# CBDCs, Financial Inclusion, and Optimal Monetary Policy<sup>\*</sup>

David Murakami<sup>†</sup> Ivan Shchapov<sup>‡</sup> Ganesh Viswanath-Natraj<sup>§</sup>

6 May 2022 This version: 2 December 2022

#### Abstract

In this paper we study the macroeconomic effects of introducing a retail central bank digital currency (CBDC). Using a two agent framework and endowment economy with banked and unbanked households, we show CBDCs address financial inclusion of the unbanked by providing a savings vehicle to allow households to smooth consumption. Finally, we study the monetary policy implications in a New Keynesian setting. Welfare gains under Ramsey optimal monetary policy are higher for a retail CBDC with a primarily unbanked population. When CBDC and deposits are near substitutes, optimal policy requires the CBDC rate to track policy rates. Taken together, our findings suggest a stronger use case for CBDCs in emerging economies with a lower degree of financial inclusion.

**Keywords**: central bank digital currency, financial inclusion, inequality, monetary policy, optimal policy, Taylor rules, welfare

**JEL Classifications**: E420, E440, E520, E580

<sup>\*</sup>The authors kindly thank Andrea Ferrero and Guido Ascari for their feedback and guidance. We also thank Todd Keister, Linda Schilling, David Bounie, and seminar participants at Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Télécom Paris and the University of Warwick for helpful comments.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>University of Milan and University of Pavia.

Email: david.murakami@unimi.it

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>Institut Polytechnique de Paris, CREST, Télécom Paris, and École Polytechnique. Email: ivan.shchapov@polytechnique.edu

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>§</sup>University of Warwick, Warwick Business School. Email: ganesh.viswanath-natraj@wbs.ac.uk

# 1 Introduction

Central bank digital currency (CBDC) are digital tokens, similar to a cryptocurrency, issued by a central bank. Central banks are actively studying the potential adoption of CBDCs, and notable examples include Sweden's E-Krona and China's Digital Currency Electronic Payment. In this emerging macroeconomics literature there is a focus on the macroeconomic effects (Barrdear and Kumhof 2022; Assenmacher, Bitter, and Ristiniemi 2022; Burlon et al. 2022; George, Xie, and Alba 2020; Ikeda 2020; Benigno, Schilling, and Uhlig 2022; Kumhof et al. 2021; Cong and Mayer 2021), and implications for banking and financial stability (Brunnermeier and Niepelt 2019; Niepelt 2020; Fernández-Villaverde et al. 2021; Agur, Ari, and Dell'Ariccia 2022; Andolfatto 2021; Chiu et al. 2019; Keister and Sanches 2021; Benigno 2019; Skeie 2019; Ramadiah, Galbiati, and Soramäki 2021; Hemingway 2022; Kim and Kwon 2022). While CBDCs present obvious advantages – improving cross-border payments, and facilitating fiscal transfers – there are still many unresolved issues in their design. For example, do CBDCs increase welfare of the unbanked through financial inclusion? Do CBDCs attenuate or amplify monetary policy transmission channels? Should the interest rate on the CBDC be adjustable or fixed? Are there implications for redistribution through taxes and subsidies on CBDC?

In answering these questions, our paper focuses on CBDC design and in particular the financial inclusion effects of introducing a digital currency.<sup>1</sup> The paper is divided into two parts. In the first part, we start with a simple two agent endowment economy with a representative banked household (BHH) and unbanked household (UHH). The unbanked use money while the banked have access to deposits.<sup>2</sup> We introduce a digital currency that can be used by the UHH as an alternative to cash. The central bank can pay an interest rate on this retail CBDC. The primary benefit of this digital currency is that it is a more effective savings vehicle as it relaxes the cash-in-advance (CIA) constraint of the UHH. Welfare for both sets of households improve with a retail CBDC.

In the next part of the paper, we then extend the model to include production and endogenous labor supply, monopolistic pricing of firms, a financial intermediary

<sup>1.</sup> For more detail on the taxonomy of CBDC designs we refer readers to Auer and Böhme (2020). They discuss many aspects of CBDC design, such as whether the CBDC uses a distributed ledger technology (DLT), is account or token based or wholesale or retail. In this paper we focus solely on retail CBDCs.

<sup>2.</sup> The BHH and UHH can be thought of as Ricardian and non-Ricardian households, respectively, as is typical in the two-agent New Keynesian literature. See, for example, Debortoli and Galí (2017).

that lends to firms that use capital in production, and monetary policy set by a central bank. This New Keynesian setup allows us to evaluate optimal monetary policy rules and the role financial intermediaries play in the transmission effects of a CBDC. Using this model, we simulate the economy with respect to productivity shocks, cost-push inflationary shocks, and monetary policy shocks.

First, we address the question on whether a CBDC attenuates or amplifies the transmission of monetary policy. Our results suggest that monetary policy transmission is stronger upon introducing a CBDC, and amplifies the economy with respect to fundamental shocks to productivity. The intuition is straightforward: monetary policy has an additional lever in a CBDC economy as the central bank sets the rate on digital currency deposits, which tracks the policy rate in our specification. The UHH is therefore more sensitive to changes in the policy rate. This translates to more sensitive changes of bank net worth and leverage to monetary policy, amplifying the response of capital and production through bank balance sheets via a financial accelerator mechanism (Bernanke, Gertler, and Gilchrist 1999; Kiyotaki and Moore 1997, 2019).

Second, we use our model to evaluate the welfare effects of the introduction of the CBDC relative to an economy with no digital currency. Similar to our endowment economy, we show distributional effects on welfare, with gains of CBDC adoption concentrated for the unbanked share of the population. In contrast, banked house-holds benefit less from the introduction of a CBDC due to digital currency being an imperfect substitute for commercial bank deposits. A welfare analysis shows that the greatest use case for CBDCs therefore lies in an economy with low levels of financial inclusion.

A final research question we answer is on elements of CBDC design and macroprudential policy. We conduct a Ramsey policy exercise to evaluate the path of monetary policy that maximizes welfare of households. The policy instruments include both the central bank rate on household deposits and the digital currency deposits rate. The social planner maximizes a weighted average of banked and unbanked household utility subject to the two policy instruments. This is a nonparametric estimation of interest rates that deviates from more traditional methods of interest-rate setting such as the Taylor rule.

Our framework allows us to test alternative regimes for the CBDC monetary policy implementation, such as whether the CBDC rate should be adjustable or fixed. The optimal policy results show that when CBDC deposits are a near substitute to regular deposits, it is optimal for the CBDC rate to track movements in the deposit rate. Welfare results show that a fixed rate in fact leads to net welfare losses in aggregate relative to the economy with no digital currency.

We also show how CBDC rates that are a spread above or below deposit rates have distributional implications on welfare. Our welfare results show that unbanked households are better off when CBDC rates are higher than the deposit rate. Explaining these findings, we note that the unbanked benefit through the savings channel, where digital currency deposits receive a higher rate of interest. Alternatively, banked households are worse off when CBDC rates are high because the banker faces adjustment costs in holding a larger amount of CBDC, with a negative impact on bank equity.

Turning to macroprudential policy, we explore the distributive implications of introducing taxes on household digital currency deposits. A tax-neutral policy raises revenue from banked households and subsidize unbanked households. We show that these transfers increase aggregate welfare. The intuition is straightforward: the marginal welfare gains of subsidising CBDC deposits for the UHH exceeds the marginal welfare cost of taxing CBDC deposits for the BHH.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 1.1 we summarize the contributions of our paper to the related literature. In Section 2 we outline the baseline endowment economy to clarify our intuition, and examine the welfare implications of introducing a CBDC. In Section 3 we introduce a two-agent New Keynesian (TANK) model with a banking sector. Using this model we examine welfare implications of introducing the CBDCs, including optimal policy exercises for when a social planner can set interest rates on both fiat and digital currencies. Section 4 considers CBDC design and macroprudential policy. Section 5 concludes the paper.

# 1.1 Related Literature

Our work relates to an emerging literature on CBDCs. The first strand of literature is on the implications for financial stability (Brunnermeier and Niepelt 2019; Niepelt 2020; Fernández-Villaverde et al. 2021; Agur, Ari, and Dell'Ariccia 2022; Andolfatto 2021; Chiu et al. 2019; Keister and Sanches 2021; Benigno 2019; Skeie 2019; Ramadiah, Galbiati, and Soramäki 2021; Hemingway 2022; Kim and Kwon 2022). Financial stability considerations include studying the competition between bank deposits and CBDCs. For example, Keister and Sanches (2021) determine conditions in which the private sector is dis-intermediated with CBDC leading to welfare losses. Chiu et al. (2019) study the role of CBDCs when banks have market power, and show the introduction of CBDCs can lead to increased competition among banks, an increase in deposit rates and lending raising welfare. In contrast to these papers, our study focuses on the benefits of CBDCs in a two-agent framework. By studying households that do not have access to a financial asset, we focus on the financial inclusion benefits of a retail CBDC. The novelty of our framework in this literature is to include an additional set of households (the unbanked) that do not have access to domestic banking channels. Critically, the unbanked only have access to digital currency as a medium of exchange and savings vehicle. Within this literature we are the first paper to evaluate the welfare benefits of retail CBDC designs.

Turning to the macroeconomic effects, there is an emerging literature that deals with the closed economy (Barrdear and Kumhof 2022; Assenmacher, Bitter, and Ristiniemi 2022; Burlon et al. 2022) and open economy implications (George, Xie, and Alba 2020; Ikeda 2020; Benigno, Schilling, and Uhlig 2022; Kumhof et al. 2021; Cong and Mayer 2021). Closed economy considerations include a discussion of optimal monetary policy Burlon et al. (2022), the use of CBDC in a monetarist framework Assenmacher, Bitter, and Ristiniemi (2022), and the introduction of CBDC on output and the ability to stabilize business cycle fluctuations Barrdear and Kumhof (2022). Open economy considerations include Benigno, Schilling, and Uhlig (2022) which derives an equilibrium result of synchronization of interest rates across the two countries in which users are indifferent between holding the global cryptocurrency and the domestic currency. Ferrari Minesso, Mehl, and Stracca (2022) use a two country framework and find productivity spillovers are amplified in the presence of a CBDC. Within this literature, we contribute mainly to an understanding of optimal monetary policy transmission. Crucially, we find that monetary policy transmission is strengthened with the introduction of CBDC. By providing a savings vehicle to the unbanked, they are able to smooth consumption. However, this makes unbanked households more sensitive to the policy rate. Second, we show that when CBDC and bank deposits are near substitutes it is optimal for CBDC rates to track the policy rate. Third, our two agent framework allows us to consider redistributive taxes to increase welfare. To increase the financial inclusion effects of a CBDC, taxing banked household use of CBDC and subsidizing the CBDC of unbanked households can increase welfare.

# 2 Two-Agent Endowment Economy Model with Central Bank Digital Currency

Below we introduce a simple two-agent endowment economy featuring CBDCs. The model is comprised of two types of households: the banked and the unbanked, denoted with j = h and j = u, respectively. The population is normalized to unity, with the two types of households occupying the continuum [0, 1]. The BHH is proportion  $\Gamma_h$  of the population. The banked have access to a one-period risk-free savings asset,  $D_t$ , which pay a gross nominal rate of interest,  $R_t$ , and are in zero net supply. Conversely, the unbanked, of proportion  $\Gamma_u = 1 - \Gamma_h$ , do not have access to the risk-free savings asset.

However, our endowment economy features an additional asset,  $DC_t$ , which represents a CBDC or digital currency, and it is accessible and traded by both types of agents. In this simple setup,  $DC_t$  is in zero net supply, and, importantly, holdings of it earn a nominal return of  $R_t^{DC}$ .

The infinite horizon problem for the representative BHH is:

$$\mathbb{V}_{t}^{h} = \max_{\{C_{t+s}^{h}, D_{t+s}, DC_{t+s}^{h}\}_{s=0}^{\infty}} \mathbb{E}_{t} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \beta^{s} u(C_{t+s}^{h}),$$

subject to the period budget constraint (in real terms):

$$C_t^h + D_t + DC_t^h + \chi_t^{DC} = T_t^h + \frac{R_{t-1}D_{t-1} + R_{t-1}^{DC}DC_{t-1}^h}{\pi_t},$$

where  $C_t^j$ , is consumption,  $T_t^j$  are lump sum transfers, and  $\pi_t$  is gross inflation,<sup>3</sup> and  $DC_t^j$  are digital currency balances held by households of type j. In our setup,  $\chi_t^{DC,j}$  represents a cost of converting digital currencies for excess borrowing and lending, the extent of which is governed by cost parameter  $\varkappa^{DC}$ :<sup>4</sup>

$$\chi_t^{DC,j} = \frac{\varkappa^{DC}}{2} \left( DC_t^j \right)^2. \tag{1}$$

The analogous problem for the representative UHH is:

$$\mathbb{V}_{t}^{u} = \max_{\{C_{t+s}^{u}, DC_{t+s}^{u}\}_{s=0}^{\infty}} \mathbb{E}_{t} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \beta^{s} u(C_{t+s}^{u}),$$

<sup>3.</sup> Gross inflation,  $\pi_t$ , is defined as  $\pi_t = P_t/P_{t-1}$ , where  $P_t$  is the price level.

<sup>4.</sup> We note that as  $\varkappa^{DC} \to 0$ , the digital currency *DC* becomes a perfect substitute for the risk-free savings asset *D*; and so the quantities of digital currency are indeterminate in equilibrium.

subject to their budget constraint,

$$C_t^u + M_t + DC_t^u + \chi_t^{DC,u} + \chi_t^M = T_t^u + \frac{M_{t-1} + R_{t-1}^{DC}DC_{t-1}^u}{\pi_t},$$

and the cash-in-advance (CIA) constraint,

$$\alpha_M C_t^u \le \frac{M_{t-1}}{\pi_t},\tag{2}$$

where  $\chi_t^M$  are money adjustment costs of the form:

$$\chi_t^M = \frac{\phi_M}{2} (M_t - \bar{M})^2.$$
(3)

The CIA constraint features parameter  $\alpha_M \in (0, 1)$  which implies that even with digital currencies, the UHH must settle a certain fraction of their consumption purchasing decisions via real money holdings.

We also define  $\omega_t$  as being an inequality measure, defined as:

$$\omega_t = 1 - \frac{C_t^u}{C_t^h},\tag{4}$$

with higher (lower) values of  $\omega_t$  showing an increase (decrease) in consumption inequality between the BHH and UHH in period t.

We assume that there exists a monetary authority which oversees real money balances. We assume the following law of motion for real money balances:

$$M_t = \frac{M_{t-1}}{\pi_t}.$$
(5)

Additionally, since  $DC_t$  is in zero net supply, we have the following aggregate condition:

$$DC_t^u = -\frac{\Gamma_h}{\Gamma_u} DC_t^h.$$

Finally, endowments are set exogenously and follow a stationary AR(1) process:

$$\ln T_t^i = \rho_T \ln T_{t-1}^j + \varepsilon_t^T,$$

where  $\varepsilon_t^T$  is an exogenous disturbance to both endowments with variance  $\sigma_T^2$ .

For a full set of equilibrium conditions for the economy economy both with and without CBDCs, please refer to Appendix A.1. We also show model impulse response functions (IRFs) to orthogonal shocks in Appendix A.1.5. Additionally, for a description of the parameterization used in our analyses, please refer to Table 2 in Section 3.6.

## 2.1 Welfare Benefits of Financial Inclusion

To analyse the benefits of financial inclusion through the provision of CBDCs, we compare the ergodic mean<sup>5</sup> of welfare for the BHH, UHH, and a synthetic aggregate household:<sup>6</sup>

$$\mathbb{W}^{j} = F\left(\operatorname{Var}(C^{j})\right), \quad j = \{h, u\}, \tag{6a}$$

$$\mathbb{W}^{agg} = \Gamma_h \mathbb{W}^h + \Gamma_u \mathbb{W}^u. \tag{6b}$$

### 2.1.1 CBDC Autarky

Figure 1 plots the ratio of welfare of the representative BHH to the UHH as a function of the variance of the endowment shock process in an economy with no CBDC. We show that as the variance of the endowment shock increases, the relative welfare of the banked increases. This supports our hypothesis of financial inclusion. As banked households have an efficient savings vehicle to smooth consumption, their relative welfare increases when there are larger shocks to income. They are able to smooth consumption through the intertemporal consumption Euler equation. On the other hand, the unbanked can only smooth consumption through money holdings, and are impaired in their ability to smooth idiosyncratic shocks due to the presence of the CIA constraint. Based on our calibration, when the volatility of the endowment process is set to 1% (quarterly), the BHH sees an almost 30% welfare gain over the UHH; when volatility is set to 10% (quarterly), the BHH sees an over 80% welfare gain over the UHH.

<sup>5.</sup> To clarify, we take a second-order approximation about the deterministic steady state, subject the economy to our specified shocks, and then simulate the model for 2,000 periods to obtain the mean value of the variables of interest.

<sup>6.</sup> We adjust the population proportion of the representative BHH and UHH when constructing aggregate variables.



Figure 1: Banked to unbanked relative welfare for a no-CBDC economy (% ch.)

Note: Figure plots the ratio of the ergodic mean of welfare for the representative BHH and UHH, for increasing variance in the endowment shock process. The proportion of banked and unbanked households are set to a baseline value of  $\Gamma_h = \Gamma_u = 0.5$ .

### 2.1.2 CBDC Introduction

We highlight the importance of financial inclusion through the introduction of CBDC to both the BHH and UHH. In Figure 2a we plot the relative welfare gains for each representative household for the baseline endowment economy with CBDC over the endowment economy without CBDC. Our analysis shows that the welfare gains for the UHH are significant and scale with the volatility of the endowment process. For example, when the quarterly endowment volatility is 1%, the gains to the BHH are 0.19%, and the gains to UHH are 22.4%. When the endowment volatility increases to 10%, the relative welfare gain for the UHH increases to approximately 60%. In contrast, the welfare gains for the BHH are 8% as deposits are the first-best risk-free asset.

We now conduct the same welfare analysis with respect to the share of the banked population, keeping the volatility of the endowment shock fixed. In Figure 2b, we plot the relative welfare gains for each representative household against the share of the banked population. In line with our previous results, aggregate welfare effects of the CBDC is decreasing in the share of BHH. When the share of BHH is 1, there are no gains from financial inclusion, and the relative welfare gains of introducing a CBDC are zero. In contrast, the relative gains of the CBDC economy approach 60% when the share of BHH is 0.1. Taken together, our findings suggest that the welfare benefits of CBDCs are higher in economies with lower degrees of financial inclusion and a higher share of the unbanked.



Figure 2: Welfare improvement decomposition

Note: Figure 2a plots the relative welfare gains of an economy with CBDC compared to an economy without CBDC for the representative BHH, UHH, and aggregate household for increasing variance in the endowment shock process. The proportion of banked and unbanked households are set to a baseline value of  $\Gamma_h = \Gamma_u = 0.5$ . Figure 2b plots the relative welfare gains of an economy with CBDC compared to an economy without CBDC for the representative BHH, UHH, and aggregate household for increasing proportion of the banked population while keeping  $\sigma_T = 0.1$  fixed.

# 3 Two-Agent New Keynesian Model with Central Bank Digital Currency

In this section, we extend the model presented in Section 2 in two ways: i) the introduction of a banking sector accompanied with credit frictions; and ii) a supply side of the economy with price stickiness and monopolistic competition (Christiano, Eichenbaum, and Evans 2005; Smets and Wouters 2007; Galí 2015) to build a two-agent New Keynesian (TANK) model as in Bilbiie (2018), Bilbiie and Ragot (2021), and Debortoli and Galí (2017, 2022).

We adopt the setup of Gertler and Karadi (2011), introducing a third type of agent – bankers – which allows us to maintain a representative setup of the household sector. In this setup, banked households hold claims on deposits – denominated in both fiat currency and digital currency – which are held at banks, and they may also directly invest in firms by purchasing equity holdings. Unbanked households are still limited to money holdings and digital currencies; the latter of which are also deposited into the banking sector. Banks then convert deposits into credit, facilitating loans to firms who acquire capital for the means of production, as in Gertler and Kiyotaki (2010, 2015).

### 3.1 Production

The supply side of the economy is simple. Final goods are produced by perfectly competitive firms that use labor and capital to produce their output. They also have access to bank loans, and conditional on being able to take out loan, they do not face any financial frictions. These firms pay back the crediting banks in full via profits. Meanwhile, capital goods are produced by perfectly competitive firms, which are owned by the collective household.

### 3.1.1 Final Good Firms

There is a representative competitive final good producing firm which aggregates a continuum of differentiated intermediate inputs according to a Dixit-Stiglitz aggregator:

$$Y_t = \left(\int_0^1 Y_t(i)^{\frac{\epsilon-1}{\epsilon}} di\right)^{\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon-1}}, \epsilon > 0.$$
(7)

So final good firms maximize their profits by selecting how much of each intermediate good to purchase, and so their problem is:

$$\max_{Y_t(i)} P_t Y_t - \int_0^1 P_t Y_t(i) di$$

Solving for the FOC for a typical intermediate good i is:

$$Y_t(i) = \left(\frac{P_t(i)}{P_t}\right)^{-\epsilon} Y_t.$$
(8)

The relative demand for intermediate good i is dependent of i's relative price with  $\epsilon$ , the price elasticity of demand, and is proportional to aggregate output,  $Y_t$ .

From Blanchard and Kiyotaki (1987), we can derive a price index for the aggregate economy:

$$P_t Y_t \equiv \int_0^1 P_t(i) Y_t(i) di.$$

Then, plugging in the demand for good i from (8) we have:

$$P_t = \left(\int_0^1 P_t(i)^{1-\epsilon} di\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}}.$$

### 3.1.2 Capital Good Firms

We assume that capital goods are produced by perfectly competitive firms, and that the aggregate capital stock grows according to the following law of motion:

$$K_t = I_t + (1 - \delta) K_{t-1},$$
(9)

where  $I_t$  is investment and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  is the depreciation rate.

The objective of the capital good producing firm is to choose  $I_t$  to maximize revenue,  $Q_t I_t$ . Thus, the representative capital good producing firm's objective function is:

$$\max_{I_t} Q_t I_t - I_t - \Phi\left(\frac{I_t}{\overline{I}}\right) I_t,$$

where  $\Phi(\cdot)$  are investment adjustment costs as in Christiano, Eichenbaum, and Evans (2005), and are defined as:

$$\Phi\left(\frac{I_t}{\bar{I}}\right) = \frac{\kappa_I}{2} \left(\frac{I_t}{\bar{I}} - 1\right)^2,$$

with  $\Phi(1) = \Phi'(1) = 0$  and  $\Phi''(\cdot) > 0$ . The investment adjustment cost parameter,

 $\kappa_I = \Phi''(1)$  is chosen so that the price elasticity of investment is consistent with instrumental variable estimates in Eberly (1997).

Differentiating the objective function with respect to  $I_t$  gives the FOC:

$$Q_t = 1 + \Phi\left(\frac{I_t}{\bar{I}}\right) + \left(\frac{I_t}{\bar{I}}\right) \Phi'\left(\frac{I_t}{\bar{I}}\right).$$
(10)

### 3.1.3 Intermediate Goods Producers

The continuum of intermediate good producers are normalized to have a mass of unity. A typical intermediate firm i produces output according to a constant returns to scale technology in capital and labor with a common productivity shock:

$$Y_t(i) = A_t K_{t-1}(i)^{\alpha} L_t(i)^{1-\alpha}.$$

The problem for the *i*-th firm is to minimize costs,

$$\min_{K_{t-1}(i), L_t(i)} z_t^k K_{t-1}(i) + w_t L_t(i),$$

subject to their production constraint:

$$A_t K_{t-1}(i)^{\alpha} L_t(i)^{1-\alpha} \ge Y_t(i) = \left(\frac{P_t(i)}{P_t}\right)^{-\epsilon} Y_t.$$

This yields the minimized unit cost of production:

$$MC_t = \frac{1}{A_t} \left(\frac{z_t^k}{\alpha}\right)^{\alpha} \left(\frac{w_t}{1-\alpha}\right)^{1-\alpha}.$$
 (11)

The price-setting problem of firm i is set up à la Rotemberg (1982) where firm i maximizes the net present value of profits,

$$\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\Lambda_{t,t+s}^{h}\left\{\left(\frac{P_{t+s}(i)}{P_{t+s}}(1-\tau)-MC_{t+s}\right)Y_{t+s}(i)-\frac{\kappa}{2}\left(\frac{P_{t+s}(i)}{P_{t-1+s}(i)}-1\right)^{2}Y_{t+s}\right\}\right],$$

by optimally choosing  $P_t(i)$ , and where  $\kappa$  denotes a price adjustment cost parameter for the firms.<sup>7</sup> Differentiating the above expression with respect to  $P_t(i)$  yields the

$$\kappa = \frac{\epsilon\theta}{(1-\theta)(1-\beta\theta)},$$

<sup>7.</sup> We calibrate  $\kappa$  to the following:

where  $\theta$  is the probability of firm *i* being unable to optimally adjust its price in any given period as in a model with Calvo (1983) pricing. For further details please refer to Appendix A.2.1.

following FOC:

$$\begin{split} \kappa \left(\frac{P_t(i)}{P_{t-1}(i)} - 1\right) \frac{Y_t}{P_{t-1}(i)} &= \frac{1 - \tau}{P_t} \left(\frac{P_t(i)}{P_t}\right)^{-\epsilon} Y_t \\ &+ \kappa \mathbb{E}_t \left[\Lambda_{t,t+1}^h \left(\frac{P_{t+1}(i)}{P_t(i)} - 1\right) \frac{P_{t+1}(i)}{P_t(i)^2} Y_{t+1}\right] \\ &- \epsilon \left(\frac{P_t(i)}{P_t} (1 - \tau) - MC_t\right) \left(\frac{P_t(i)}{P_t}\right)^{-\epsilon - 1} \frac{Y_t}{P_t}. \end{split}$$

Evaluating at the symmetric equilibrium where intermediate firms optimally price their output at  $P_t(i) = P_t, \forall i$ , allows us to write:

$$\pi_t(\pi_t - 1) = \frac{1}{\kappa} \left[ \epsilon M C_t + 1 - \epsilon + \tau \epsilon - \tau \right] + \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Lambda^h_{t,t+1}(\pi_{t+1} - 1) \pi_{t+1} \frac{Y_{t+1}}{Y_t} \right] + \xi^\pi_t,$$
(12)

where  $\xi_t^{\pi}$  is a cost-push shock that follows a stationary AR(1) process (in logarithms).

Also, under the symmetric equilibrium we can express output as:

$$Y_t = A_t K_{t-1}^{\alpha} L_t^{1-\alpha}, \tag{13}$$

where it follows that:

$$K_{t-1} = \int_0^1 K_{t-1}(i)di, \quad L_t = \int_0^1 L_t(i)di.$$

As noted above, there is a distortion arising from monopolistic competition among intermediate firms. We assume that there is a lump-sum subsidy to offset this distortion,  $\tau$ . From Equation (12), we see that the policymaker chooses a subsidy such that the markup over marginal cost is offset:<sup>8</sup>

$$\tau = -\frac{1}{\epsilon - 1}$$

which guarantees a non-distorted steady-state. Hereinafter, we abstract from distorted steady states and only consider the efficient steady state. Our choice to model nominal rigidity following Rotemberg pricing should not alter our welfare analysis in Section 3.7. As noted by Nisticò (2007) and Ascari and Rossi (2012), up to a second order approximation and provided that the steady state is efficient, models under both Calvo and Rotemberg pricing imply the same welfare costs of inflation.

<sup>8.</sup> Note that this assumes that steady state inflation is net-zero, i.e.,  $\bar{\pi} = 1$ .

Therefore, a welfare-maximizing social planner would prescribe the same optimal policy across the two regimes.

## **3.2** Households and Workers

The representative household now contains a continuum of individuals, normalized to 1, each of which are of type  $i \in \{b, h, u\}$ . The setup follows Murakami and Viswanath-Natraj (2021). Bankers (i = b) and BHH workers share a perfect insurance scheme, such that they each consume the same amount of real output. However, UHH workers are not part of this insurance scheme, and so their consumption volumes are different from bankers and workers. Similar to before in Section 2, we define  $\Gamma_h$  as the proportion of the BHH and bankers, and the UHH are of proportion  $\Gamma_u = 1 - \Gamma_h$ .

We endogenize labor supply decisions on the part of households, and so the BHH maximize the present value discounted sum of utility:<sup>9</sup>

$$\mathbb{V}_{t}^{h} = \max_{\{C_{t+s}^{h}, L_{t+s}^{h}, D_{t+s}, K_{t+s}^{h}, DC_{t+s}^{h}\}_{s=0}^{\infty}} \mathbb{E}_{t} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \beta^{s} \ln \left( C_{t+s}^{h} - \zeta_{0}^{h} \frac{(L_{t+s}^{h})^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta} \right),$$
(14)

subject to their period budget constraint:

$$C_t^h + D_t + Q_t K_t^h + \chi_t^h + DC_t^h + \chi_t^{DC,h} + T_t^h = w_t L_t^h + \Pi_t + (z_t^k + (1-\delta)Q_t)K_{t-1}^h + \frac{R_{t-1}D_{t-1} + R_{t-1}^{DC}DC_{t-1}^h}{\pi_t},$$
(15)

where  $w_t$  are real wages,  $L_t^j, j \in \{h, u\}$ , is labor supply,  $\zeta$  is the inverse-Frisch elasticity of labor supply,  $\zeta_0^j$  is a relative labor supply parameter,  $K_t^h$  are equity holdings in firms by the BHH,  $\chi_t^h$  are the costs of equity acquisitions incurred by the BHH,  $T_t^j$  are now lump-sum taxes,  $Q_t$  is the price of equity/capital, and  $\Pi_t$  are distribution of profits due to the ownership of banks and firms. We also note that  $\Lambda_{t,p}^h$  is the BHH stochastic discount factor (SDF):

$$\Lambda^{h}_{t,p} \equiv \beta^{p-t} \mathbb{E}_{t} \left( \frac{\lambda^{h}_{p}}{\lambda^{h}_{t}} \right), \qquad (16)$$

where  $\lambda_t^h$  is the marginal utility of consumption for the BHH.

One distinction between the BHH and bankers purchasing equity in firms is the

<sup>9.</sup> We make use of Greenwood–Hercowitz–Huffman preferences for both the BHH and UHH to eliminate the income effect on an agent's labor supply decision. Additionally, it allows us to develop a tractable analytical solution for the model steady state

assumption that the BHH pays an efficiency cost when it adjusts its equity holdings. We assume the following functional form for  $\chi_t^h$ :

$$\chi_t^h = \frac{\varkappa^h}{2} \left(\frac{K_t^h}{K_t}\right)^2 \Gamma_h K_t.$$
(17)

Meanwhile, the UHH maximizes the present discounted sum of per-period utilities given by:

$$\mathbb{V}_{t}^{u} = \max_{\{C_{t+s}^{u}, L_{t+s}^{u}, M_{t+s}, DC_{t+s}^{u}\}_{s=0}^{\infty}} \mathbb{E}_{t} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \beta^{s} \ln \left( C_{t}^{u} - \zeta_{0}^{u} \frac{(L_{t}^{u})^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta} \right),$$
(18)

subject to its budget constraint,

$$C_t^u + M_t + \chi_t^M + DC_t^u + \chi_t^{DC,u} + T_t^u = w_t L_t^u + \frac{M_{t-1} + R_{t-1}^{DC} DC_{t-1}^u}{\pi_t},$$
(19)

and the CIA constraint, (2).

# 3.3 Bankers and the Finance Sector

Among the population of bankers, each *j*-th banker owns and operates her own bank. The bankers are indexed on a continuum of measure one. A banker will facilitate financial services between households and firms by providing loans to firms in the form of equity,  $k_t^b$ , funded by domestic deposits,  $d_t$ , and digital currencies deposits,  $dc_t$ , and her own net worth,  $n_t$ . However, financial frictions may limit the ability of the banker to raise deposits from households.

To this end, each banker seeks to accumulate retained earnings to funds their investments. To maintain model tractability, in each period, bankers have a fixed probability of moving in and out of the financial sector. Let  $\sigma_b$  denote the probability that a banker remains as a banker in the following period, with complementary probability  $1 - \sigma_b$  that she retires. This implies an expected franchise life of an individual bank of  $\frac{1}{1-\sigma_b}$ . Furthermore, the number of bankers exiting the financial market is matched by the number of new bankers entering.

New bankers start up their franchise with fraction  $\gamma_b$  of total assets of the banked households. Upon retirement, a banker will exit with her net worth, bringing the balance back to the household in the form of a dividend. Therefore, a banker will seek to maximize her franchise value,  $\mathbb{V}_t^b$ , which is the expected present discount value of future dividends:

$$\mathbb{V}_t^b = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{s=1}^\infty \Lambda_{t,t+s}^h \sigma_b^{s-1} (1 - \sigma_b) n_{t+s} \right],$$
(20)

where  $n_{t+s}$  is the net worth of the bank when the banker retires at date t + s with probability  $\sigma_b^{s-1}(1 - \sigma_b)$ . Note that we make the simplifying assumption that each individual banker exogenoubly accepts digital currency deposits,  $dc_t$ , directly in proportion to the population of bankers and total digital currency holdings. In other words, in aggregate, the total sum of individual digital currency deposits at each *j*-th bank,  $dc_t(j)$ , is equal to aggregate digital currency deposits,  $DC_t$ :

$$\int_0^1 dc_t(j) \, dj = DC_t$$

Thus, a banker will choose quantities  $k_t^b$  and  $d_t$  to maximize expression (20). We assume that managing the sources of funding is costly in terms of resources, and so the banker pays the following the management cost:

$$\chi_t^b = \frac{\varkappa^b}{2} x_t^2 Q_t k_t^b, \tag{21}$$

where we define  $\varkappa^b > 0$  is a parameter and  $x_t$  is a banker's digital currency deposit leverage ratio:

$$x_t = \frac{dc_t}{Q_t k_t^b}.$$
(22)

A financial friction in line with Gertler and Kiyotaki (2010) is used to limit the banker's ability to raise funds, whereby the banker faces a moral hazard problem: the banker can either abscond with the funds she has raised from depositors, or the banker can operate honestly and pay out her obligations. Absconding is costly, however, and so the banker can only divert a fraction  $\theta^b > 0$  of assets she has accumulated.

The caveat to absconding, in addition to only being able to take a fraction of assets away, is that it takes time – i.e. it take a full period for the banker to abscond. Thus, the banker must decide to abscond in period t, in addition to announcing what value of  $d_t$  she will choose, prior to realising next period's rental rate of capital. If a banker chooses to abscond in period t, its creditors will force the bank to shut down in period t + 1, causing the banker's franchise value to become zero.

Therefore, the banker will choose to abscond in period t if and only if the return to absconding is greater than the franchise value of the bank at the end of period t,  $\mathbb{V}_t^b$ . It is assumed that the depositors act rationally, and that no rational depositor will supply funds to the bank if she clearly has an incentive to abscond. In other words, the bankers face the following incentive constraint:

$$\mathbb{V}_t^b \ge \theta^b Q_t k_t^b,\tag{23}$$

where we assume that the banker will not abscond in the case of the constraint holding with equality.

#### 3.3.1 Bank Balance Sheet

Table 1 represents the balance sheet of a typical banker, and so we can write the following balance sheet constraint that the banker faces:

$$Q_t k_t^b + \chi_t^b = d_t + dc_t + n_t.$$
(24)

Table 1: Bank balance sheet

Assets	Liabilities + Equity		
Loans $Q_t k_t^b$	Deposits $d_t$		
Management costs $\chi_t^b$	Digital currency deposits $dc_t$		
	Net worth $n_t$		

Additionally, we can write the flow of funds constraint for a banker as

$$n_t = [z_t^k + (1 - \delta)Q_t]k_{t-1}^b - \frac{R_{t-1}}{\pi_t}d_{t-1} - \frac{R_{t-1}^{DC}}{\pi_t}d_{t-1}, \qquad (25)$$

noting that for the case of a new banker, the net worth is the startup fund given by the household:

$$n_t = \gamma_b [z_t^k + (1 - \delta)Q_t] k_{t-1}.$$

### 3.3.2 Rewriting the Banker's Problem

With the constraints of the banker established, we can proceed to write the banker's problem as:

$$\max_{k_t, d_t} \mathbb{V}_t^b = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Lambda_{t, t+1}^h \left\{ (1 - \sigma_b) n_{t+1} + \sigma_b \mathbb{V}_{t+1}^b \right\} \right],$$

subject to the incentive constraint (23) and the balance sheet constraint (24).

Since  $\mathbb{V}_t^b$  is the franchise value of the bank, which we can interpret as a "market value", we can divide  $\mathbb{V}_t^b$  by the bank's net worth to obtain a Tobin's Q ratio for the

bank denoted by  $\psi_t$ :

$$\psi_t \equiv \frac{\mathbb{V}_t^b}{n_t} = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Lambda_{t,t+1}^h (1 - \sigma_b + \sigma_b \psi_{t+1}) \frac{n_{t+1}}{n_t} \right].$$
(26)

We define  $\phi_t$  as the maximum feasible asset to net worth ratio, or, rather, the leverage ratio of a bank:

$$\phi_t = \frac{Q_t k_t^b}{n_t}.\tag{27}$$

Additionally, if we define  $\Omega_{t,t+1}$  as the stochastic discount factor of the banker,  $\mu_t$  as the excess return on capital over fiat currency deposits,  $\mu_t^{DC}$  as the cost advantage of digital currency deposits over fiat currency deposits, and  $v_t$  as the marginal cost of deposits, we can write the banker's problem as the following:

$$\psi_t = \max_{\phi_t} \left\{ \mu_t \phi_t + \mu_t^{DC} x_t \phi_t + \left( 1 - \frac{\varkappa^b}{2} x_t^2 \phi_t \right) v_t \right\},\tag{28}$$

subject to

 $\psi_t \ge \theta^b \phi_t.$ 

Solving this problem yields:

$$\psi_t = \theta^b \phi_t,\tag{29}$$

$$\phi_t = \frac{\upsilon_t}{\theta^b - \mu_t - \mu_t^{DC} x_t + \frac{\varkappa^b}{2} x_t^2 \upsilon_t},\tag{30}$$

where:

$$\mu_t = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Omega_{t,t+1} \left\{ \frac{z_{t+1}^k + (1-\delta)Q_{t+1}}{Q_t} - \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} \right\} \right],\tag{31}$$

$$\mu_t^{DC} = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Omega_{t,t+1} \left\{ \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} - \frac{R_t^{DC}}{\pi_{t+1}} \right\} \right], \tag{32}$$

$$v_t = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Omega_{t,t+1} \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} \right], \tag{33}$$

$$\Omega_{t,t+1} = \Lambda_{t,t+1}^{h} (1 - \sigma_b + \sigma_b \psi_{t+1}).$$
(34)

For the complete solution of the banker, please refer to Appendix A.2.3 and A.2.4.

## **3.4** Fiscal and Monetary Policy

We assume that the government operates a simple fiscal rule to cover the producer subsidy addressing the distortions arising from monopolistic competition:

$$-\tau Y_t = \Gamma_h T_t^h + \Gamma_u T_t^u. \tag{35}$$

Meanwhile, the central bank is assumed to operate an inertial Taylor Rule for the nominal interest rate:

$$\frac{R_t}{\bar{R}} = \left(\frac{R_{t-1}}{\bar{R}}\right)^{\rho_R} \left(\pi_t^{\phi_\pi} X_t^{\phi_Y}\right)^{1-\rho_R} \exp(\varepsilon_t^R)$$
(36)

where it reacts to inflation and the welfare relevant output gap,  $X_t$ , which we define as:

$$X_t = \frac{Y_t}{Y_t^f},$$

where  $Y_t^f$  is the flexible price level of output corresponding to when  $\kappa = 0$ , and where  $\varepsilon_t^R$  is an exogenous and transitory monetary policy shock.

Additionally, we assume that the central bank sets the nominal return on digital currency one-for-one in line with the nominal interest rate on deposits:

$$R_t^{DC} = R_t. aga{37}$$

We explore the implications of alternative rules on model dynamics and welfare in Sections 3.7 and 4.1.

# 3.5 Market Equilibrium

Aggregate consumption, labor supply, and digital currency holdings by the BHH and UHH are given as:

$$C_t = \Gamma_h C_t^h + \Gamma_u C_t^u, \tag{38}$$

$$L_t = \Gamma_h L_t^h + \Gamma_u L_t^u, \tag{39}$$

$$DC_t = \Gamma_h DC_t^h + \Gamma_u DC_t^u.$$
<sup>(40)</sup>

The aggregate resource constraint of the economy is:

$$Y_t = C_t + \left[1 + \Phi\left(\frac{I_t}{\bar{I}}\right)\right] I_t + \frac{\kappa}{2}(\pi_t - 1)^2 Y_t + \Gamma_h(\chi_t^h + \chi_t^b + \chi_t^{DC,h}) + \Gamma_u(\chi_t^M + \chi_t^{DC,u}),$$
(41)

with aggregate capital being given by:

$$K_t = \Gamma_h (K_t^h + K_t^b). \tag{42}$$

Aggregate net worth of the bank is given by:

$$N_{t} = \sigma_{b} \left[ (z_{t}^{k} + (1 - \delta)Q_{t})K_{t-1}^{b} - \frac{R_{t-1}}{\pi_{t}}D_{t-1} - \frac{R_{t-1}^{DC}}{\pi_{t}}\frac{DC_{t-1}}{\Gamma_{h}} \right] + \gamma_{b}(z_{t}^{k} + (1 - \delta)Q_{t})\frac{K_{t-1}}{\Gamma_{h}},$$
(43)

and the aggregate balance sheet of the bank is given by the following equations:

$$Q_t K_t^b = \phi_t N_t, \tag{44}$$

$$\left(1 + \frac{\varkappa^b}{2}x_t^2\right)Q_t K_t^b = D_t + \frac{DC_t}{\Gamma_h} + N_t,\tag{45}$$

$$x_t = \frac{DC_t}{Q_t \Gamma_h K_t^b}.$$
(46)

Finally, the stationary AR(1) processes for TFP and cost-push shocks (in logs) are given by:

$$A_t = \rho_A A_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t^A, \tag{47}$$

$$\xi_t^{\pi} = \rho_{\pi} \xi_{t-1}^{\pi} + \varepsilon_t^{\pi}, \tag{48}$$

A competitive equilibrium is a set of seven prices, {  $MC_t$ ,  $R_t$ ,  $R_t^{DC}$ ,  $\pi_t$ ,  $Q_t$ ,  $w_t$ ,  $z_t^k$  }, 19 quantity variables, {  $C_t$ ,  $C_t^h$ ,  $C_t^u$ ,  $D_t$ ,  $DC_t$ ,  $DC_t^h$ ,  $DC_t^u$ ,  $I_t$ ,  $K_t$ ,  $K_t^b$ ,  $K_t^h$ ,  $L_t$ ,  $L_t^h$ ,  $L_t^u$ ,  $M_t$ ,  $N_t$ ,  $T_t^h$ ,  $T_t^u$ ,  $Y_t$  }, six bank variables, {  $x_t$ ,  $\psi_t$ ,  $\phi_t$ ,  $\mu_t$ ,  $\mu_t^{DC}$ ,  $v_t$  }, and two exogenous variables, {  $A_t$ ,  $\xi_t^{\pi}$  }, that satisfies 34 equations. For a complete list of the equilibrium conditions please refer to Appendix A.2.5. Parameter values are provided in Table 2, and a brief description of our parameterization strategy is provided below in Section 3.6. Steady state solutions are provided in Appendix A.2.6 for the baseline TANK model, and numerical model steady state values can be found in Table 3.

### 3.6 Model Parameterization and Steady State Values

We set model parameters, which are found in standard New Keynesian models, in line with the literature. See, for example, Galí (2015), Walsh (2010), and Woodford (2003). Model parameters that are not standard, particularly the bank parameters, are set based on Aoki, Benigno, and Kiyotaki (2016). For example, a banker's survival rate,  $\sigma_b$ , is chosen so that the annual dividend payout is a share of  $4 \times (1 - \sigma_b) = 0.24$ of net worth. The banker absconding ratio,  $\theta^b$ ; the banker management cost of digital currencies,  $\varkappa^b$ ; and the fraction of total assets inherited by new bankers,  $\gamma^b$ , are chosen so that in steady state the bank leverage ratio is approximately 4 and that the share of equity financed by bank finance is approximately 0.70.

Finally, we set the parameters pertaining to monetary policy, namely the sensitivity of nominal interest rates to inflation,  $\phi_{\pi}$ , the sensitivity of nominal interest rates to the output gap,  $\phi_Y$ , and the interest rate smoothing parameter,  $\rho_R$ , in line with Guerrieri and Iacoviello (2015).

Parameter	Value	Description		
$ heta^b$	0.399	Banker absconding ratio		
$\sigma_b$	0.940	Survival probability		
$\gamma^b$	0.005	Fraction of total assets inherited by new banks		
$\varkappa^b$	0.022	Management cost for DC		
eta	0.990	Discount rate		
$\zeta$	0.333	Inverse-Frisch elasticity		
$\zeta_0^h$	3.050	labor supply capacity		
$\varkappa^h$	0.020	Cost parameter of direct finance		
$\Gamma_h$	0.500	Proportion of BHH		
$\gamma$	0.500	CIA weight on money		
$\phi_M$	0.010	Money adjustment cost parameter		
$arkappa^{DC}$	0.0005	Digital currency adjustment cost parameter		
$\alpha$	0.333	Capital share of output		
$\delta$	0.025	Depreciation rate		
$\epsilon$	9.000	Elasticity of demand		
$\kappa_I$	0.667	Investment adjustment cost		
heta	0.750	Calvo parameter		
au	-0.125	Producer subsidy		
${\cal M}$	1.125	Markup		
$\phi_{\pi}$	1.500	Taylor rule inflation coefficient		
$\phi_Y$	0.100	Taylor rule output coefficient		
$ ho_A$	0.850	AR(1) coefficient for TFP shock		

Table 2: Parameter values

Table 2 – Continued

Parameter	Value	Description	
$ ho_{\pi}$	0.850	AR(1) coefficient for cost-push shock	
$ ho_R$	0.550	Taylor rule persistence	

Table 3: Baseline TANK steady state values

Variable	Value	Description		
$\overline{MC}$	1	Real marginal cost		
$\bar{\pi}$	1	Gross inflation (annual)		
$ar{z}^k$	0.041	Return on capital (quarterly)		
$ar{w}$	1.901	Real wage		
$\bar{R}$	1.04	Gross nominal interest rate (annual)		
$ar{Q}$	1	Price of capital		
$\bar{R}^{DC}$	1.04	Gross nominal return on digital currency (annual)		
$\bar{Y}$	0.69	Output		
$\bar{L}$	0.243	Aggregate labor supply		
$\bar{C}$	0.545	Aggregate consumption		
$\bar{C}^h$	0.63	BHH consumption		
$\bar{C}^u$	0.46	UHH consumption		
$\bar{DC}$	0	Aggregate DC holdings		
$\bar{I}$	0.14	Investment		
$\bar{K}$	5.606	Capital		
$\bar{K}^h$	3.332	BHH equity holdings		
$ar{K}^b$	7.879	Bank equity		
$\bar{N}$	1.905	Bank net worth		
$\bar{D}$	5.974	Deposits		
$ar{M}$	0.23	UHH money balances		
$ar{\phi}$	4.137	Bank leverage ratio		
$\frac{\bar{K}}{\bar{Y}}$	8.127	Capital-output ratio		
$\frac{\bar{K}^b}{\bar{K}}$	0.703	Share of bank equity		

We assume the persistence of our exogenous AR(1) processes to be 0.85 per quarter. Standard deviations of shocks are set to be 1% per quarter, unless otherwise stated – for instance, innovations to the interest rate are 1% annualized. We assume no cross correlation of our shocks.

### 3.7 Model Dynamics and Welfare Comparisons

#### 3.7.1 Impulse Responses to a Monetary Policy shock

Figure 3 presents results in response to a 1% annualized monetary policy shock. We assume a standard Taylor rule, as set out in Equation (36), and assume that the CBDC rate to track the deposit rate. Monetary policy tightening causes a decline in inflation, asset prices and consumption. The increase in deposit rates leads to a decline in bank net worth, asset prices and bank equity. While this is offset by an increase in equity held by banked households, this results in a decline in consumption of the banked and unbanked households.

When a CBDC is introduced, the main differences are in the UHH consumption response. The UHH response is quantitatively significant and translates to stronger transmission to aggregate consumption and the output gap. Turning to the bank balance sheet, we find neutral effects, where a contractionary shock induces the UHH to hold more CBDC, and the deposit base to shrink as the bank's funding costs increase. Therefore net worth of the bank and capital are quantitatively similar to the no CBDC regime. In summary, monetary policy transmission to aggregate consumption, output, and pass-through to inflation is strengthened with the introduction of the CBDC. The IRFs to a fundamental TFP shock and cost-push shock are provided in Appendix A.2.7.



Figure 3: IRFs to a 1% annualized monetary policy shock

Note: Figure plots impulse responses of model variables with respect to a 1% annualized innovation to the Nominal Interest Rate. Time periods are measured in quarters, and responses are measured as a percent deviation from steady state except for Inflation ( $\pi$ ), Nominal Interest Rates (R) and Digital Currency Returns ( $R^{DC}$ ) which are expressed as annualized net rates.

### 3.7.2 Welfare Effects of Introducing a CBDC

Figure 4 evaluates welfare of introducing a CBDC with respect to TFP, cost-push, and monetary shocks. We find the UHH have lower levels of financial inclusion and have a stronger incentive to adopt a retail CBDC. As the CBDC offers a rate of remuneration, it is an effective savings vehicle for the unbanked and enables them to achieve welfare gains through consumption smoothing. The BHH achieves smaller net welfare benefits with a retail CBDC. There are two reasons for this. First, the BHH face some distortionary costs of holding a CBDC relative to bank deposits, and therefore do not gain directly from access to a CBDC as they already have an efficient savings vehicle. However, when the UHH hold CBDC, this scales the bank balance sheet, increasing net worth and bank equity. This explains why BHH have higher welfare relative to the economy with no CBDC when the banked population share is low. Turning to aggregate welfare, we observe net welfare benefits are highest when the economy is primarily unbanked.



Figure 4: Welfare comparison (% change over no-CBDC regime)

Note: Figure plots welfare for BHH, UHH and aggregate households as a function for the share of the banked population,  $\Gamma_h$ . The welfare is calculated as a per cent change from the regime with no digital currency.

# 4 CBDC Design: Monetary and Macroprudential Policies

## 4.1 Optimal Policy

We now explore the implications for optimal policy, assuming that a policymaker has access to two instruments in order to maximize welfare: nominal interest rates on deposits, R, and nominal interest rates on digital currency,  $R^{DC}$ . More formally,

let us state the problem for the welfare maximizing policymaker as:

$$\max_{\{R_{t+s}, R_{t+s}^{DC}\}_{s=0}^{\infty}} \mathbb{V}_t = \Gamma_h \mathbb{V}_t^h + \Gamma_u \mathbb{V}_t^u,$$
(49)

subject to the entire set of structural equations as set out in Sections 3.1-3.5.

As CBDC and deposits are imperfect substitutes, the instruments available to the policymaker are not collinear, allowing us to conduct the optimal policy exercise.<sup>10</sup>

The presence of unbanked households subject to a CIA constraint leads the policymaker to set a steady-state rate of inflation that is deflationary. This is a result well covered in, for example, Chari, Christiano, and Kehoe (1991) and Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (2010). Deflation is, however, costly through inefficient price adjustments; thus the policymaker induces a relatively low level of deflation (0.66% annualized). As the share of the unbanked households converges to zero, the model becomes a standard representative agent setup and the optimal inflation level converges to zero,  $\bar{\pi} \rightarrow 1$ .

Figure 5 shows the decomposition of welfare gains associated with both the introduction of the CBDC and optimal monetary policy. For different levels of the banked population share, we decompose welfare improvements associated with the transition from the economy without digital currency and standard Taylor rule to the economy with digital currency and Ramsey-optimal two instrument monetary policy. These welfare gains are associated with: (i) introduction of digital currency, (ii) optimal conventional monetary policy, and (iii) optimal  $R_t^{DC}$  setting.<sup>11</sup>

Consider the welfare decomposition of TFP shocks as in Figure 5a. Firstly, we observe that for the economy with low initial financial inclusion ( $\Gamma_h \rightarrow 0$ ) the welfare improvements are mainly associated with the introduction of digital currency. As the share of the unbanked decreases, we observe that the welfare benefits associated with the provision of digital currency go to zero. Secondly, we see that as the proportion of the banked grows, the importance of optimal conventional monetary policy for welfare increases. The decomposition of the welfare gains with respect to the cost-push shock are shown in Figure 5b. Similar to our analysis with the TFP shock, we observe that the welfare improvement associated with introduction

<sup>10.</sup> We argue that  $R^{DC}$  is different to R in two distinct ways. First, digital currencies are a sub-optimal savings instruments compared to deposits due to the presence of convex adjustment costs. Secondly, bankers cannot optimally select the quantity of digital currency deposits. Thus,  $R^{DC}$  can be set to induce a socially optimal level of digital currency. If bankers had been able to privately optimize x, and if digital currency deposits were a perfect substitute for deposits, then the two instruments available to the policymaker would be collinear.

<sup>11.</sup> We compare welfare under the three policy changes to the baseline regime without digital currency and suboptimal conventional monetary policy. The welfare improvements associated with each regime change do not include cross effects, which are small in magnitude.

of digital currency diminish with the population share of BHH. In response to TFP and cost push shocks, optimal monetary policy is similar to a rule in which the rate on CBDC tracks the policy rate,  $R_t = R_t^{DC}$ . Deviating from this rule results in negligible welfare improvement and is an order of numerical approximation error. The results are qualitatively similar with higher values of the adjustment costs of holding CBDC  $\varkappa^{DC}$ , and are available in Appendix A.2.8.



Figure 5: Welfare improvement decomposition

Note: Panel 5a: TFP shock, Panel 5b: cost-push shock. Vertical axis indicates percent increase in welfare compared to baseline specification without digital currency access.

### 4.1.1 Welfare Implications of Constant Spread Rules

We have shown that optimal monetary policy is approximated by the simple rule  $R^{DC} = R$ . We now show how deviating from the optimal rule has distributional implications on welfare. Let us assume that the policymaker operates the digital currency interest rate rule of the form,

$$R_t^{DC} = R_t + \delta^{DC},$$

where  $\delta^{DC}$  is the constant spread term. We compare welfare outcomes to the case when the spread between CBDC rates and deposit rates are zero in response to a 1% TFP shock in Figure 6. While aggregate welfare is maximized with  $R^{DC} = R$ , positive and negative values of the spread imply different distributional outcomes. The BHH are better off under negative values of the spread, while the converse is true for the UHH. The UHH benefit through the savings channel, when their digital currency deposits receive a higher rate of interest. The BHH are worse off because the banker is forced to hold digital currency deposits at a higher rate, resulting in a decline in bank equity.

Figure 6: Welfare implications of constant spread rule (% ch.)



Note: Figure plots welfare for BHH, UHH, and aggregate households as a function of the spread between the policy rate and the CBDC rate. The welfare is calculated as a percent change from the regime with no digital currency.

## 4.2 Financial Taxes and Subsidies

We introduce macroprudential policy instruments in the form of taxes and subsidies to the bank balance sheet. Let  $\tau_t^N$  denote the subsidy on bank net worth,  $\tau_t^{DC}$  is a direct tax on digital currency holdings of the BHH and an equivalent subsidy to the UHH, and  $\tau_t^K$  is a tax on bank equity holdings. The government's budget constraint would then be given by:

$$\tau_t^N \Gamma_h N_t - \tau Y_t = \tau_t^K \Gamma_h K_t^b + \Gamma_h (T_t^h + \tau_t^{DC,h} DC_t^h) + \Gamma_u (T_t^u + \tau_t^{DC,u} DC_t^u).$$
(50)

With these taxes and subsidies in place, we can rewrite the balance sheet constraint of an individual banker, (24), as:

$$\left(1 - \tau_t^K + \frac{\varkappa^b}{2} x_t^2\right) Q_t k_t^b = d_t + dc_t + (1 + \tau_t^N) n_t,$$
(51)

and the excess return on capital over fiat currency deposits, (31), and cost advantage of digital currency deposits over fiat currency deposits, (32), respectively, are defined as:

$$\mu_t = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Omega_{t,t+1} \left\{ \frac{z_{t+1}^k + (1-\delta)Q_{t+1}}{Q_t} - (1-\tau_t^K) \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} \right\} \right],\tag{52}$$

and the optimal leverage ratio of the banker, (30), is:

$$\phi_t = \frac{(1 + \tau_t^N)v_t}{\theta^b - \mu_t - \mu_t^{DC} x_t + \frac{\varkappa^b}{2} x_t^2 v_t}.$$
(53)

We first assess the effects of a permanent increase in tax and subsidy rates. Table 4 summarizes the changes in aggregate variables, as well as of welfare, in the deterministic steady state. We observe that, compared to the baseline case, the subsidy to net worth,  $\tau^N$ , and tax and subsidy on digital currency holdings,  $\tau^{DC}$ , are welfare improving, while the tax on bank equity,  $\tau^K$ , is not. The subsidy to net worth alleviates the inefficiencies associated with the competitive equilibrium in the presence of financial frictions, increasing the ability of the banker to finance equity and, thus, increases output and consumption. We note that even a small subsidy to net worth of 0.1% induces increases in net worth by more than 2% and in output of more than 1%. The subsidy, however, increases volatility of the aggregate variables, most significantly that of deposits.

The tax and subsidy on digital currency,  $\tau^{DC}$ , primarily serves the role of a redistribution device, since it is a tax on BHH CBDC holdings and a subsidy to UHH CBDC holdings. Given its design, it does not change the levels of output and consumption, but it does make deposits and net worth more volatile. This is due to the fact that the tax on BHH CBDC holdings makes the household more eager to substitute its digital currency holdings for deposits, making bank net worth more volatile as well. The redistribution results in an decrease in the inequality measure,  $\omega$ , which is consistent with a decline in consumption differences between banked and unbanked households. A striking increase in the aggregate welfare is a direct consequence of this redistribution and is mainly due to the marginal benefit of tax subsidies to the unbanked exceeding the marginal cost of CBDC taxes to the banked.

A tax on bank equity decreases the incentives of the banker to acquire equity and, thus, leads to a decline in aggregate equity and output. The introduction of this instrument, however, decreases volatility of the aggregate variables and leads to more equitable consumption levels across households. This is due to the fact that, by design, the UHH do not hold equity and benefit from the transfers from the BHH. The introduction of the tax, however, is not welfare improving in steady state due to a decrease in economic activity.

		λ/ -		<i>V</i> ,
Variable	Baseline	$\tau^{N}$ only	$\tau^{DC}$ only	$\tau^{\kappa}$ only
$\bar{Y}$	0.6898	0.6972	0.6898	0.6604
	(0.0077)	(0.0078)	(0.0077)	(0.0073)
$\bar{C}$	0.5447	0.5502	0.5437	0.5230
	(0.0092)	(0.0092)	(0.0092)	(0.0087)
$\overline{I}$	0.1401	0.1424	0.1401	0.1313
	(0.0021)	(0.0022)	(0.0021)	(0.0019)
$\bar{D}$	5.9744	6.1784	5.9745	5.1938
	(1.0204)	(1.0590)	(1.0852)	(0.9038)
$\bar{N}$	1.9048	1.9528	1.9048	1.7190
	(0.7242)	(0.7552)	(0.7229)	(0.6412)
$\bar{DC}$	0	0	0	0
	(0.0456)	(0.0494)	(0.1634)	(0.0387)
$ar{Q}$	1	1	1	1
	(0.0722)	(0.0772)	(0.0722)	(0.0719)
$\bar{\pi}$	1	1	1	1
	(0.0107)	(0.0104)	(0.0107)	(0.0105)
$\bar{\omega}$	0.3806	0.3809	0.3257	0.3791
	(0.0087)	(0.0086)	(0.0141)	(0.0085)
$u(\bar{C}^h, \bar{L}^h)$	-111.5150	-110.5513	-118.8607	-115.4663
	(0.3197)	(0.3304)	(1.1893)	(0.3112)
$u(\bar{C}^u, \bar{L}^u)$	-260.9348	-260.5185	-235.5938	-262.8615
	(1.3410)	(1.4517)	(3.7737)	(1.1535)
$u(ar{C},ar{L})$	-186.2249	-185.5349	-177.2272	-189.1639
	(0.5861)	(0.6322)	(1.3217)	(0.5087)

Table 4: Permanent tax policy changes

Note: Table shows deterministic steady state values and the standard deviation of variables simulated with TFP, cost-push, and monetary policy shocks over 2,000 periods.

Finally, Figure 7 shows the stochastic steady state transition path of a subsidy and tax on CBDCs.<sup>12</sup> For numerical accuracy of the simulation and calculation of the stochastic steady state, we only consider small changes in  $\tau^{DC}$  of the order of

<sup>12.</sup> In a stochastic state, agents anticipate recurrent arrivals of various shocks and choose the quantities as the function of the state variables; and when aggregate shocks never materialize, the

0.01%. Consistent with tax redistribution, a tax on BHH CBDC holdings induces a sharp fall in  $DC^h$ , while a subsidy to UHH increases its CBDC holdings. The BHH switches to holding more deposits and equity. The banker's net worth, however, declines due to a decrease in the amount of digital currency it receives. We plot the stochastic steady state transition paths for a permanent subsidy to bank net worth and a tax on equity in Appendix A.2.11

Figure 7: Stochastic steady state transition (permanent change to tax/subsidy on digital currency,  $\tau^{DC})$ 



Note: Plots show a transition from the baseline stochastic steady state to the new one induced by a permanent change in policy. The change in policy is assumed to happen in period 10 of the simulations.

economy settles in the stochastic steady state. There is a contradiction in the stochastic steady state: Even though agents anticipate aggregate shocks to arrive, the shocks never materialize (Aoki, Benigno, and Kiyotaki 2016).

# 5 Conclusion

In this paper we focus on the financial inclusion effects of introducing a CBDC. We address a number of research questions. What are the welfare implications of a retail CBDC, and does it address financial inclusion of the unbanked? Does the strength of monetary policy transmission increase or decrease after CBDC adoption? What are optimal interest rate rules in an economy with a CBDC, and does it matter whether CBDC rates are adjustable or fixed?

In the first part, we review the arguments for and against introducing a CBDC using a simple endowment economy with two types of agents. Welfare for both sets of households improve with the introduction of a CBDC, however we find the benefits are stronger for the unbanked. This supports the financial inclusion channel argument: unbanked households now have a savings device to smooth consumption and a buffer against macroeconomic fluctuations.

We then extend the model to a New Keynesian setup with banks and financial frictions to examine the macroeconomic effects of issuing a digital currency. Similar to our endowment economy, we find the net benefit of introducing a CBDC is stronger for unbanked households. This richer framework allows us to evaluate monetary policy rules and determine the magnitude of monetary policy transmission. Our results suggest that the introduction of a CBDC amplifies monetary policy transmission to consumption. This is because the unbanked households now hold digital currency deposits and are sensitive to the central bank rate.

Our final contribution tests a number of elements of CBDC design. We determine optimal monetary policy with two instruments: the policy rate on regular deposits and the rate on CBDC deposits. This speaks to policy discussions on whether the CBDC rate should be adjustable or fixed, and whether monetary policy transmission requires CBDC deposits to be responsive to the policy rate. When CBDCs are a near-perfect substitute for bank deposits, we find optimal policy requires the CBDC rate to track the policy rate, yielding higher welfare than rules that require a constant rate of remuneration on the CBDC. Second, we set optimal taxes on the CBDC. Based on the distributional effects of introducing a CBDC, we define a system of taxes and subsidies on the CBDC held by each household type. Taxing the banked households to subsidize unbanked households is strictly welfare improving in our model framework.

# References

- Agur, Itai, Anil Ari, and Giovanni Dell'Ariccia. 2022. "Designing central bank digital currencies." Journal of Monetary Economics 125:62–79.
- Andolfatto, David. 2021. "Assessing the impact of central bank digital currency on private banks." *The Economic Journal* 131 (634): 525–540.
- Aoki, Kosuke, Gianluca Benigno, and Nobuhiro Kiyotaki. 2016. "Monetary and Financial Policies in Emerging Markets." *working paper.*
- Ascari, Guido, and Lorenza Rossi. 2012. "Trend Inflation and Firms Price-Setting: Rotemberg verses Calvo." The Economic Journal 122 (563): 1115– 1141.
- Assenmacher, Katrin, Lea Bitter, and Annukka Ristiniemi. 2022. "CBDC and business cycle dynamics in a New Monetarist New Keynesian model."
- Auer, Raphael, and Rainer Böhme. 2020. "The technology of retail central bank digital currency." *BIS Quarterly Review, March.*
- Barrdear, John, and Michael Kumhof. 2022. "The macroeconomics of central bank digital currencies." *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 142:104148.
- **Benigno, Pierpaolo.** 2019. "Monetary Policy in a World of Cryptocurrencies." Centre of Economic Policy Research, *discussion papers*.
- Benigno, Pierpaolo, Linda M. Schilling, and Harald Uhlig. 2022. "Cryptocurrencies, Currency Competition, and the Impossible Trinity." Journal of International Economics, 103601.
- Bernanke, Ben S., Mark Gertler, and Simon Gilchrist. 1999. "The Financial Accelerator in a Quantitative Business Cycle Framework." *Handbook of Macroeconomics* 1 (C): 1341–1393.
- Bilbiie, Florin O., and Xavier Ragot. 2021. "Optimal Monetary Policy and Liquidity with Heterogeneous Households." *Review of Economic Dynamics* 41:71– 95.
- Bilbiie, Floring O. 2018. "Monetary Policy and Heterogeneity: An Analytical Framework." Available at SSRN 3106805.

- Blanchard, Olivier J., and Jordi Galí. 2007. "Real Wage Rigidities and the New Keynesian Model." Journal of Money, Credit and Banking 39 (1): 35–65.
- Blanchard, Olivier J., and Nobuhiro Kiyotaki. 1987. "Monopolistic Competition and the Effects of Aggregate Demand." American Economic Review 77 (4): 647–666.
- Brunnermeier, Markus K, and Dirk Niepelt. 2019. "On the equivalence of private and public money." *Journal of Monetary Economics* 106:27–41.
- Burlon, Lorenzo, Carlos Montes-Galdon, Manuel Muñoz, and Frank Smets. 2022. "The optimal quantity of CBDC in a bank-based economy."
- Calvo, Guillermo A. 1983. "Staggered Prices in a Utility-Maximising Framework." Journal of Monetary Economics 12 (3): 383–398.
- Chari, V. V., Lawrence J. Christiano, and Patrick J. Kehoe. 1991. "Optimal Fiscal and Monetary Policy: Some Recent Results." *Journal of Money, Credit* and Banking 23 (3): 519–539.
- Chiu, Jonathan, Seyed Mohammadreza Davoodalhosseini, Janet Hua Jiang, and Yu Zhu. 2019. "Bank market power and central bank digital currency: Theory and quantitative assessment." Available at SSRN 3331135.
- Christiano, Lawrence J., Martin S. Eichenbaum, and Charles L. Evans. 2005. "Nominal Rigidities and the Dynamic Effects of a Shock to Monetary Policy." *Journal of Political Economy* 113 (1): 1–45.
- Cong, Lin William, and Simon Mayer. 2021. "The Coming Battle of Digital Currencies." Available at SSRN 3992815, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers .cfm?abstract\_id=4068564.
- Debortoli, Davide, and Jordi Galí. 2017. "Monetary Policy with Heterogeneous Agents: Insights from TANK Models." Department of Economics and Business, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, *Economics Working Papers*, no. 1686.

—. 2022. *Idiosyncratic income risk and aggregate fluctuations*. Technical report. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Eberly, Janice C. 1997. "International Evidence on Investment and Fundamentals." *European Economic Review* 41 (6): 1055–1078.

- Fernández-Villaverde, Jesús, Daniel Sanches, Linda Schilling, and Harald Uhlig. 2021. "Central Bank Digital Currency: Central Banking for All?" *Review* of Economic Dynamics 41:225–242.
- Ferrari Minesso, Massimo, Arnaud Mehl, and Livio Stracca. 2022. "Central Bank Digital Currency in an Open Economy." *Journal of Monetary Economics*.
- Galí, Jordi. 2015. Monetary Policy, Inflation, and the Business Cycle. 2nd Edition. Princeton University Press.
- George, Ammu, Taojun Xie, and Joseph D Alba. 2020. "Central Bank Digital Currency with Adjustable Interest Rate in Small Open Economies." Available at SSRN 3605918, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3605 918.
- Gertler, Mark, and Peter Karadi. 2011. "A Model of Unconventional Monetary Policy." *Journal of Monetary Economics* 58 (1): 17–34.
- Gertler, Mark, and Nobuhiro Kiyotaki. 2010. "Financial Intermediation and Credit Policy in Business Cycle Analysis." Handbook of Monetary Economics 3:547–599.
  - ——. 2015. "Banking, Liquidity, and Bank Runs in an Infinite Horizon Economy." American Economic Review 105 (7): 2011–2043.
- Guerrieri, Luca, and Matteo Iacoviello. 2015. "OccBin: A Toolkit for Solving Dynamic Models with Occasionally Binding Constraints Easily." Journal of Monetary Economics 70 (C): 22–38.
- Hemingway, Benjamin. 2022. "The Impact of CBDC on Bank Deposits and the Interbank Market."
- Ikeda, Daisuke. 2020. "Digital Money as a Unit of Account and Monetary Policy in Open Economies." Institute for Monetary and Economic Studies, Bank of Japan.
- Keister, Todd, and Daniel R Sanches. 2021. "Should central banks issue digital currency?" Available at SSRN 3966817.
- Kim, Young Sik, and Ohik Kwon. 2022. "Central Bank Digital Currency, Credit Supply, and Financial Stability." *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking.*

Kiyotaki, Nobuhiro, and John Moore. 1997. "Credit Cycles." Journal of Political Economy 105 (2): 211–248.

——. 2019. "Liquidity, Business Cycles, and Monetary Policy." *Journal of Political Economy* 127 (6): 2926–2966.

- Kumhof, Michael, Marco Pinchetti, Phurichai Rungcharoenkitkul, and Andrej Sokol. 2021. "Central Bank Digital Currencies, Exchange Rates and Gross Capital Flows." ECB working paper series, no. No 2488, https://www.e cb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/scpwps/ecb.wp2488~fede33ca65.en.pdf.
- Murakami, David, and Ganesh Viswanath-Natraj. 2021. "Cryptocurrencies in Emerging Markets: A Stablecoin Solution?" SSRN working paper, https://p apers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3949012.
- Niepelt, Dirk. 2020. "Monetary policy with reserves and CBDC: Optimality, equivalence, and politics." *Equivalence, and Politics (November 2020)*.
- Nisticò, Salvatore. 2007. "The Welfare Loss from Unstable Inflation." *Economic Letters*, no. 96, 51–57.
- Ramadiah, Amanah, Marco Galbiati, and Kimmo Soramäki. 2021. "Agent-Based Simulation of Central Bank Digital Currencies." Available at SSRN 3959759.
- Rotemberg, Julio J. 1982. "Sticky Prices in the United States." Journal of Political Economy 90 (6): 1187–1211.
- Schmitt-Grohé, Stephanie, and Martín Uribe. 2010. "The Optimal Rate of Inflation." *Handbook of Monetary Economics* 3:653–722.
- Skeie, David R. 2019. "Digital Currency Runs." Available at SSRN 3294313, htt ps://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3294313.
- Smets, Frank, and Rafael Wouters. 2007. "Shocks and Frictions in US Business Cycles: A Bayesian DSGE Approach." American Economic Review 97 (3): 586– 606.
- Walsh, Carl E. 2010. Monetary Theory and Policy. 3rd Edition. MIT Press.
- Woodford, Michael. 2003. Interest and Prices. Princeton University Press.

# A Appendix

# A.1 Two-Agent Endowment Economy

### A.1.1 Model without CBDC

The following equations outline a two-agent endowment economy model with no CBDCs. Defining the functional form for household utility as logarithmic in consumption,

$$u(C_t) = \ln C_t,$$

we define  $\lambda_t^i$  as the marginal utility of consumption of the type *i* household. Thus, our equilibrium conditions are:

### Households.

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_t \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} \lambda_{t+1}^h = \lambda_t^h \tag{54}$$

$$\frac{1}{C_t^u} = \lambda_t^u + \mu_t^u \tag{55}$$

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_t \frac{\lambda_{t+1}^u + \mu_{t+1}^u}{\pi_{t+1}} = \lambda_t^u \left[ 1 + \phi_M (M_t - \bar{M}) \right]$$
(56)

$$C_t^u + M_t = T_t^u + \frac{M_{t-1}}{\pi_t}$$
(57)

$$C_t^u = \frac{M_{t-1}}{\pi_t} \tag{58}$$

Market clearing.

$$0 = \Gamma_u (T_t^u - M_t) + \Gamma_h (T_t^h - C_t^h)$$
(59)

$$C_t = \Gamma_h C_t^h + \Gamma_u C_t^u \tag{60}$$

$$M_t = \frac{M_{t-1}}{\pi_t} \tag{61}$$

$$\omega_t = 1 - \frac{C_t^u}{C_t^h} \tag{62}$$

Exogenous processes.

$$\ln T_t^h = \rho_T \ln T_{t-1}^h + \varepsilon_t^T \tag{63}$$

$$\ln T_t^u = \rho_T \ln T_{t-1}^u + \varepsilon_t^T \tag{64}$$

### A.1.2 Steady State for Endowment Economy without CBDC

Given that the steady state transfer amounts,  $\overline{T}^i$ , are exogenously set, the steady state is characterized by the following set of equations:

$$\begin{split} \bar{\pi} &= 1, \\ \bar{R} &= \frac{1}{\beta}, \\ \bar{M} &= \bar{T}^u_t, \\ \bar{\lambda}^u &= \beta, \\ \bar{\mu}^u &= 1 - \beta, \\ \bar{C}^h &= \bar{T}^h, \\ \bar{C} &= \Gamma \bar{C}^h + (1 - \Gamma) \bar{C}^u, \\ \bar{\omega} &= 1 - \frac{\bar{C}^u}{\bar{C}^h}. \end{split}$$

### A.1.3 Model with CBDC

As above in Appendix A.1.1, the functional form for household utility is logarithmic in consumption. Thus, our equilibrium conditions are:

### Households.

$$\frac{1}{C_t^h} = \lambda_t^h \tag{65}$$

$$\lambda_t^h = \beta \mathbb{E}_t \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} \lambda_{t+1}^h \tag{66}$$

$$\lambda_t^h \left( 1 + \varkappa^{DC} D C_t^h \right) = \beta \frac{R_t^{DC}}{\pi_{t+1}} \lambda_{t+1}^h \tag{67}$$

$$\chi_t^{DC,h} = \frac{\varkappa^{DC}}{2} \left( DC_t^h \right)^2 \tag{68}$$

$$\frac{1}{C_t^u} = \lambda_t^u + \alpha_M \mu_t^u \tag{69}$$

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_t \frac{\lambda_{t+1}^u + \mu_{t+1}^u}{\pi_{t+1}} = \lambda_t^u \left[ 1 + \phi_M (M_t - \bar{M}) \right]$$
(70)

$$\lambda_t^u (1 + \varkappa^{DC} DC_t^u) = \beta \mathbb{E}_t \frac{R_t^{DC}}{\pi_{t+1}} \lambda_{t+1}^u$$
(71)

$$\chi_t^{DC,u} = \frac{\varkappa^{DC}}{2} \left( DC_t^u \right)^2 \tag{72}$$

$$C_t^u + M_t + DC_t^u + \chi_t^{DC,u} = T_t^u + \frac{M_{t-1} + R_{t-1}^{DC}DC_{t-1}^u}{\pi_t}$$
(73)

$$\alpha_M C_t^u = \frac{M_{t-1}}{\pi_t} \tag{74}$$

Market clearing.

$$\Gamma_h T_t^h + \Gamma_u T_t^u = C_t + \Gamma_h \chi_t^{DC,h} + \Gamma_u \chi_t^{DC,u}$$
(75)

$$C_t = \Gamma_h C_t^h + \Gamma_u C_t^u \tag{76}$$

$$M_t = \frac{M_{t-1}}{\pi_t} \tag{77}$$

$$\omega_t = 1 - \frac{C_t^u}{C_t^h} \tag{78}$$

Exogenous processes.

$$\ln T_t^h = \rho_T \ln T_{t-1}^h + \varepsilon_t^T \tag{79}$$

$$\ln T_t^u = \rho_T \ln T_{t-1}^u + \varepsilon_t^T \tag{80}$$

# A.1.4 Steady State for Endowment Economy with CBDC

Given that the steady state transfer amounts,  $\overline{T}^i$ , are exogenously set, the steady state is characterized by the following set of equations:

$$\begin{split} \bar{\pi} &= 1, \\ \bar{R} &= \frac{1}{\beta}, \\ \bar{D}\bar{C}^{h} &= \bar{D}\bar{C}^{u} = 0, \\ \bar{R}^{DC} &= \frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\beta}\varkappa^{DC}\bar{D}\bar{C}^{u}, \\ \bar{C}^{h} &= \bar{T}^{h} + \bar{D}\bar{C}^{h}\left(\bar{R}^{DC} - 1\right) - \bar{\chi}^{DC,h}, \\ \bar{C}^{u} &= \bar{T}^{u} + \bar{D}\bar{C}^{u}\left(\bar{R}^{DC} - 1\right) - \bar{\chi}^{DC,u}, \\ \bar{M} &= \alpha_{M}\bar{C}^{u}, \\ \bar{M} &= \alpha_{M}\bar{C}^{u}, \\ \bar{\lambda}^{u} &= \frac{1}{\bar{C}^{u}\left(1 + \frac{\alpha_{M}}{\beta} - \alpha_{M}\right)}, \\ \bar{\mu}^{u} &= \bar{\lambda}^{u}\left(\frac{1}{\beta} - 1\right), \\ \bar{C} &= \Gamma_{h}\bar{C}^{h} + \Gamma_{u}\bar{C}^{u}, \\ \bar{\omega} &= 1 - \frac{\bar{C}^{u}}{\bar{C}^{h}}. \end{split}$$

### A.1.5 Endowment economy IRFs

Below are the IRFs related to the endowment economy. We observe that the presence of digital currency in the economy allows for better risk-sharing between the households. This is more vivid in the money supply shock case; as the money supply shock influences the UHH, they are eager to smooth consumption through borrowing in digital currency, which leads to perfect stabilization of aggregate consumption.



Figure 8: IRFs to 1% endowment shock

Note: Price variables are in levels, quantity variables are in percent deviations from steady state. The proportion of banked and unbanked households are set to a baseline value of  $\Gamma_h = \Gamma_u = 0.5$ .



Figure 9: IRFs to 1% money supply shock

Note: Price variables are in levels, quantity variables are in percent deviations from steady state. The proportion of banked and unbanked households are set to a baseline value of  $\Gamma_h = \Gamma_u = 0.5$ .

# A.2 TANK model with Central Bank Digital Currency

### A.2.1 The New Keynesian Phillips Curve

If we log linearize Equation (12) about the non-inflationary steady state, we yield the NKPC. First start by totally differentiating (12):

$$(2\bar{\pi}-1)d\pi_t = \frac{\epsilon}{\kappa}dMC_t + \beta(2\bar{\pi}-1)\mathbb{E}_t d\pi_{t+1},$$

where  $\bar{\pi} = \bar{MC} = 1$  (recall that we have production subsidy  $\tau$  to offset distortions arising from monopolistic competition). Substitute these values in and assume that  $dMC_t = MC_t - \bar{MC}$  to get the log-linearized NKPC:

$$\hat{\pi}_t = \frac{\epsilon}{\kappa} \hat{MC}_t + \beta \mathbb{E}_t \hat{\pi}_{t+1}, \qquad (81)$$

where hatted variables denote log-deviations from steady state values (for any variable  $x_t : \hat{x} = \ln \frac{x_t}{\bar{x}}$ , and where we calibrate  $\kappa$  to a standard value as in, for example, Blanchard and Galí (2007):

$$\kappa = \frac{\epsilon \theta}{(1-\theta)(1-\beta \theta)}.$$

### A.2.2 Household Optimization Problem

The FOCs to the BHH problem are:

$$\lambda_t^h = \frac{1}{C_t^h + \zeta_0^h \frac{(L_t^h)^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}},$$
(82)

$$w_t = \zeta_0^h (L_t^h)^{\zeta},\tag{83}$$

$$1 = \mathbb{E}_t \Lambda^h_{t,t+1} \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}},\tag{84}$$

$$1 = \mathbb{E}_t \Lambda_{t,t+1}^h \frac{z_{t+1}^k + (1-\delta)Q_{t+1}}{Q_t + \varkappa^h \Gamma_h\left(\frac{K_t^h}{K_t}\right)},\tag{85}$$

$$1 = \mathbb{E}_t \Lambda_{t,t+1}^h \frac{R_t^{DC}}{\pi_{t+1} (1 + \varkappa^{DC} DC_t^h)}.$$
(86)

The FOCs to the UHH problem are:

$$\lambda_t^u + \alpha_M \mu_t^u = \frac{1}{C_t^u + \zeta_0^u \frac{(L_t^u)^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}},$$
(87)

$$\lambda_t^u w_t = \frac{\zeta_0^u}{C_t^u - \zeta_0^u \frac{(L_t^u)^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}} (L_t^u)^{\zeta}, \tag{88}$$

$$\lambda_t^u \left[ 1 + \phi_M (M_t - \bar{M}) \right] = \beta \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\lambda_{t+1}^u + \mu_{t+1}^u}{\pi_{t+1}} \right], \tag{89}$$

$$1 = \beta \mathbb{E}_t \frac{\lambda_{t+1}^u}{\lambda_t^u} \frac{R_t^{DC}}{\pi_{t+1}(1 + \varkappa^{DC} DC_t^u)}.$$
(90)

### A.2.3 Rewriting the Banker's Problem

To setup the problem of the banker as in Section 3.3.2, first iterate the banker's flow of funds constraint (25) forward by one period, and then divide through by  $n_t$  to yield:

$$\frac{n_{t+1}}{n_t} = \frac{\left(z_{t+1}^k + (1-\delta)Q_{t+1}\right)}{Q_t} \frac{Q_t k_t^b}{n_t} - \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} \frac{d_t}{n_t} - \frac{R_t^{DC}}{\pi_{t+1}} \frac{d_c}{n_t}.$$

Rearrange the balance sheet constraint (24) and use the fact that  $dc_t/n_t = x_t\phi_t$ , to yield the following:

$$\frac{d_t}{n_t} = \frac{\varkappa^b}{2} x_t^2 \phi_t + \phi_t - x_t \phi_t - 1.$$

Substitute this value for  $d_t/n_t$  into the expression for  $n_{t+1}/n_t$ , and we get:

$$\frac{n_{t+1}}{n_t} = \left(\frac{z_{t+1}^k + (1-\delta)Q_{t+1}}{Q_t} - \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}}\right)\phi_t + \left(\frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} - \frac{R_t^{DC}}{\pi_{t+1}}\right)x_t\phi_t + \left(1 - \frac{\varkappa^b}{2}x_t^2\phi_t\right)\frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}}$$

Substituting this expression into (26), yields the following:

$$\psi_{t} = \mathbb{E}_{t} \left[ \Lambda_{t,t+1}^{h} (1 - \sigma_{b} + \sigma_{b} \psi_{t+1}) \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2^{k}_{t+1} + (1 - \delta)Q_{t+1}}{Q_{t}} - \frac{R_{t}}{\pi_{t+1}} \end{pmatrix} \phi_{t} \\ + \left( \frac{R_{t}}{\pi_{t+1}} - \frac{R_{t}^{DC}}{\pi_{t+1}} \right) x_{t} \phi_{t} \\ + \left( 1 - \frac{\varkappa^{b}}{2} x_{t}^{2} \phi_{t} \right) \frac{R_{t}}{\pi_{t+1}} \\ \end{bmatrix} \right] \\ = \mu_{t} \phi_{t} + \mu_{t}^{DC} x_{t} \phi_{t} + \left( 1 - \frac{\varkappa^{b}}{2} x_{t}^{2} \phi_{t} \right) \upsilon_{t},$$

which is (28) in the text.

### A.2.4 Solving the banker's problem

With  $\{\mu_t, \mu_t^{DC}\} > 0$ , the banker's incentive compatibility constraint binds with equality, and so we can write the Lagrangian as:

$$\mathcal{L} = \psi_t + \lambda_t (\psi_t - \theta^b \phi_t),$$

where  $\lambda_t$  is the Lagrangian multiplier. The FOCs are:

$$(1+\lambda_t)\left[\mu_t + \mu_t^{DC}x_t - \frac{\varkappa^b}{2}x_t^2\upsilon_t\right] = \lambda_t\theta^b,\tag{91}$$

$$\psi_t = \theta^b \phi_t. \tag{92}$$

Substitute (92) into the banker's objective function to yield:

$$\phi_t = \frac{\upsilon_t}{\theta^b - \mu_t - \mu_t^{DC} x_t + \frac{\varkappa^b}{2} x_t^2 \upsilon_t},$$
(93)

which is (30) in the text.

# A.2.5 Full Set of Equilibrium Conditions

Households.

$$w_t = \zeta_0^h L_t^h \tag{94}$$

$$1 = \mathbb{E}_t \Lambda^h_{t,t+1} \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} \tag{95}$$

$$1 = \mathbb{E}_t \Lambda_{t,t+1}^h \frac{z_{t+1}^k + (1-\delta)Q_{t+1}}{Q_t + \varkappa^h \Gamma_h\left(\frac{K_t^h}{K_t}\right)}$$
(96)

$$1 = \mathbb{E}_t \Lambda_{t,t+1}^h \frac{R_t^{DC}}{\pi_{t+1}(1 + \varkappa^{DC} DC_t^h)}$$
(97)

$$C_t^u + M_t + \chi_t^M + DC_t^u + \chi_t^{DC,u} + T_t^u = w_t L_t^u + \frac{M_{t-1}}{\pi_t} + \frac{R_{t-1}^{DC}}{\pi_t} DC_{t-1}^u$$
(98)

$$\frac{\lambda_t^u}{\lambda_t^u + \alpha_M \mu_t^u} w_t = \zeta_0^u (L_t^u)^\zeta \tag{99}$$

$$\lambda_t^u + \alpha_M \mu_t^u = \frac{1}{C_t^u + \zeta_0^u \frac{(L_t^u)^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}}$$
(100)

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_t \frac{\lambda_{t+1}^u + \mu_{t+1}^u}{\pi_{t+1}} = \lambda_t^u \left[ 1 + \phi_M (M_t - \bar{M}) \right] \tag{101}$$

$$\lambda_t^u (1 + \varkappa^{DC} DC_t^u) = \beta \mathbb{E}_t \lambda_{t+1}^u \frac{R_t^{DC}}{\pi_{t+1}}$$
(102)

$$\alpha_M C_t^u = \frac{M_{t-1}}{\pi_t} \tag{103}$$

Production.

$$Q_t = 1 + \frac{\kappa_I}{2} \left(\frac{I_t}{\bar{I}} - 1\right)^2 - \frac{\kappa_I}{\bar{I}} \left(\frac{I_t}{\bar{I}} - 1\right)$$
(104)

$$K_t = (1 - \delta)K_{t-1} + I_t \tag{105}$$

$$Y_t = A_t K_{t-1}^{\alpha} L_t^{1-\alpha} \tag{106}$$

$$w_t = (1 - \alpha) A_t \left(\frac{K_{t-1}}{L_t}\right)^{\alpha} \tag{107}$$

$$MC_t = \frac{1}{A_t} \left(\frac{z_t^k}{\alpha}\right)^{\alpha} \left(\frac{w_t}{1-\alpha}\right)^{1-\alpha}$$
(108)

$$\pi_t(\pi_t - 1) = \frac{1}{\kappa} \left[ \epsilon M C_t + 1 - \epsilon + \tau \epsilon - \tau \right] + \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Lambda^h_{t,t+1}(\pi_{t+1} - 1) \pi_{t+1} \frac{Y_{t+1}}{Y_t} \right] + \xi^\pi_t$$
(109)

Banks.

$$\psi_t = \theta^b \phi_t \tag{110}$$

$$\phi_t = \frac{\upsilon_t}{\theta^b - \mu_t - \mu_t^{DC} x_t + \frac{\varkappa^b}{2} x_t^2 \upsilon_t} \tag{111}$$

$$\mu_t = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Omega_{t,t+1} \left\{ \frac{z_{t+1}^k + (1-\delta)Q_{t+1}}{Q_t} - \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} \right\} \right]$$
(112)

$$\mu_t^{DC} = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Omega_{t,t+1} \left\{ \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} - \frac{R_t^{DC}}{\pi_{t+1}} \right\} \right]$$
(113)

$$\upsilon_t = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Omega_{t,t+1} \frac{R_t}{\pi_{t+1}} \right] \tag{114}$$

$$\Omega_{t,t+1} = \Lambda_{t,t+1}^{h} (1 - \sigma_b + \sigma_b \psi_{t+1})$$
(115)

Monetary and fiscal policy.

$$\frac{R_t}{\bar{R}} = \left(\frac{R_{t-1}}{\bar{R}}\right)^{\rho_R} \left(\pi_t^{\phi_\pi} X_t^{\phi_Y}\right)^{1-\rho_R} \exp(\varepsilon_t^R) \tag{116}$$

$$-\tau Y_t = \Gamma_h T_t^h + \Gamma_u T_t^u \tag{117}$$

$$R_t^{DC} = R_t \tag{118}$$

Market clearing.

$$C_t = \Gamma_h C_t^h + \Gamma_u C_t^u \tag{119}$$

$$L_t = \Gamma_h L_t^h + \Gamma_u L_t^u \tag{120}$$

$$DC_t = \Gamma_h DC_t^h + \Gamma_u DC_t^u \tag{121}$$

$$Y_t = C_t + \left[1 + \Phi\left(\frac{I_t}{\bar{I}}\right)\right] I_t + \frac{\kappa}{2}(\pi_t - 1)^2 Y_t$$
(122)

$$+\Gamma_{h}(\chi_{t}^{h}+\chi_{t}^{b}+\chi_{t}^{DC,h})+\Gamma_{u}(\chi_{t}^{M}+\chi_{t}^{DC,u})$$

$$V^{f}=C+\left[1+\Phi\left(I_{t}\right)\right]I$$

$$Y_t^J = C_t + \left[1 + \Phi\left(\frac{-\iota}{\overline{I}}\right)\right] I_t + \Gamma_h(\chi_t^h + \chi_t^b + \chi_t^{DC,h}) + \Gamma_u(\chi_t^M + \chi_t^{DC,u})$$
(123)

$$X_t = \frac{Y_t}{Y_t^f} \tag{124}$$

$$K_{t} = \Gamma_{h}(K_{t}^{h} + K_{t}^{b})$$

$$N_{t} = \sigma_{b} \left[ (z_{t}^{k} + (1 - \delta)Q_{t})K_{t-1}^{b} - \frac{R_{t-1}}{\pi_{t}}D_{t-1} - \frac{R_{t-1}^{DC}DC_{t-1}}{\pi_{t}} \right]$$

$$(125)$$

$$(125)$$

$$(125)$$

$$(126)$$

$$+\gamma_b(z_t^k + (1-\delta)Q_t)\frac{K_{t-1}}{\Gamma_h}$$

$$Q_t K_t^b = \phi_t N_t \tag{127}$$

$$\left(1 + \frac{\varkappa^b}{2} x_t^2\right) Q_t K_t^b = D_t + \frac{DC_t}{\Gamma_h} + N_t \tag{128}$$

$$x_t = \frac{DC_t}{Q_t \Gamma_h K_t^b} \tag{129}$$

Exogenous processes.

$$\ln A_t = \rho_A \ln A_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t^A \tag{130}$$

$$\xi_t^{\pi} = \rho_{\pi} \xi_{t-1}^{\pi} + \varepsilon_t^{\pi} \tag{131}$$

### A.2.6 Model Steady State

In the non-stochastic steady state, we have the following:

$$\begin{split} \bar{Q} &= 1, \\ \bar{\pi} &= 1, \\ \bar{R} &= \frac{1}{\beta}, \\ \bar{R}^{DC} &= \bar{R}. \end{split}$$

We define the discounted spreads on equity and DC as:

$$s = \beta [\bar{z}^k + (1 - \delta)] - 1, \qquad (132)$$

$$s^{DC} = 1 - \beta \bar{R}^{DC} = 0, \tag{133}$$

which we consider to be endogenous and exogenous, respectively.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13.</sup> Note that we could have a non-zero discounted spread between the return on digital currency and the deposit.

From the BHH's FOC with respect to equity, (85), we have:

$$1 = \beta \left[ \frac{\bar{z}^{k} + (1 - \delta)}{1 + \varkappa^{h} \Gamma_{h} \frac{\bar{K}^{h}}{\bar{K}}} \right]$$

$$1 + \varkappa^{h} \Gamma_{h} \frac{\bar{K}^{h}}{\bar{K}} = \beta \left[ \bar{z} + (1 - \delta) \right]$$

$$\Gamma_{h} \frac{\bar{K}^{h}}{\bar{K}} = \frac{s}{\varkappa^{h}}.$$
(134)

Additionally, in steady state we have:

$$\begin{split} \bar{\Omega} &= \beta (1 - \sigma_b + \sigma_b \bar{\psi}), \\ \bar{\upsilon} &= \frac{\bar{\Omega}}{\beta}, \\ \bar{\mu} &= \bar{\Omega} \left[ \bar{z}^k + (1 - \delta) - \frac{1}{\beta} \right], \\ \bar{\mu}^{DC} &= \bar{\Omega} \left[ \frac{1}{\beta} - \bar{R}^{DC} \right], \end{split}$$

and so, using (132) and (133), we can write:

$$\begin{split} \frac{\bar{\mu}}{\bar{\upsilon}} &= s, \\ \frac{\bar{\mu}^{DC}}{\bar{\upsilon}} &= s^{DC} \implies \bar{\mu}^{DC} = 0. \end{split}$$

Next, define J as:

$$J = \frac{n_{t+1}}{n_t} = \left[\bar{z}^k + (1-\delta)\right] \frac{\bar{K}^b}{\bar{N}} - \bar{R}\frac{\bar{D}}{\bar{N}} - \bar{R}^{DC}\frac{\bar{D}C}{\Gamma_h\bar{N}},$$

and use the following:

$$\begin{split} \frac{\bar{D}}{\bar{N}} &= \frac{\varkappa^b}{2} \bar{\phi} \bar{x}^2 + \bar{\phi} - \bar{x} \bar{\phi} - 1, \\ \bar{\phi} &= \frac{\bar{K}^b}{\bar{N}}, \\ \frac{\bar{D}C}{\Gamma_h \bar{N}} &= \bar{\phi} \bar{x}, \end{split}$$

to write J as:

$$\begin{split} J &= (\bar{z}^k + (1-\delta) - \bar{R})\bar{\phi} + \left(1 - \frac{\varkappa^b}{2}\bar{x}^2\bar{\phi}\right)\bar{R} + (\bar{R} - \bar{R}^{DC})\bar{x}\bar{\phi} \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta}\left[p(s, s^{DC})\bar{\phi} + 1\right], \end{split}$$

where

$$p(s, s^{DC}) \equiv s + s^{DC}\bar{x} - \frac{\varkappa^b}{2}\bar{x}^2$$

is defined as the return premium.

Then, from (43) we have:

$$\begin{split} \bar{N} &= \sigma_b \left\{ \left[ \bar{z}^k + (1-\delta) \right] \bar{K}^b - \bar{R}\bar{D} - \bar{R}^{DC} \frac{\bar{D}C}{\Gamma} \right\} + \gamma_b \left[ \bar{z}^k + (1-\delta) \right] \frac{\bar{K}}{\Gamma} \\ \frac{\bar{N}}{\bar{N}} &= \sigma_b \left\{ \left[ \bar{z}^k + (1-\delta) \right] \frac{\bar{K}^b}{\bar{N}} - \bar{R}^{DC} \frac{\bar{D}C}{\Gamma \bar{N}} \right\} + \frac{\gamma_b}{\bar{N}} \left[ \bar{z}^k + (1-\delta) \right] \frac{\bar{K}}{\Gamma} \\ \beta &= \sigma_b \beta J + \frac{\gamma_b}{\bar{N}} \beta \left[ \bar{z}^k + (1-\delta) \right] \frac{\bar{K}}{\Gamma} \\ &= \sigma_b \beta J + \frac{\gamma_b \bar{K}^b}{\bar{N}} \left( 1 + \varkappa^h \Gamma \frac{\bar{K}^h}{\bar{K}} \right) \frac{\bar{K}}{\Gamma \bar{K}^b} \\ &= \sigma_b \beta J + \gamma_b (1+s) \bar{\phi} \frac{1}{\frac{\Gamma \bar{K}^b}{\bar{K}}} \\ &= \sigma_b \beta J + \gamma_b (1+s) \bar{\phi} \frac{1}{\frac{\bar{K} - \Gamma \bar{K}^h}{\bar{K}}} \\ &= \sigma_b \left[ p(s, s^{DC}) \bar{\phi} + 1 \right] + \gamma_b (1+s) \bar{\phi} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{s}{\varkappa^h}} \\ \beta &= \sigma_b + \left[ \sigma_b p(s, s^{DC}) + \gamma_b \frac{1+s}{1-\frac{s}{\varkappa^h}} \right] \bar{\phi}, \end{split}$$

or

$$\bar{\phi} = \frac{\beta - \sigma_b}{\sigma_b p(s, s^{DC}) + \gamma_b \frac{1+s}{1-\frac{s}{\varkappa^h}}}$$

Equation (26) in steady state gives us:

$$\begin{split} \bar{\psi} &= \beta (1 - \sigma_b + \sigma_b \bar{\psi}) J \\ &= \beta J - \beta \sigma_b J + \beta \sigma_b \bar{\psi} J \\ &= \beta (1 - \sigma_b) J + \beta \sigma_b \bar{\psi} J \\ &= \frac{\beta (1 - \sigma_b) J}{1 - \beta \sigma_b J} \\ &= \frac{(1 - \sigma_b) \left[ p(s, s^{DC}) \bar{\phi} + 1 \right]}{1 - \sigma_b \left[ p(s, s^{DC}) \bar{\phi} + 1 \right]} \\ &= \frac{(1 - \sigma_b) \left[ p(s, s^{DC}) \bar{\phi} + 1 \right]}{1 - \sigma_b - \sigma_b p(s, s^{DC}) \bar{\phi}}, \end{split}$$

and from (92) we have

$$\bar{\psi} = \theta^b \bar{\phi}.$$

Combine the expressions for  $\bar{\phi}$  and  $\bar{\psi}$  to get:

$$\frac{\theta^b(\beta-\sigma_b)}{\sigma_b p(s,s^{DC})+\gamma_b\frac{1+s}{1-\frac{s}{\varkappa^h}}} = \frac{(1-\sigma_b)\left[\frac{p(s,s^{DC})(\beta-\sigma_b)}{\sigma_b p(s,s^{DC})+\gamma_b\frac{1+s}{1-\frac{s}{\varkappa^h}}}+1\right]}{1-\sigma_b-\sigma_b\left[\frac{p(s,s^{DC})(\beta-\sigma_b)}{\sigma_b p(s,s^{DC})+\gamma_b\frac{1+s}{1-\frac{s}{\varkappa^h}}}\right]},$$

then rearrange:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= H(s, s^{DC}) \\ &= (1 - \sigma_b) \left[ \beta p(s, s^{DC}) + \gamma_b \frac{1 + s}{1 - \frac{s}{\varkappa^h}} \right] \left[ \sigma_b p(s, s^{DC}) + \gamma_b \frac{1 + s}{1 - \frac{s}{\varkappa^h}} \right] \\ &- \theta^b (\beta - \sigma_b) \left[ \sigma_b (1 - \beta) p(s, s^{DC}) + (1 - \sigma_b) \gamma_b \frac{1 + s}{1 - \frac{s}{\varkappa^h}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the absence of any taxes or subsidies on digital currency deposits, and in the case where  $s^{DC} = \bar{\mu}^{DC} = 0$ , the fixed management cost of digital currency  $\varkappa^{DC} > 0$  imply that  $\bar{DC} = \bar{x} = 0$ . Thus, we can write the risk premium as:

$$p(s,0) \rightarrow s,$$

and

$$H(s,0) = (1 - \sigma_b) \left[ s\beta + \gamma_b \frac{1+s}{1-\frac{s}{\varkappa^h}} \right] \left[ s\sigma_b + \gamma_b \frac{1+s}{1-\frac{s}{\varkappa^h}} \right] - \theta^b (\beta - \sigma_b) \left[ \sigma_b (1-\beta)s + (1-\sigma_b)\gamma_b \frac{1+s}{1-\frac{s}{\varkappa^h}} \right].$$

We can observe that as  $\gamma_b \to 0$ ,

$$H(s,0) = (1 - \sigma_b)s^2\beta\sigma_b - \theta^b(\beta - \sigma_b)\left[\sigma_b(1 - \beta)s\right]$$
$$\implies s \to \theta^b \frac{(\beta - \sigma_b)(1 - \beta)}{(1 - \sigma_b)\beta}.$$

Thus, there exists a unique steady state equilibrium with positive spread s > 0 for a small enough  $\gamma_b$ .

Given s, we then yield:

$$\bar{z}^k = \frac{1}{\beta}(1+s) - (1-\delta),$$

and since in the steady state MC = 1, we also have:

$$\bar{MC} = \left(\frac{\bar{z}^k}{\alpha}\right)^{\alpha} \left(\frac{\bar{w}}{1-\alpha}\right)^{1-\alpha} = 1$$
$$= \left(\frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{K}}\right)^{\alpha} \left(\frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{L}}\right)^{1-\alpha}$$
$$= \left(\frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{K}}\right)^{\alpha} \left(\frac{\bar{z}^k}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)}{\alpha-1}},$$

with

$$\begin{split} \bar{w} &= (1-\alpha)\frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{L}}, \\ \bar{z}^k &= \alpha\frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{K}}, \\ \implies \bar{w} &= (1-\alpha)\left(\frac{\bar{z}^k}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}. \end{split}$$

Put these together to get:

$$\frac{\bar{K}}{\bar{Y}} = \left(\frac{\bar{z}^k}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha-1}} \\ = \frac{\alpha}{\bar{z}^k}.$$

From the FOCs of the BHH and UHH problem, we have:

$$\bar{w} = \zeta_0^h (\bar{L}^h)^{\zeta},$$
$$\bar{w} = \frac{\zeta_0^u (\bar{L}^u)^{\zeta} (1 + \frac{\alpha_M}{\beta} - \alpha_M)}{\left[C^u - \zeta_0^u \frac{(L^u)^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}\right]}.$$

But since we have that  $\zeta_0^u = \frac{\zeta_0^h}{(1 + \frac{\alpha_M}{\beta} - \alpha_M)}$ , we can write:

$$\bar{w} = \zeta_0^h \bar{L}^\zeta.$$

We can then use our previous expression for  $\bar{w}$  to express  $\bar{L}$  as a function of  $\bar{z}^k$ :

$$\bar{L} = \left[\frac{1-\alpha}{\zeta_0^h} \left(\frac{\bar{z}^k}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}\right]^{\frac{1}{\zeta}}.$$

Since we know that

$$\bar{w} = (1 - \alpha) \frac{Y}{\bar{L}},$$

we yield:

$$\bar{Y} = \frac{\zeta_0^h}{\alpha} \left[ \frac{1 - \alpha}{\zeta_0^h} \left( \frac{\bar{z}^k}{\alpha} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1}} \right]^{\frac{1 + \zeta}{\zeta}}.$$

Additionally, we have:

$$\frac{\bar{I}}{\bar{K}} = \delta,$$

and

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{\beta} &= \frac{\alpha \frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{K}} + 1 - \delta}{1 + \varkappa^h \Gamma_h \frac{\bar{K}^h}{\bar{K}}} \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{\bar{Y}}{\bar{K}} &= \frac{\beta^{-1} \left(1 + s\right) + \delta - 1}{\alpha}, \end{split}$$

from (134), and:

$$\frac{\bar{I}}{\bar{Y}} = \frac{\bar{I}/\bar{K}}{\bar{Y}/\bar{K}} = \frac{\alpha\delta}{\beta^{-1}(1+s) + \delta - 1}.$$

These of course imply:

$$\bar{K} = \left[\frac{1-\alpha}{\zeta_0^h} \left(\frac{\bar{z}^k}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}\right]^{\frac{1+\zeta}{\zeta}} \frac{\zeta_0^h}{\beta^{-1}(1+s) + \delta - 1}$$

With  $\bar{K}$  and s in hand, we can then turn back to the BHH's FOC wrt to equity, (85), to find  $\bar{K}^h$ :

$$\bar{K}^h = \frac{s}{\varkappa^h} \frac{K}{\Gamma_h},$$

and also get  $\bar{K}^b$ :

$$\bar{K}^b = \frac{\bar{K}}{\Gamma_h} - \bar{K}^h.$$

This then gives us  $\overline{N}$  as we already solved  $\overline{\phi}$ :

$$\bar{N} = \frac{\bar{K}^b}{\bar{\phi}}.$$

Then  $\overline{D}$  is also solved as a residual from (24):

$$\bar{D} = \bar{K}^b - \bar{N}.$$

Given  $\overline{Y}$ ,  $\overline{I}$ , and  $\overline{K}$ , we can get  $\overline{C}$ :

$$\frac{\bar{C}}{\bar{Y}} = 1 - \frac{\bar{I}}{\bar{Y}} - \frac{\varkappa^h}{2} (\Gamma_h \bar{K}^h)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{K}}{\bar{Y}}\right)^{-1}.$$

From the UHH's FOC with respect to M, we have:

$$\bar{\mu}^u = \bar{\lambda}^h \left( \frac{1}{\beta} - 1 \right),$$

and the FOC with respect to consumption gives us an expression for the marginal utility from consumption:

$$\bar{\lambda}^h \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha_M}{\beta} - \alpha_M \right).$$

Thus, we can express  $\bar{\lambda}^u$  as a function of the marginal utility from consumption:

$$\frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}^u} = \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_M}{\beta} - \alpha_M\right) \left(\bar{C}^u - \zeta_0^u \frac{(\bar{L}^u)^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}\right),\,$$

noting that because of the values of  $\zeta_0^h$  and  $\zeta_0^u$ , we have:

$$\bar{L}^u = \left(\frac{\bar{w}}{\zeta_0^h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\zeta}}.$$

Finally, much like aggregate digital currency holdings, the BHH will not hold any digital currency holdings in steady state due to the presence of management costs. This means that in steady state:

$$\bar{DC}^h = 0,$$

which, of course, implies:

$$\bar{DC}^u = 0.$$

### A.2.7 Additional Impulse Responses to Shocks

Figures 10 and 11 present results in response to an annualized 1% orthogonal innovation to TFP and cost-push shocks, respectively. Figures compare IRFs for a no-CBDC economy and to an economy with CBDCs.

Figures 12 and 13 show IRFs to a 1 basis point orthogonalized innovation to TFP and cost-push shocks, respectively. Figures compare IRFs between two economies; one with Taylor Rule and one with a Ramsey optimal policy rule.

Figure 10: IRFs to a 1% annualized TFP shock



Figure plots impulse responses of model variables with respect to a 1 % annualized innovation to TFP. Time periods are measured in quarters, and responses are measured as a percent deviation from steady state except for Inflation ( $\pi$ ), Nominal Interest Rates (R), and Digital Currency Returns ( $R^{DC}$ ) which are expressed as annualized net rates.



Figure 11: IRFs to a 1% annualized cost-push shock

Note: Figure plots impulse responses of model variables with respect to a 1 % annualized cost-push shock. Time periods are measured in quarters, and responses are measured as a percent deviation from steady state except for Inflation ( $\pi$ ), Nominal Interest Rates (R), and Digital Currency Returns ( $R^{DC}$ ) which are expressed as annualized net rates.



Figure 12: Optimal policy IRFs to a 1 b.p. TFP shock

Note: Figure plots impulse responses of model variables with respect to a 1 basis point innovation to TFP. Time periods are measured in quarters, and responses are measured as a percent deviation from steady state except for Inflation ( $\pi$ ), Nominal Interest Rates (R), and Digital Currency Returns ( $R^{DC}$ ) which are expressed as annualized net rates.



Figure 13: Optimal policy IRFs to a 1 b.p. cost-push shock

Note: Figure plots impulse responses of model variables with respect to a 1 basis point cost-push shock. Time periods are measured in quarters, and responses are measured as a percent deviation from steady state except for Inflation ( $\pi$ ), Nominal Interest Rates (R), and Digital Currency Returns ( $R^{DC}$ ) which are expressed as annualized net rates.

### A.2.8 Impact of Digital Currency Adjustment Costs

As noted in Section 4.1, as the cost parameter of digital currency holdings,  $\varkappa^{DC} \to 0$ – which can be thought of as the degree of imperfection of digital currency relative to deposits – deposits and digital currency become perfect substitutes and, thus, the importance of  $R^{DC}$  as a distinct policy instrument is attenuated. We perform sensitivity analysis to show how imperfections in design of digital currency influence optimal policy.

In Figures 14 and 15 we illustrate the dynamics of the model with respect to a TFP shock and cost-push shock, respectively, for different levels of  $\varkappa^{DC}$ . We observe that a higher degree of imperfection of digital currency design leads to two distinct consequences: (i) potency of monetary policy to reduce variance of inflation and output is attenuated, (ii) optimal spread between R and  $R^{DC}$  is higher. A higher degree of imperfection of digital currency has direct effect on consumer welfare as the households face higher digital currency adjustment costs.



Figure 14: IRFs to a 1 b.p. TFP shock (low and high  $\varkappa^{DC})$ 



Figure 15: IRFs to a 1 b.p. cost-push shock (low and high  $\varkappa^{DC})$ 







Figure 17: Relative welfare comparisons (% change;  $\varkappa^{DC} = 0.0005$ )

Figure 18: Welfare decomposition, 1% annualized TFP shock  $(\varkappa^{DC}=0.002)$ 





Figure 19: Welfare decomposition, 1% annualized cost-push shock  $(\varkappa^{DC}=0.002)$ 

### A.2.9 Banked Population and CBDC Design

Figure 20: Welfare implications of banked population and CBDC design



Note: The plot shows the welfare implications of different digital currency regimes (with respect to  $\gamma^{DC}$ ) compared to the baseline specification ( $\gamma^{DC} = 1$ ) for different banked population ( $\Gamma_h$ ) compositions.

### A.2.10 Welfare and Optimal Policy

Given the period utility function of the type j household,

$$U_t^j = \ln\left(C_t^j - \zeta_0^j \frac{(L_t^j)^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}\right),\,$$

the second-order Taylor expansion of  $U_t^j$  about the deterministic steady state  $(\bar{C}^j, \bar{L}^j)$ is:

$$\begin{split} U_t^j - \bar{U} &\simeq \bar{U}_C^j \bar{C}^j \left( \frac{C_t^j - \bar{C}^j}{\bar{C}^j} \right) + \bar{U}_L^j \bar{L}^j \left( \frac{L_t^j - \bar{L}^j}{\bar{L}^j} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \bar{U}_{CC}^j (\bar{C}^j)^2 \left( \frac{C_t^j - \bar{C}^j}{\bar{C}^j} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{U}_{LL}^j (\bar{L}^j)^2 \left( \frac{L_t^j - \bar{L}^j}{\bar{L}^j} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \bar{U}_{CL}^j \bar{C}^j \bar{L}^j \left( \frac{C_t^j - \bar{C}^j}{\bar{C}^j} \right) \left( \frac{L_t^j - \bar{L}^j}{\bar{L}^j} \right), \end{split}$$

where we ignore terms independent of policy, and where:

$$\begin{split} \bar{U}_{C}^{j} &= \frac{1}{\bar{C}^{j} - \zeta_{0}^{j} \frac{(\bar{L}^{j})^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}}, \\ \bar{U}_{L}^{j} &= -\frac{\zeta_{0}^{j}}{\bar{C}^{j} - \zeta_{0}^{j} \frac{(\bar{L}^{j})^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}} (\bar{L}^{j})^{\zeta}, \\ \bar{U}_{CC}^{j} &= -\frac{1}{\left(\bar{C}^{j} - \zeta_{0}^{j} \frac{(\bar{L}^{j})^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}\right)^{2}}, \\ \bar{U}_{LL}^{j} &= \frac{-\left(\bar{C}^{j} - \zeta_{0}^{j} \frac{(\bar{L}^{j})^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}\right) \zeta_{0}^{j} \zeta(\bar{L}^{j})^{\zeta-1} - \left(\zeta_{0}^{j} (\bar{L}^{j})^{\zeta}\right)^{2}}{\left(\bar{C}^{j} - \zeta_{0}^{j} \frac{(\bar{L}^{j})^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}\right)^{2}}, \\ \bar{U}_{CL}^{j} &= -\frac{\zeta_{0}^{j}}{\left(\bar{C}^{j} - \zeta_{0}^{j} \frac{(\bar{L}^{j})^{1+\zeta}}{1+\zeta}\right)^{2}} (\bar{L}^{j})^{\zeta}. \end{split}$$

# A.2.11 Stochastic Steady State Transitions due to changes in Macroprudential Policy

In Figure 21 we plot the transition path to a new stochastic steady state after the introduction of permanent subsidy to net worth.<sup>14</sup> On impact, there is an increase in output and consumption, but over time their levels decrease and stabilize at new lower levels. Even though the policy induces higher deterministic steady state of the variables, it increases their volatility and, thus, their levels in stochastic steady state. Finally, we plot the stochastic steady state transition of the tax on equity in Figure 22. As the bank has a lower incentive to hold equity after the policy is introduced, it scales down its liabilities, and deposits and net worth decline sharply on impact. As mentioned, the BHH, however, do not face this tax on their equity

<sup>14.</sup> To improve numerical accuracy of the simulation and calculation of the stochastic steady state, we only consider small changes in  $\tau^N$  and  $\tau^K$  of the order of 0.01%.

and, thus, decrease their deposit holdings and substitute them with digital currency and equity, which manifests in growth of aggregate equity.



Figure 21: Stochastic steady state transition (permanent change to net worth subsidy,  $\tau^N)$ 

Note: Plots show a transition from the baseline stochastic steady state to the new one induced by a permanent change in policy. The change in policy is assumed to happen in period 10 of the simulations.



Figure 22: Stochastic steady state transition (permanent change to tax on bank equity,  $\tau^{K}$ )

Note: This Figure shows a transition from the baseline stochastic steady state to the new one induced by a permanent change in policy. The change in policy is assumed to happen in period 10 of the simulations.