

Protecting Pegged Currency Markets from Speculative Investors

Eyal Neuman*

Alexander Schied**

March 28, 2020

Abstract

We consider a stochastic game between a trader and a central bank in a target zone market with a lower currency peg. This currency peg is maintained by the central bank through the generation of permanent price impact, thereby aggregating an ever increasing risky position in foreign reserves. We describe this situation mathematically by means of two coupled singular control problems, where the common singularity arises from a local time along a random curve. Our first result identifies a certain local time as that central bank strategy for which this risk position is minimized. We then consider the worst-case situation the central bank may face by identifying that strategy of the strategic investor that maximizes the expected inventory of the central bank under a cost criterion, thus establishing a Stackelberg equilibrium in our model.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: 93E20, 91G80, 60J55

Key words: currency peg, market impact, target zone models, singular stochastic control, local time, Stackelberg equilibrium

1 Introduction

In September 16 of 1992, a day which is known as the Black Wednesday, the British government was forced to step out of the European Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM). Shortly before this crucial date, the British pound exchange rate was close to its lower limit, and currency market speculators were trying to take advantage of this opportunity to “drop” the exchange rate by making immense short orders. Among the speculators stood out George Soros who shorted 10 billion pounds within a single day. The British treasury kept spending its foreign currency during that day, in order to buy British pounds, which were becoming less valuable, as the exchange rate was rapidly decreasing. The Guardian wrote that “40 per cent of Britain’s foreign exchange reserves were spent in frenetic trading” [9]. Also an announcement to raise interest rates to 15%

*Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, SW7 2AZ London, United Kingdom

**Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Waterloo. E-mail: alex.schied@gmail.com. This author gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) through grant RGPIN-2017-04054.

did not help. By the end of the day, the British government could not keep up with the purchases and announced an exit from the ERM. As a result, the exchange rate dropped substantially (see Figure 1) and the short positions of Soros and the speculators surged in value. In one day, George Soros made over 1 billion Sterling. On the other hand, the cost for the British taxpayers was estimated at around 3.3 billion Sterling.

A similar situation occurred during the EUR/CHF currency peg, which was maintained by the Swiss National Bank (SNB) from September 6, 2011 to January 15, 2015. Here, however, the roles between the foreign and domestic currencies were reversed, as euro investors scared by the European sovereign debt crisis were seeking a safe haven in the Swiss franc, thus driving up its value in comparison with the euro. In maintaining the currency peg, the SNB accumulated an ever increasing inventory, which in January 2015 stood at an amount equal to about 70% of the Swiss GDP; see Figure 2. When the SNB finally abandoned the currency peg, the Swiss franc appreciated dramatically, and the FX inventory incurred a loss equal to about 12% of the Swiss GDP [15].

The goal of this work is to describe such situations mathematically and to analyze the worst-case scenario a central bank may be facing when keeping up a currency peg. For simplicity, we focus on the situation in which the central bank tries to prevent an over-appreciation of the domestic currency, as it was the case during the EUR/CHF currency peg. By switching signs and replacing long with short positions, one can easily see that our results also apply to the reversed situation as found, e.g., during the above-described exit of the British pound from the ERM. We model the system of a speculative investor versus the central bank or government as a Stackelberg equilibrium within a stochastic differential game. One player, the central bank, enforces the currency peg, thereby generating an ever increasing risky position in foreign currency. This position will incur dramatic losses once the currency peg is abandoned. The other player is a strategic investor whose strategy is aimed at increasing the central bank's risky position, in an attempt to force the central bank to terminate of the currency peg.

Our first result identifies a central bank strategy that, for all strategies of the strategic investor, minimizes the accumulated FX inventory. Implementing this strategy will turn the exchange rate process into a reflecting diffusion process. As a byproduct, we thus give an endogenous justification for the common approach of modelling pegged currency markets as reflecting diffusions (for such approaches, see, e.g., [2, 17] and the references therein). Then we formulate an optimization problem for the strategic investor, who wishes to maximize the expected inventory of the central bank minus a trading cost term by implementing a worst-case trading strategy. We give an explicit solution to this problem and thereby establish a Stackelberg equilibrium between our two players.

Pegged exchange rates, also called *target zone models*, have previously been studied in a wide range of contexts. For the corresponding economics literature, see [14, 19, 4, 11, 2], among others. Another stream of literature studies the central bank's problem in a setup of impulse control [10, 13]. For two-sided target zones, i.e., exchange rates with both upper and lower currency pegs, one can use this approach to identify optimal peg levels [16, 7, 8]. Yet, a third stream of literature studied optimal portfolio liquidation problems for investors who are active in an exogenously given target zone [17, 3]. Finally, an optimal central bank strategy in a two-sided target zone is derived in [18].




Figure 1: Plot of the GBP/DEM exchange rate from January 1, 1992 to December 31, 1992. On September 16, 1992, the British government announced an exit from the European Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM) in which the exchange rate was pegged at 2.78. A rapid drop of the exchange rate followed.




Figure 2: EUR/CHF exchange rate (blue) and Swiss FX reserves (orange) during the time of the Swiss currency peg from September 2011 through January 2015. A rapid increase of the exchange rate followed the announcement of the currency peg, whereas the rate dropped substantially after termination.

2 Model setup and main results

We consider a model for the exchange rate between two currencies subject to a lower currency peg $c > 0$. The exchange rate describes the price of one unit of foreign currency in terms of units of the domestic currency. The function of the lower currency peg is to keep the exchange rate above the threshold c and thus to prevent an over-valuation of the domestic currency. Such currency pegs are frequently observed on financial markets. Our reference example is the lower EUR/CHF currency peg of 1.20 CHF, which was maintained by the Swiss National Bank (SNB) from September 6, 2011, to January 15, 2015; see Figure 2. By switching the roles taken by the foreign and domestic currencies, one can see that our approach will also apply to upper currency pegs such as the GBP/DEM peg within the European Exchange Rate Mechanism. To some extent, it will also apply to two-sided pegs for which one of the two barriers is under attack.

Let $T > 0$ be a given time horizon and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}, P)$ be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions and supporting a standard Brownian motion W . We suppose that in the absence of any large-investor intervention the exchange rate \tilde{S} above the threshold c is given by a Bachelier model,

$$\tilde{S}_t = S_0 + \sigma W_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (2.1)$$

where S_0 and σ are two positive constants. This unaffected exchange rate process will be impacted by the price impact components of two types of “big players”. One of these “big players” models the central bank of the domestic currency, which will intervene so as to keep the exchange rate above the threshold c . The second impact component will stand for a strategic investor, for the accumulated price impact of a group of such investors, or simply for a strong macroeconomic trend pushing the exchange rate toward the threshold c . We may therefore expect that the actual exchange rate process will stay in close proximity of c , and so the assumption of a constant volatility in (2.1) is natural from a modeling perspective and clearly not an oversimplification.

The strategy of the strategic investor over the time interval $[0, T]$ is described through the trading speed $\{v_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ in a linear, continuous-time Almgren–Chriss model [1], so that $X_t = \int_0^t v_s ds$ is the accumulated inventory after trading over the time interval $[0, t]$. We assume that v_t is progressively measurable and satisfies

$$E \left[\int_0^T v_s^2 ds \right] < \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

By \mathcal{V} we denote the class of all such controls v . In the Almgren–Chriss model, the permanent price impact generated at time t by the strategy $v \in \mathcal{V}$ is of the form $\gamma \int_0^t v_s ds$ where $\gamma > 0$ is the permanent impact parameter. Thus, the exchange rate process before central bank intervention is of the form

$$\bar{S}_t^v := \tilde{S}_t + \gamma \int_0^t v_s dr. \quad (2.3)$$

If the exchange rate comes too close to the threshold c , the central bank will have to intervene so as to defend the currency peg. The two main instruments at the disposal of the central bank are:

- (a) lowering the domestic reference interest rate;

(b) generating price impact by selling the domestic currency and buying the foreign currency.

Method (a) is difficult to implement and may have substantial side effects. As a matter of fact, in our reference example of the EUR/CHF currency peg, the SNB used this instrument only once during the duration of the currency peg: On December 18, 2014, i.e., less than one month before the abandonment of the currency peg, the SNB decreased its 3-months Libor target range from $[0.0\%, 0.25\%]$ to $[-0.75\%, -0.25\%]$. Although this decision made headlines by introducing a regime of strictly negative interest rates, one can see from Figure 2 that it had no visible effect on the exchange rate, which increased from 1.2010 on December 17 to a mere 1.2039 on December 18. Also, during the “breaking of the bank of England”, announcing a dramatic increase of interest rates to the level of 15% had no effect [9]. For this reason, we will ignore interest rates in our setup and focus exclusively on central bank intervention through the generation of price impact.

Next we describe the response of the central bank. Let R_t^v be the permanent price impact generated by the response strategy of the central bank. Then we must have that

$$S_t^{v,R^v} := \tilde{S}_t + \gamma \int_0^t v_s dr + R_t^v \geq c, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T], \quad P - \text{a.s.} \quad (2.4)$$

Moreover, the response R^v must be adapted to (\mathcal{F}_t) . Since the response R_t^v is generated by permanent price impact, it is the result of the cumulative purchase of $Y_t^v := \frac{1}{\gamma} R_t^v$ units of the foreign currency by the central bank. In other words, Y_t^v is the inventory in foreign currency the central bank has accumulated during $[0, t]$ in its efforts to maintain the currency peg. As for the strategic investor’s strategy, we could insist that Y_t^v is absolutely continuous in t , but since central banks typically face less restrictions on transaction costs than regular investors, we will only assume that $t \mapsto Y_t^v(\omega)$ is continuous and nondecreasing for P -a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$. At first glance, the monotonicity assumption is not intuitive, but it was basically satisfied during the EUR/CHF currency peg, as can be seen from Figure 2, where the orange line represents the development of the Swiss FX reserves¹. As a matter of fact, the monotonicity assumption actually appears natural when realizing that it may difficult politically for a central bank to unload inventory during a currency peg, as this will lower the exchange rate and thus might be perceived as acting against national interest. This argument will apply in particular, but not exclusively, to an export-driven economy such as Switzerland’s. Given $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we introduce the class

$$\mathcal{Y}(v) := \{Y \mid Y \text{ is adapted, continuous, nondecreasing, and satisfies (2.4)}\}. \quad (2.5)$$

The inventory accumulated through a strategy $Y \in \mathcal{Y}(v)$ can be problematic for the central bank. This was obviously the case during “the breaking of the Bank of England” by the investor George Soros, albeit of course with an inverted sign: According to [9], it was estimated that “40 per cent of Britain’s foreign exchange reserves were spent in frenetic trading”. For our EUR/CHF reference example, we can observe from Figure 2 that the abandonment of the Swiss currency peg was preceded by another surge in FX inventory by about 100 billion euros. The total FX inventory

¹The small fluctuations that can be seen in that plot may even stem from other sources than from an unloading of inventory by the SNB. They may be due to value fluctuations of reserves held in other currencies than EUR or from fluctuations due to international trade.

stood then at 480 billion euros, an amount about equal to 70% of the Swiss GDP.² Following the abandonment of the currency peg on January 15, 2015, the inventory of the Swiss National bank (SNB) lost about CHF 78 billion of its value, which was about 12% of the Swiss GDP; see [15]. Based on these observations, it is natural for the central bank to adopt a strategy that minimizes the accumulated inventory over all strategies in $\mathcal{Y}(v)$. The following theorem states that this goal can be achieved for any $v \in \mathcal{V}$ based on the Skorokhod map.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that $S_0 = z > c$. For any $v \in \mathcal{V}$ there exists a unique element in $Y^{*,v} \in \mathcal{Y}(v)$ that is minimal in the sense that $Y_t^{*,v} \leq Y_t^v$ for all for all $t \in [0, T]$ P -a.s., for all $Y^v \in \mathcal{Y}(v)$. Moreover, it is given by*

$$Y_t^{*,v} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\max_{0 \leq r \leq t} \{c - \bar{S}_r^v\} \right)_+, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (2.6)$$

where \bar{S}^v is as in (2.3) and $(x)_+ = \max\{0, x\}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. For $Y_t^{*,v}$ as in (2.6) define

$$S_t^v := \bar{S}_t^v + \gamma Y_t^{*,v} \geq c, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.7)$$

Note that S_t^v is the Skorokhod map of the continuous semimartingale \bar{S}^v . The minimality of $Y^{*,v}$ thus follows from the minimality property of the solution $(S^v, \gamma Y^{*,v})$ to the Skorokhod problem (see, e.g., Remark 6.15 in [12]). \square

When comparing the result of Theorem 2.1 with Figure 2, we see that the Swiss FX reserves increased in a way that is indeed close to the local time of the EUR/CHF exchange rate. The reserves increased steeply during the two periods in mid 2012 and at the end of 2014, when the exchange rate stayed in the immediate vicinity of the lower threshold 1.20. On the other hand, they hardly changed at all between those two periods. This is even true for the short period toward the end of 2012, when the exchange rate was below 1.21 but did not quite hit the barrier.

Theorem 2.1 has also the following theoretical significance: Exogenously given pegged exchange rate processes are often modeled by means of reflected diffusion processes; see, e.g., [2, 17] and the references therein. Our Theorem 2.1 now shows that exactly such a model arises endogenously as solution to an optimal central bank strategy.

Now we turn toward the optimization problem of the strategic investor. Recall that this strategic investor can also stand for a group of investors or for a macroeconomic trend in the market. In our EUR/CHF example, it could stand for the cumulative trend of euro investors seeking a safe haven in the Swiss franc during the European sovereign debt crisis. Our goal is to identify the worst-case scenario with which the central bank has to reckon when keeping up a (one-sided) currency peg. To this end, the goal of the strategic investor will consist in maximizing the future expected inventory $E[Y_T^{*,v}]$ of the central bank in an attempt to force the central bank to abandon the target zone. Here, $Y^{*,v}$ is the optimal response from Theorem 2.1. According to the linear Almgren–Chriss model, the investor’s trading strategy v creates transaction costs,

²See also the article *Why the Swiss unpegged the franc*, published on January 18, 2015 in The Economist.

sometimes also called “slippage”, proportional to $\int_0^T v_t^2 dt$. These costs arise, e.g., from short-term price impact effects and from the need to increase the proportion of market vs. limit orders in a strategy with high trading speed. We therefore assume that, for a certain constant $\kappa > 0$, the goal of the investor is to

$$\text{maximize} \quad E \left[\gamma Y_T^{*,v} - \kappa \int_0^T v_t^2 dt \right] \quad \text{over } v \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (2.8)$$

Our main result provides a solution to the preceding problem of stochastic optimal control in terms of a solution to a Skorokhod SDE, and thus establishes a Stackelberg equilibrium in our stochastic differential game between trader and central bank.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that $S_0 = z > c$ and let $\beta = \gamma^2 / (2\kappa\sigma^2)$ and*

$$U(t, z) := \frac{1}{\beta} \log \left(E \left[\exp \left(\sigma \beta L_t^{(z-c)/\sigma}(W) \right) \right] \right), \quad z \geq 0, \quad (2.9)$$

where $L_t^x(W)$ is the local time of the Brownian motion W at level $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we have

$$U(t, z) = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} E \left[\gamma Y_t^{*,v} - \kappa \int_0^t v_s^2 ds \right] \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T].$$

Moreover, $U(t, z)$ is smooth on $[0, T] \times [c, \infty) \setminus \{(0, c)\}$ and when letting

$$\bar{v}(t, z) := \frac{\gamma}{2\kappa} \partial_z U(t, z), \quad (2.10)$$

then there exists a unique strong solution to the following SDE with reflection,

$$\begin{cases} dS_t = \sigma dW_t + \gamma \bar{v}(T-t, S_t) dt + dR_t, \\ S_t \geq c, \\ S_0 = z, \\ R_t \text{ is continuous, nondecreasing, and } \int_0^T \mathbb{1}_{\{S_t > c\}} dR_t = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

Then $v^* := \bar{v}(T-t, S_t)$ belongs to \mathcal{V} and is an optimal strategy for the strategic investor with time horizon T . Finally, the corresponding optimal central bank response (2.6) is given by $Y^{*v^*} = \frac{1}{\gamma} R$.

Remark 2.3. From Formula 1.3.3 on p. 161 in [5] we get a closed-form expression for U ,

$$U(t, z) = \frac{1}{\beta} \log \left(\operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{z-c}{\sigma\sqrt{2t}} \right) + e^{-\beta(z-c)+\beta^2\sigma^2 t/2} \left[1 - \operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{z-c}{\sigma\sqrt{2t}} - \frac{\beta\sigma\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right] \right), \quad (2.12)$$

where $\operatorname{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-y^2} dy$ is the Gaussian error function. It follows that

$$\bar{v}(t, z) = - \frac{\gamma e^{\frac{1}{2}\beta^2\sigma^2 t} \left(\operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{c+\beta\sigma^2 t-z}{\sqrt{2}\sigma\sqrt{t}} \right) + 1 \right)}{2\kappa e^{\frac{1}{2}\beta^2\sigma^2 t} \left(\operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{c+\beta\sigma^2 t-z}{\sqrt{2}\sigma\sqrt{t}} \right) + 1 \right) + e^{\beta(z-c)} \operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{z-c}{\sqrt{2}\sigma\sqrt{t}} \right)}. \quad (2.13)$$

See Figure 3 for plots of $U(t, z)$ and $v^*(t, z)$.




Figure 3: The value function $U(t, z)$ (left) and the function $\bar{v}(t, z)$ (right) for $\sigma = \gamma = \kappa = 1$ and $c = 0$




Figure 4: Solution of the reflecting SDE (2.11) (black), optimal central bank response, R (gray, nondecreasing), and optimal investor strategy, v^* (gray, lower trajectory), for $\sigma = \gamma = \kappa = 1$, $c = 0$, and $T = 2$. We used 1 million time steps for our simulation.

3 Proof of Theorem 2.2

Proposition 3.1. *The function U satisfies the following partial differential equation,*

$$\partial_t U(t, z) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \partial_{zz} U(t, z) + \frac{\gamma^2}{4\kappa} (\partial_z U(t, z))^2, \quad \text{in } (0, T] \times [c, \infty), \quad (3.1)$$

with boundary condition

$$\partial_z U(t, c) = -1, \quad t \in (0, T]. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Let

$$\psi(t, x) := \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{\sigma\sqrt{2t}}\right) + e^{-\beta x + \beta^2 \sigma^2 t/2} \left[1 - \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x}{\sigma\sqrt{2t}} - \frac{\beta\sigma\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\right].$$

For $t > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \psi(t, x) &= \frac{\beta\sigma}{\sqrt{2\pi t}} e^{-x^2/(2t\sigma^2)} + \frac{\beta\sigma}{2} e^{(x-t\beta\sigma^2)^2/(2t\sigma^2)} \left[1 - \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x - \beta\sigma^2 t}{\sigma\sqrt{2t}}\right)\right], \\ \partial_x \psi(t, x) &= -\beta e^{-\beta x + \beta^2 \sigma^2 t/2} \left[1 - \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{x - \beta\sigma^2 t}{\sigma\sqrt{2t}}\right)\right], \\ \partial_{xx} \psi(t, x) &= \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \partial_t \psi(t, x). \end{aligned}$$

From (2.12) we have $U(t, z) = \frac{1}{\beta} \log \psi(t, z - c)$. It follows that

$$\partial_t U(t, z) = \frac{\partial_t \psi(t, z - c)}{\beta \psi(t, z - c)}, \quad \partial_z U(t, z) = \frac{\partial_x \psi(t, z - c)}{\beta \psi(t, z - c)}. \quad (3.3)$$

In particular,

$$\partial_z U(t, c) = \frac{\partial_x \psi(t, 0)}{\beta \psi(t, 0)} = -1.$$

Next, the second z -derivative of U corresponds to

$$\partial_{zz} U(t, z) = \frac{\partial_{xx} \psi(t, z - c)}{\beta \psi(t, z - c)} - \beta \left(\frac{\partial_x \psi(t, z - c)}{\beta \psi(t, z - c)}\right)^2.$$

Plugging everything together yields the assertion. \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2 Recall that $S_0 = z > c$ and define $V(t, z)$ to be the trader's value function from (2.8), that is

$$V(t, z) := \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} E \left[\gamma Y_t^{*,v} - \kappa \int_0^t v_s^2 ds \right].$$

In a first step, we show that $V(t, z)$ is equal to the right-hand side of (2.9). To this end, recall that $\beta = \gamma^2/(2\kappa\sigma^2)$ and use (2.1), (2.3) and (2.6) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
-\beta V(t, z) &= \inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} E \left[-\beta Y_t^{*,v} + \beta \kappa \int_0^t v_s^2 ds \right] \\
&= \inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} E \left[-\beta \left(\max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \{c - \bar{S}_t^v\} \right)_+ + \frac{\gamma^2}{2\sigma^2} \int_0^t v_s^2 ds \right] \\
&= \inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} E \left[-\beta \sigma \left(\max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left\{ \frac{c-z}{\sigma} - W_s - \int_0^s \left(\frac{\gamma}{\sigma} v_r \right) dr \right\} \right)_+ + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \left(\frac{\gamma}{\sigma} v_s \right)^2 ds \right] \\
&= \inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} E \left[-\beta \sigma \left(\max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left\{ \frac{c-z}{\sigma} - W_s - \int_0^s v_r dr \right\} \right)_+ + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t v_s^2 ds \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $v \in \mathcal{V}$ if and only if $\frac{\gamma}{\sigma}v \in \mathcal{V}$ in the last equality. Define

$$F\left(W_s + \int_0^s v_r dr\right) = -\beta \sigma \left(\max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left\{ \frac{c-z}{\sigma} - W_s - \int_0^s v_r dr \right\} \right)_+.$$

Clearly the functional $F(\cdot)$ is bounded from above by 0, so we can use the Boue-Dupuis variational formula (Theorem 5.1 from [6]) to get that the trader's value function is given by

$$V(t, z) = \frac{1}{\beta\gamma} \log \left(E \left[\exp \left(\left(\beta \sigma \max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left\{ \frac{c-z}{\sigma} - W_s \right\} \right)_+ \right) \right] \right), \quad z \geq 0.$$

Since $\left(\max_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left\{ \frac{c-z}{\sigma} - W_s \right\} \right)_+$ and $L_t^{(c-z)/\sigma}(W)$ have the same law under P , we get (2.9).

We write $S^{v,z}$ for the reflected semimartingale in (2.7), with $S_0 = z > c$ and with a given $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Itô's formula and an application of Proposition 3.1 give that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, t)$

$$\begin{aligned}
U(\varepsilon, S_t^{v,z}) &= U(t, z) + \sigma \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \partial_z U(t-r, S_r^{v,z}) dW_r + \gamma \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \partial_z U(t-r, c) dY_r^{*,v} \\
&\quad + \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \left(-\partial_t U(t-r, S_r^{v,z}) + \gamma v(r) \partial_z U(t-r, S_r^{v,z}) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \partial_{zz} U(t-r, S_r^{v,z}) \right) dr \\
&= U(t, z) + \sigma \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \partial_z U(t-r, S_r^{v,z}) dW_r - \gamma Y_t^{*,v} \\
&\quad + \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \left(\gamma v_r \partial_z U(t-r, S_r^{v,z}) - \frac{\gamma^2}{4\kappa} (\partial_z U(t-r, S_r^{v,z}))^2 \right) dr \\
&\leq U(t, z) + \sigma \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \partial_z U(t-r, S_r^{v,z}) dW_r - \gamma Y_t^{*,v} + \kappa \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} v_r^2 dr, \tag{3.4}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (3.3) that $\partial_z U$ is bounded, and so $\sigma \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} \partial_z U(t-r, S_r^{v,z}) dW_r$ is a true P -martingale. Taking expectations hence gives

$$U(t, z) \geq E[U(\varepsilon, S_t^{v,z})] + E[\gamma Y_{t-\varepsilon}^{*,v}] - E\left[\kappa \int_0^{t-\varepsilon} v_r^2 dr\right].$$

Using that $U(\varepsilon, \cdot) \rightarrow 0$ boundedly as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ and monotone convergence for the two rightmost expectations yields

$$U(t, z) \geq E\left[\gamma Y_t^{*,v} - \kappa \int_0^t v_r^2 dr\right]. \tag{3.5}$$

Taking the supremum over $v \in \mathcal{V}$ shows the inequality “ \geq ” in Theorem 2.2.

Now we consider the reflecting SDE (2.11). To this end, we note first that, on any domain $[\varepsilon, T] \times [c, \infty]$ with $\varepsilon \in (0, T)$, the function $\bar{v}(t, z)$ is bounded and satisfies a global Lipschitz condition in z . Next, we define

$$\Gamma_t f := f(t) + \max_{0 \leq r \leq t} \{c - f(r)\}, \quad f \in C[0, T].$$

Since Γ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the supremum norm, there exists for any $\varepsilon \in (0, T)$ a unique strong solution to the SDE

$$d\bar{S}_t = \sigma dW_t + \gamma \bar{v}(T - t, \Gamma_t \bar{S}) dt, \quad \bar{S}_0 = z, \quad (3.6)$$

on the time interval $[0, T - \varepsilon]$. Uniqueness implies that this solution extends to $[0, T)$, and since \bar{v} is bounded and non-positive, the limit $\bar{S}_T := \lim_{t \uparrow T} \bar{S}_t$ exists and is finite. That is, the SDE (3.6) admits a unique strong solution on $[0, T]$. When letting $v_t^* := \bar{v}(T - t, \Gamma_t \bar{S})$, then $v^* \in \mathcal{V}$ and \bar{S} is equal to the process \bar{S}^{v^*} from (2.3). Moreover,

$$S_t^{v^*} := \bar{S}_t^{v^*} + \left(\max_{0 \leq r \leq t} \{c - \bar{S}_r^{v^*}\} \right)_+ = \Gamma_t \bar{S}^{v^*}$$

clearly solves the reflecting SDE (2.11) for $R_t = \left(\max_{0 \leq r \leq t} \{c - \bar{S}_r^{v^*}\} \right)_+$. Finally, with this choice of v^* , we have an equality in (3.4) and hence in (3.5). This concludes the proof. \square

Acknowledgments

We are very grateful to Amarjit Budhiraja whose numerous useful comments enabled us to significantly improve this paper.

References

- [1] R. Almgren. Optimal execution with nonlinear impact functions and trading-enhanced risk. *Applied Mathematical Finance*, 10:1–18, 2003.
- [2] C. Ball and A. Roma. Detecting mean reversion within reflecting barriers: application to the European Exchange Rate Mechanism. *Applied Mathematical Finance*, 5(1):1–15, 1998.
- [3] C. Belak, J. Muhle-Karbe, and K. Ou. Liquidation in target zone models. *Market Microstructure and Liquidity*, 4:1950010, 2018.
- [4] G. Bertola and R. J. Caballero. Target zones and realignments. *The American Economic Review*, 82(3):pp. 520–536, 1992.
- [5] A. N. Borodin and P. Salminen. *Handbook of Brownian motion—facts and formulae*. Probability and its Applications. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 2002.

- [6] M. Boue and P. Dupuis. A variational representation for certain functionals of brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.*, 26(4):1641–1659, 1998.
- [7] A. Cadenillas and F. Zapatero. Optimal central bank intervention in the foreign exchange market. *Journal of Economic theory*, 87(1):218–242, 1999.
- [8] A. Cadenillas and F. Zapatero. Classical and impulse stochastic control of the exchange rate using interest rates and reserves. *Mathematical Finance*, 10(2):141–156, 2000.
- [9] L. Elliot, W. Hutton, and J. Wolf. September 17 1992: Pound drops out of ERM. *The Guardian*, September 17, 1992.
- [10] M. Jeanblanc-Picqué. Impulse control method and exchange rate. *Mathematical Finance*, 3(2):161–177, 1993.
- [11] F. D. Jong. A univariate analysis of EMS exchange rates using a target zone model. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 9(1):pp. 31–45, 1994.
- [12] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1991.
- [13] R. Korn. Optimal impulse control when control actions have random consequences. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 22(3):639–667, 1997.
- [14] P. R. Krugman. Target zones and exchange rate dynamics. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(3):669–682, 1991.
- [15] S. Lleo and W. T. Ziemba. The Swiss Black Swan unpegging bad scenario: The losers and the winners. In J. John B. Guerard, editor, *Portfolio Construction, Measurement, and Efficiency: Essays in Honor of Jack Treynor*, pages 389–420. Springer, 2017.
- [16] G. Mundaca and B. Øksendal. Optimal stochastic intervention control with application to the exchange rate. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 2(29):225–243, 1998.
- [17] E. Neuman and A. Schied. Optimal portfolio liquidation in target zone models and catalytic superprocesses. *Finance Stoch.*, 20(2):495–509, 2016.
- [18] E. Neuman, A. Schied, C. Weng, and X. Xue. A central bank strategy for defending a currency target zone. *SSRN working paper 3497807*, 2019.
- [19] L. E. O. Svensson. The term structure of interest rate differentials in a target zone: Theory and Swedish data. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 28(1):87–116, 1991.