1} = \Pi_t \exp\left(\delta_0^\pi + \delta_1^{\Pi'} X_t + \sigma_q' e_{t+1} + \sigma_v v_{t+1} - 0.5(\sigma_q' \sigma_q + \sigma_v^2)\right), \quad (9)$$

where δ_0^π is a scalar, δ_1^π is a (4×1) vector, σ_q is a (4×1) vector, σ_v is a scalar, and v_t is a white noise process. I assume that $\text{cov}(v_t, e_t) = 0$. Thus, I follow D'Amico et al. (2018) and Risa (2001) and allow for an exogenous shock not spanned by the yield curve to affect the price process. Nominal yields follow the same functional form as real yields, i.e.,

$$y_{t,t+n}^N = A_n^N + B_n^{N'} X_t, \quad (10)$$

where $y_{t,t+n}^N$ is the continuously compounded yield at time t with maturity n , A_n^N is a scalar, and B_n^N is a (4×1) vector. To complete the model, the relationship between the real and nominal pricing equations can be derived via the following no-arbitrage argument: the price of an asset that promises 1 unit of consumption in the next period has to be equal under both the real and nominal pricing kernel. That is,

$$E\left(\frac{M_{t+1}^R}{M_t^R} \cdot 1\right) = E\left(\frac{M_{t+1}^N}{M_t^N} \cdot \frac{\Pi_{t+1}}{\Pi_t}\right). \quad (11)$$

Assuming that the market is complete implies that

$$\frac{M_{t+1}^R}{M_t^R} = \frac{M_{t+1}^N}{M_t^N} \cdot \frac{\Pi_{t+1}}{\Pi_t}. \quad (12)$$

Substituting Equations (3), (7) and (9) into (12) and matching coefficients yields the following restrictions on the parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_0^N &= \delta_0^R + \delta_0^\pi + 0.5(\sigma_q' \sigma_q + \sigma_v^2) - \lambda_0^{N'} \sigma_q, \\ \delta_1^N &= \delta_1^R + \delta_1^\pi - \lambda_1^{N'} \sigma_q, \\ \lambda_0^N &= \lambda_0^R + \sigma_q, \\ \lambda_1^R &= \lambda_1^N. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

5 Estimation

Following Kim and Orphanides (2012), D'Amico et al. (2018), and Joyce, Lildholdt, and Sorensen (2010), I assume that all yields are estimated with error, and construct the maximum likelihood function using the Kalman filter.¹⁶

5.1 The State and Measurement Equation

Implementing the Kalman filter requires definition of a state and a measurement equation. ATSMs lend themselves easily to this specification. Equation (2), the law of motion of the latent factors, explicitly defines the state equation. For the measurement equations¹⁷ I will assume that real and nominal yields are observed with a measurement error such that

$$\begin{aligned} y_{t,t+n}^N &= A_n^N + B_n^{N'} X_t + \eta_R, \\ y_{t,t+n}^R &= A_n^R + B_n^{R'} X_t + \eta_N, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

¹⁶See Appendix A for more details on deriving the maximum likelihood function.

¹⁷Since the data is monthly end-of-month yields, t and n are in monthly units.

where

$$\begin{bmatrix} \eta_R \\ \eta_N \end{bmatrix} \underset{N}{\sim} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_R & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_N \end{pmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

where σ_R and σ_N are scalars. Therefore, I assume that nominal and real bonds differ with respect to their measurement error.

5.2 The Price Process

For the price process level, Π_t , I use the seasonally adjusted series. I define the monthly change at time t as the log of the level at time t divided by its level at $t - 1$, i.e.,

$$\pi_{t+1} \equiv \log \left(\frac{\Pi_{t+1}}{\Pi_t} \right) = \delta_0^\pi + \delta_1^{\pi'} X_t + \sigma_q' e_{t+1} + \sigma_v v_{t+1} - 0.5(\sigma_q' \sigma_q + \sigma_v^2). \quad (16)$$

Unlike for yields, I assume that the price process is estimated without error.

5.3 Matching Surveys

Kim and Orphanides (2012) make the point that ATSMs law of motion parameters are estimated imprecisely and biased downwards, because estimating persistent factors requires a large sample. This results in an estimated model with faster mean reversion parameters that attribute almost all variation of longer term forward rates to the term premium. Kim and Orphanides then show that supplementing the estimation of an ATSM with survey forecasts of future T-bill yields reduces the bias in the estimated law of motion parameters considerably. I follow them by using the mean of survey forecast of one month and one year ahead interest rate BOI target rate.

Expected n -month ahead short rates are easily derived and take the form¹⁸

$$E_t(r_{t+n}^N) = \delta_0^N + \delta_1^{N'} \phi^n X_t. \quad (17)$$

I assume that one-month and one-year ahead mean survey forecasts have no bias in their expectations, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} I_t^2 &= E_t(r_{t+1}^N) + \eta_{i_2}, \\ I_t^{13} &= E_t(r_{t+12}^N) + \eta_{i_{13}}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

and

$$\eta_I \stackrel{N}{\sim} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{i_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_{i_{13}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

A disadvantage of the Israeli data is that there are no long-term surveys. This may bias the estimated law of motion parameters. However, it is not clear how important the long term forecasts are in terms of reducing the bias. For instance, Kim and Orphanides (2012) use the expected 3-month T-bill yield between the next 6 and 11 years, but since it is available only twice a year, they downplay its role in their estimation by imposing a large standard error.

¹⁸To show this, note that

$$E_t(r_{t+n}^N) = E_t(\cdots E_{t+n-1}(r_{t+n}^N)).$$

This can be solved backwards using the tower property.

5.4 The Augmented State and Measurement Equation

To fix ideas, I conclude this section with a more explicit representation and the identification restriction I impose. The augmented state equation takes the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_{t+1}^1 \\ x_{t+1}^2 \\ x_{t+1}^3 \\ x_{t+1}^4 \\ \pi_{t+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \delta_0^\pi - \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_q' \sigma_q + \sigma_v) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{1,1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \phi_{2,2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \phi_{3,3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \phi_{4,4} & 0 \\ \delta_{1,1}^\pi & \delta_{1,2}^\pi & \delta_{1,3}^\pi & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_t^1 \\ x_t^2 \\ x_t^3 \\ x_t^4 \\ q_t \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0.01 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \sigma_{2,1} & 0.01 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \sigma_{3,1} & \sigma_{3,2} & 0.01 & 0 & 0 \\ \sigma_{4,1} & \sigma_{4,2} & \sigma_{4,3} & 0.01 & 0 \\ \sigma_q^1 & \sigma_q^2 & \sigma_q^3 & \sigma_q^4 & \sigma_v \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{t+1}^1 \\ \epsilon_{t+1}^2 \\ \epsilon_{t+1}^3 \\ \epsilon_{t+1}^4 \\ v_{t+1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

Notice that as in the ATSM not all the parameters are identified,¹⁹ I set the off-diagonal entries of matrix ϕ to zero, the vector μ to zero and the diagonal of Σ_v to 0.01, while only estimating the cross correlation parameters. I also set the off-diagonal price of risk of λ_1^N to zero.

¹⁹For a discussion on this point see Dai and Singleton (2000).

The augmented measurement equation takes the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} y_{t,t+6}^N \\ y_{t,t+9}^N \\ \vdots \\ y_{t,t+12}^N \\ \vdots \\ y_{t,t+120}^N \\ y_{t,t+12}^R \\ \vdots \\ y_{t,t+120}^R \\ \pi_t \\ I_t^2 \\ I_t^{13} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_6^N \\ A_9^N \\ \vdots \\ A_{12}^N \\ \vdots \\ A_{120}^N \\ A_{12}^R \\ \vdots \\ A_{120}^R \\ \delta_0^\pi - \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_q' \sigma_q + \sigma_v) \\ \delta_0^N \\ \delta_0^N \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} B_{1,6}^N & \dots & B_{4,6}^N & 0 \\ B_{1,9}^N & \dots & B_{4,9}^N & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ B_{1,12}^N & \dots & B_{4,12}^N & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ B_{1,120}^R & \dots & B_{4,120}^R & 0 \\ B_{1,12}^R & \dots & B_{4,12}^R & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ B_{1,120}^R & \dots & B_{4,120}^R & 0 \\ \delta_{1,1}^\pi & \dots & \delta_{1,4}^\pi & 0 \\ \delta_{1,1}^N \phi_{1,1} & \dots & \delta_{1,4}^N \phi_{4,4} & 0 \\ \delta_{1,1}^N \phi_{1,1}^{12} & \dots & \delta_{1,4}^N \phi_{4,4}^{12} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_t \\ \pi_t \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \eta_N \\ \eta_R \\ 0 \\ \eta_I \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

Using the Kalman filter, I estimate a total of 36 parameters.

$$\Theta \equiv (\phi, \sigma_v, \sigma_q, \lambda_0^N, \lambda_1^N, \delta_0^\pi, \delta_1^\pi, \sigma_\eta, \sigma_R, \sigma_N, \sigma_I) \quad (22)$$

6 Results

6.1 General Fit

The mean absolute deviation (MAD) and the root mean square error (RMSE) are reported in Table 2. Except for the one-year real yield, the average RMSE across maturities is 23 for the 01/1985–03/2018 and 7.5 basis points for real and nominal yields for the period of 05/2001–03/2018. For the period of 05/2001–03/2018, the RMSE of real yields across

maturities is lower (15 basis points). The better fit in the later period might be due to the fact that the yield to maturities I used in the previous period induced more measurement error. In Figures 8 and 9 I compare the time series of the model’s fitted real and nominal yields with their actual yields. The model’s good fit of the nominal and real yield curves is confirmed by the figures. One might object that the lack of a good fit for the 1-year real rate stems from its poor liquidity. To make sure that this is not the case, I follow Pflueger and Viceira (2011) and run the following regression,

$$BEI_t = \alpha + \beta_1 E_t(\pi_t) + \beta_2 \text{BaS}_t + \epsilon_t, \quad (23)$$

for the period of 01/2005–03/2018²⁰, where BEI_t is the end-of-month 1-year BEI, $E_t(\pi_t)$ is the end-of-month average of the survey of professional forecasters for the 1-year inflation, BaS is the end-of-month daily half-quoted spreads divided by the midpoint price (in percentages) that serve as a proxy for the 1-year real yield liquidity. The results of the regression are presented in Table 3. They reveal that the level of liquidity, as proxied by the bid-ask spreads do not result in a lower BEI so the lack of fit (at least from 2005 onwards) might not be the result of poor 1-year liquidity. Another possibility is that the 1-year real yield is still partially affected by seasonality as its effect on the shortest maturities is highest. This could possibly result in a fitted 1-year real yield that is closer to the “true” seasonally-adjusted 1-year rate. To test this, I run two regression. The first one is the seasonally adjusted real rate (the series used to estimate the model) on the seasonal adjustment factors for the period of 01/2008–03/2018 (01/2008 is when real yields were seasonality adjusted). The results in Table 4 show that the seasonal adjustment is statistically significant indicating the presence of seasonality.²¹ I then run a regression of the fitted 1-year real yield from the model on the seasonal adjustment. The results reveal an R^2 that is cut in half and with a statistical

²⁰The sample begins in 2005 because this is the earliest I have bid-ask spreads data.

²¹In an unreported regression, the subsample from 03/2012 onwards is no longer statistically significant, indicating that seasonality might not be an issue from this period onwards.

significance of only 10%, supporting the notion that part of the fitting error may be due to seasonality noise.

6.2 Decomposing the Yield Curve

This subsection presents the main results of the paper, which is the decomposition of the nominal yield into its expectation and risk premium parts:

$$y_t^N = \underbrace{E_t(y_t^R)}_{\text{expected real rate}} + \underbrace{RealRP_t^N}_{\text{real risk premium}} + \underbrace{E_t(\pi_t^N)}_{\text{inflation expectations}} + \underbrace{RP_t^N}_{\text{inflation risk premium}}. \quad (24)$$

6.3 The Real Rate

Table 1 revealed that the real term structure was upward sloping during the 01/1985–03/2018 period. Figure 10 shows the time-series decomposition of the 1-year, 3-year, 5-year, 7-year and 10-year real yields into fitted real yields, average expected short real yields and the real term premium. It shows that variation in real yields is mostly driven by variation in the expected short rate and not in the real term premium. Table 5 shows that, on average, the expected real short rate was flat throughout the period. It is interesting to compare these results to some theoretical model predictions. Nakamura, Steinsson, Barro, and Ursúa (2013) develop a model of consumption disasters that allows disasters to unfold over multiple years and to be systematically followed by recoveries. Their model implies that the real term premium should be negative and that real term structure should be downward sloping, as real bonds are excellent hedges against disaster risk. Piazzesi and Schneider (2006) solve for a model of a representative agent asset-pricing model with recursive utility preferences and exogenous consumption growth and inflation. In their model, inflation shocks are “bad news” for future consumption growth. Therefore, long indexed bonds pay off when future real interest rates (and future consumption growth) are low so that they provide a hedge. Therefore, the real term structure should be downward sloping. Both of the channels

described by the two models are not corroborated by the Israeli data. Our results are however in line with the model of Wachter (2006) who develops a consumption-based model of the term structure of interest rates. She calibrates her model so that the real risk-free rate is negatively correlated with surplus consumption. The negative correlation between surplus consumption and the risk-free rate leads to positive risk premia on real bonds, and an upward-sloping yield curve.

6.4 The Break-Even Term Structure

In this subsection, I analyze the results of the BEI decomposition. As nominal yields data is only from 05/2001, my analysis of the BEI starts accordingly from that point. Figure 12 shows the time series decomposition of the 1-year, 3-year, 5-year, 7-year and 10-year of the BEI into fitted break-even yields, expected inflation and the inflation term premium. The figure reveals that the variation in the short rate is largely driven by variation in expected inflation. As we move into longer maturities, this changes and the variation is largely driven by variation in the inflation premium. The results also reveal that in the past four years, the inflation premium has been negative in all years to maturity, which coincides with a period of decline in yearly CPI to negative territory both in Israel and worldwide (see Figure 11).

The negative inflation risk premia are consistent with positive inflation shocks being correlated with states of low marginal utility of wealth and therefore acting as a hedge against inflation. This is consistent with the findings of Kitsul and Wright (2013) for the U.S. that the empirical pricing kernel is U-shaped (which they estimate from options based on consumer price index inflation) with inflation. Therefore, in times of low inflation, a high inflation shock, which is associated with lower real yields for nominal bond holders, is associated with low marginal utility of wealth.²² Table 6 shows unconditional averages for the whole sample. It reveals that the inflation term premium for the whole sample has been positive, ranging from a low of 0.22 basis points at the short end (1 year) to 0.63 at the

²²The high inflation term premia in the early 2000s is also consistent with this finding.

10-year maturity.

It is interesting to compare these results with other results in the literature. Figure 13 shows the fitted 5-year/5-year BEI forward rates along with the 5-year/5-year expected inflation. It shows that almost all the variation in the forward BEI measure is driven by the inflation term premium. It further shows that the expected inflation is fairly constant at around 2%, which is the BOI target rate. These results are similar to those of Abrahams et al. (2016) who report the same finding for the U.S.: most of the variation is due to the inflation term premia, and the expected inflation remains stable between 2.1% and 2.5%. As mentioned earlier, the results for Israel show that concurrently with the persistent low inflation, the inflation term premia has become negative. Thus, the results for Israel are consistent with the findings of Abrahams et al. (2016) (whose sample ends in November 2014) and D’Amico et al. (2018) (whose sample ends in March 2013) for the U.S. They show a trending inflation term premium that was concurrent with the persistent world inflation.

7 Conclusions

In this paper I estimate a discrete-time four-factor essentially affine term structure model using Israeli data for both inflation-indexed and nominal government bonds. The real rates data is uniquely long and spans the period of 01/1985–03/2018. The nominal yields data spans the period of 05/2001–03/2018. I find that an increasing inflation term premium accounts for the unconditional positive slope of the nominal curve, while inflation expectations are relatively flat. I also find that the variance in the one-year real yield accounts for most of the variance in the one-year nominal yield, while in the longer maturities most of the variance is due to expected inflation and the inflation term premium.

I also show that contrary to the results of Abrahams et al. (2016), D’Amico et al. (2018) for the U.S., liquidity has a less prominent role in determining real yields in Israel.

A limitation of the model is that it does not identify the four factors. It would be

interesting to identify the factors, as macro-finance models do. I leave this to future work.

A Estimating ATSMs with the Kalman Filter

In this appendix, I summarize the general strategy of estimating affine term structure models with the Kalman filter. We start with our state and measurement equations:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{t+1} &= \mu + \Phi X_t + \Sigma \epsilon_{t+1}, \\ y_t^n &= A_n + B_n X_t + u_t, \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $\{u_t\}$ is i.i.d $N(0, \Sigma \Sigma')$. This framework assumes that what drives the yields are k latent factors. In this particular setup, we shall also need some results from the Kalman filter algorithm. The Kalman filter algorithm can produce latent factors given both observed data and the parameters of the model. Although Equation (25) is written in state-space form, we lack the parameters of the dynamics. Thus, the role of the Kalman filter in the estimation process is subtle.

A.1 The Kalman Filter Algorithm

In order to understand the role of the algorithm in the estimation of the essentially affine term structure model, we first present the algorithm. Suppose that we are given the following set of equations:

$$y_t = Hx_t + v_t, \tag{26}$$

$$x_t = Gx_{t-1} + \epsilon_t, \tag{27}$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_t \\ \epsilon_t \end{pmatrix} \sim N \left(0, \begin{bmatrix} R & 0 \\ 0 & Q \end{bmatrix} \right). \tag{28}$$

Assume that we can observe only the multivariate series $\{y_t\}$, when what we really want to know is the dynamics of the latent series $\{x_t\}$. Suppose also that H,G,R, and Q are given. The Kalman filter algorithm yields:

$$E(x_t|\Omega_t), \text{Var}(x_t|\Omega_t), f(y_t|\Omega_{t-1}).$$

We introduce some useful notation:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t-1|t-1} &\equiv E(x_{t-1}|\Omega_{t-1}), \\ P_{t-1|t-1} &\equiv V(x_{t-1}|\Omega_{t-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The Kalman filter combines $x_{t-1|t-1}$ and $P_{t-1|t-1}$ with y_t to yield

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t|t} &\equiv E(x_t|\Omega_t), \\ P_{t|t} &\equiv V(x_t|\Omega_t). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we know that $\{x_t\}$ and $\{y_t\}$ are jointly normal processes. Moreover,

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_t & | \Omega_{t-1} \\ y_t & | \Omega_{t-1} \end{pmatrix} \sim N \left(\begin{bmatrix} x_{t|t-1} \\ y_{t|t-1} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} P_{t|t-1} & C'_{t|t-1} \\ C_{t|t-1} & h_{t|t-1} \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (29)$$

where we have that

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t|t-1} &= Gx_{t-1|t-1}, \\ y_{t|t-1} &= Hx_{t|t-1}, \\ P_{t|t-1} &= GP_{t-1|t-1}G' + Q, \\ C_{t|t-1} &= HP_{t-1|t-1}, \\ h_{t|t-1} &= HP_{t-1|t-1}H' + R. \end{aligned}$$

The main takeaway is to note that the marginal distribution of y_t is

$$f(\cdot|y_{t|t-1}) \sim N(y_{t|t-1}, h_{t|t-1}). \quad (30)$$

This means that in order to build the likelihood function of the $\{y_t\}$ process, we have to go along and work out the Kalman filter, as it generates the covariance matrix of the process. Next, we run the Kalman filter algorithm.

A.2 The Likelihood Function

We want to estimate the likelihood function

$$f(y_1, \dots, y_T | \Theta), \quad (31)$$

where $\Theta = \{\Sigma, \Sigma_u, A_n, B_n, \mu, \Phi, \lambda\}$. Since the process $\{y_t\}$ has the Markov property, we have

$$f(y_1, \dots, y_T | \Theta) = f(y_1 | \Theta) \prod_{t=2}^T f(y_t | y_{t-1}, \Theta), \quad (32)$$

where $f(y_t | y_{t-1}, \Theta)$ is a multivariate normal variable (see Equation (30)). The likelihood function is thus of the form

$$L(\Theta | \{y_1, \dots, y_T\}) = (2\pi)^{\frac{-k(T)}{2}} \prod_{t=1}^T \det(h_{t|t-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(y_t - y_{t|t-1})' h_{t|t-1}^{-1} (y_t - y_{t|t-1})\right). \quad (33)$$

For better numerical stability, we maximize the log-likelihood function:

$$\text{Log}L(\Theta | \{y_1, \dots, y_T\}) \propto -\sum_{t=2}^T \log(\det(h_{t|t-1})) - \sum_{t=2}^T (y_t - y_{t|t-1})' h_{t|t-1}^{-1} (y_t - y_{t|t-1}). \quad (34)$$

B Deriving the Pricing Equations

Note that

$$P_t^1 = E(M_{t+1}) = \exp(-r_t) = \exp(-\delta_0 - \delta_1 X_t).$$

From this, we guess the general form of the price of a bond to be

$$\log(P_t^n) = p_t^n = (-\bar{A}_n - \bar{B}_n X_t). \quad (35)$$

We know from no-arbitrage pricing that

$$p_t^n = E(p_{t+1}^{n-1} + m_{t+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \text{var}(p_{t+1} + m_{t+1}). \quad (36)$$

Matching the coefficients of Equation (36) with Equation (35), we have that the coefficients \bar{A}_n and \bar{B}_n follow the difference equations (also known as loading factors):

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A}_{n+1} &= \bar{A}_n + \bar{B}_n' (\mu - \Sigma_v \lambda_0) + 0.5 \bar{B}_n' \Sigma_v \Sigma_v' \bar{B}_n - \delta_0, \\ \bar{B}_{n+1}' &= \bar{B}_n' (\Phi - \Sigma_v \lambda_1) - \delta_1'. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Since $P_t^n = \exp(-ny_t^n)$, we have that

$$y_t^n = A_n + B_n X_t, \quad (38)$$

where $A_n = -\bar{A}_n/n$ and $B_n = -\bar{B}_n/n$.

References

- Michael Abrahams, Tobias Adrian, Richard K. Crump, Emanuel Moench, and Rui Yu. Decomposing real and nominal yield curves. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 84:182–200, 2016.
- Geert Bekaert and Xiaozheng Wang. Inflation risk and the inflation risk premium. *Economic Policy*, 25(64):755–806, 2010.
- John Y. Campbell and Robert J. Shiller. Yield spreads and interest rate movements: A bird’s eye view. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 58(3):495–514, 1991.
- Qiang Dai and Kenneth J Singleton. Specification analysis of affine term structure models. *The Journal of Finance*, 55(5):1943–1978, 2000.
- Qiang Dai and Kenneth J. Singleton. Expectation puzzles, time-varying risk premia, and affine models of the term structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 63(3):415–441, 2002.
- Stefania D’Amico, Don H. Kim, and Min Wei. Tips from TIPS: The informational content of treasury inflation-protected security prices. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 53(1):395–436, 2018.
- Gregory R. Duffee. Term premia and interest rate forecasts in affine models. *The Journal of Finance*, 57(1):405–443, 2002.
- Gregory R. Duffee. Sharpe ratios in term structure models. *Working papers of the Johns Hopkins University, Department of Economics*, 2011.
- Darrell Duffie and Rui Kan. A yield-factor model of interest rates. *Mathematical Finance*, 6(4):379–406, 1996.
- Andrey Ermolov. International real yields. 2017.

- Eugene F. Fama and Robert R. Bliss. The information in long-maturity forward rates. *The American Economic Review*, 77:680–692, 1987.
- Matthias Fleckenstein, Francis A. Longstaff, and Hanno Lustig. The tips-treasury bond puzzle. *the Journal of Finance*, 69(5):2151–2197, 2014.
- Inon Gamrasni. The effect of the 2006 market maker reform on the liquidity of local-currency unindexed Israeli government bonds in the secondary market. *Bank of Israel Working Paper*, 2011.
- Joseph Haubrich, George Pennacchi, and Peter Ritchken. Inflation expectations, real rates, and risk premia: Evidence from inflation swaps. *Review of Financial Studies*, 25:1588–1629, 2012.
- Michael A.S. Joyce, Peter Lildholdt, and Steffen Sorensen. Extracting inflation expectations and inflation risk premia from the term structure: A joint model of the U.K. nominal and real yield curves. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 34(2):281–294, 2010.
- Michael Kahn, Shmuel Kandel, and Oded Sarig. Real and nominal effects of central bank monetary policy. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 49(8):1493–1519, 2002.
- Shmuel Kandel, Aharon R. Ofer, and Oded Sarig. Real interest rates and inflation: An ex-ante empirical analysis. *The Journal of Finance*, 51(1):205–225, 1996.
- Don H. Kim and Athanasios Orphanides. Term structure estimation with survey data on interest rate forecasts. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 47(1):241–272, 2012.
- Mervyn King and David Low. Measuring the “world” real interest rate. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2014.
- Yuriy Kitsul and Jonathan H Wright. The economics of options-implied inflation probability density functions. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 110(3):696–711, 2013.

- Emi Nakamura, Jón Steinsson, Robert Barro, and José Ursúa. Crises and recoveries in an empirical model of consumption disasters. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 5(3):35–74, 2013.
- Carolyn E Pflueger and Luis M Viceira. An empirical decomposition of risk and liquidity in nominal and inflation-indexed government bonds. *NBER Working Papers*, 16892, 2011.
- Monika Piazzesi. An econometric model of the yield curve with macroeconomic jump effects. *NBER Working Papers*, 8246, 2001.
- Monika Piazzesi and Martin Schneider. Equilibrium yield curves. *NBER Working Papers*, 12609, 2006.
- Stefano Risa. Nominal and inflation indexed yields: Separating expected inflation and inflation risk premia. 2001.
- Richard Roll. Empirical tips. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 60:31–53, 2004.
- Brian Sack and Robert Elsasser. Treasury inflation-indexed debt: a review of the U.S. experience. 2002.
- Pu Shen. Liquidity risk premia and breakeven inflation rates. *Economic Review-Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City*, 91(2):29, 2006.
- Kenneth J. Singleton. *Empirical Dynamic Asset Pricing: Model Specification and Econometric Assessment*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Roy Stein. Estimating the expected natural interest rate using affine term-structure models: The case of israel. *Bank of Israel Working Paper*, 2011.
- Roy Stein. The effect of seasonality in the CPI on inflation expectations. *Bank of Israel Working Paper*, 2012.

Jessica A. Wachter. A consumption-based model of the term structure of interest rates.
Journal of Financial Economics, 79(2):365–399, 2006.

Table 1: Summary Statistics. This table shows summary statistics of nominal and real yields with maturities of one, three, five, seven, and ten. The frequency of the data is monthly (end-of-month) and it spans the period of 01/1985–03/2018 for real yields and the period of 05/2001–2018 for nominal yields. From 05/2001 onwards, the yields are of constant maturity and smoothed. Before that, yield to maturity of inflation-indexed bonds are used. Real yields are adjusted for both the effect of carry and seasonality. Data is in percent and annualized. Yields are continuously compounded.

(a) Real Yields 01/1985–03/2018

Maturity	1	3	5	7	10
Mean	2.50	2.80	2.98	3.09	3.43
Std. Dev. (changes)	1.24	0.55	0.48	0.41	0.36
1 Month Autocorrel.	0.882	0.973	0.972	0.973	0.977
3 Month Autocorrel.	0.810	0.931	0.931	0.941	0.943
6 Month Autocorrel.	0.741	0.887	0.888	0.891	0.915
1 Year Autocorrel.	0.704	0.834	0.845	0.839	0.864

(b) Nominal Yields (05/2001–03/2018)

Maturity	1	3	5	7	10
Mean	3.12	3.79	4.39	4.86	5.31
Std. Dev. (changes)	0.34	0.42	0.41	0.39	0.39
1 Month Autocorrel.	0.990	0.987	0.987	0.988	0.986
3 Month Autocorrel.	0.959	0.958	0.959	0.958	0.951
6 Month Autocorrel.	0.901	0.906	0.914	0.917	0.911
1 Year Autocorrel.	0.822	0.822	0.835	0.840	0.824

Table 2: Fit Statistics. This table shows the RMSE and the MAD of the estimated yields, both real and nominal. Data is in basis points.

(a) Real rates (01/1985–03/2018)

Real					
	1 Year	3 Year	5 Year	7 Year	10 Year
Real RMSE	49.80	19.57	22.20	27.04	24.44
Real MAD	30.86	12.75	11.07	14.87	17.77

(b) Nominal rates (05/2001-03/2018)

Nominal							
	3M	6M	1 Year	3 Year	5 Year	7 Year	10 Year
Nominal RMSE	8.35	3.35	17.21	6.32	4.83	2.52	10.00
Nominal MAD	5.51	2.10	10.30	4.43	3.32	1.80	7.07

Table 3: Liquidity of the 1-year real rate. This table presents the results of the regression $BEI_t = \alpha + \beta_1 E_t(\pi_t) + \beta_2 BaS_t + \epsilon_t$ for the period of 01/2005-03/2018, where BEI_t is the end-of-month 1-year BEI, $E_t(\pi_t)$ is the end-of-month average of the survey of professional forecasters for the 1-year inflation rate, BaS_t is the end-of-month daily half-quoted spread divided by the midpoint price (in percentages) that serves as a proxy for the 1-year real rate.

α	Std.Error	$E_t(\pi)$	Std.Error	BaS_t	Std.Error	R^2
-0.068	0.098	1.17	0.037	-21.04	54.76	0.84

Table 4: Seasonality bias. This table shows the results of regressing the end-of-month 1-year real rate and the fitted 1-year real rate on the seasonal adjustment factor for the period of 01/2008–03/2018.

(a) Dependent variable: 1-year real rate

constant	t-stat	seasonality	t-stat	R^2
-0.025	-0.30	-0.55	-3.19	0.077

(b) Dependent variable: Fitted 1-year real rate

constant	t-stat	seasonality	t-stat	R^2
-0.14	-1.68	-0.35	-1.97	0.031

Table 5: Decomposing the Real Term Structure. This table presents the first and second moments of the decomposition of fitted real yields implied from the estimated four factor model. Data is in percent annualized.

Maturity	Fitted real yields	std. dev.	Expected real yields	std. dev.	Real term premium	std. dev.
1	2.42	2.52	2.17	2.52	0.25	0.53
3	2.80	2.32	2.39	2.08	0.41	0.32
5	2.97	2.02	2.45	1.76	0.51	0.40
7	3.13	1.80	2.47	1.47	0.66	0.51
10	3.40	1.61	2.45	1.13	0.94	0.58

Table 6: Decomposing the BEI. This table presents the first and second moments of the decomposition of fitted BEI implied from the estimated four factor model. Data is in percent annualized.

Maturity	Fitted BEI	std. dev.	Expected inflation	std. dev.	Inflation term premium	std. dev.
1	1.77	1.09	1.54	0.92	0.22	0.34
3	2.17	0.96	1.78	0.62	0.40	0.56
5	2.40	0.93	1.90	0.45	0.50	0.66
7	2.55	0.92	1.98	0.35	0.57	0.71
10	2.67	0.92	2.04	0.25	0.63	0.76




Figure 1: Time Series of Real Yields. This figure presents the time series of real yields (adjusted for the effect of carry and seasonality) with maturities of one, three, five, seven, and ten years used in the estimation of the model. Data is monthly (end-of-month) and yields are in percent annualized.




Figure 2: Time Series of Nominal Yields. This figure presents the time series of nominal yields with maturities of one, three, five, seven, and ten years used in the estimation of the model. Data is monthly (end-of-month) and yields are in percent annualized.




Figure 3: Time Series of Break-Even Inflation. This figure presents the time series of the break-even inflation (nominal minus real yield) with maturities of one, three, five, seven, and ten used in the estimation of the model. Data is monthly (end-of-month) and yields are in percent annualized.




Figure 4: Issuance of indexed and non-indexed bonds. This figure plots yearly issuance of indexed and nominal bonds. Data is in millions of NIS.




Figure 5: Volume (in millions of NIS) of bonds. The figure plots the trading volume of indexed and non-indexed bonds in the Israeli stock market.




Figure 6: Bid-Ask Spreads. The figure plots the quoted spread divided by the midpoint price (in percentages) in the nominal and inflation-indexed bonds.




Figure 7: Number of Series. This figure plots the number of series of Indexed and non-indexed bonds.




Figure 8: Real Yields Comparison. This figure plots fitted real yields from the three factor model and actual real yields for maturities of 1,3,5,7 and 10 years.




Figure 9: Nominal Yields Comparison. This figure plots fitted nominal yields from the three factor model and actual nominal yields for maturities of 1,3,5,7 and 10 years.




Figure 10: Fitted real rate Time Series Decomposition. This figure presents a decomposition of the fitted real rate rate to the expected real rate and the real term premium for the 01/1985-03/2018 period. The decomposition is based on a joint estimation of a four factor model using both real and nominal Israeli yields.




Figure 11: World Inflation. The figure plots the annual CPI inflation for selected countries.




Figure 12: Fitted BEI Time Series Decomposition. This figure presents a decomposition of the fitted BEI rate rate to inflation expectations and the inflation term premium for the 05/2001-03/2018 period. The decomposition is based on a joint estimation of a four factor model using both real and nominal Israeli yields.




Figure 13: Fitted 5-year/5-year forward BEI Time Series Decomposition. This figure presents the fitted 5-year/5-year forward BEI rate and the 5-year/5-year inflation expectations for the 05/2001-03/2018 period. The decomposition is based on a joint estimation of a four factor model using both real and nominal Israeli yields.