

If the short-term rate  $r(t)$  is taken to be unobservable, there are four coefficients to be estimated:  $\kappa$ ,  $\phi_0$ ,  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$ . From these estimated coefficients we can derive the implied parameters,

$$\text{implied short-term rate: } r(t) = \kappa\phi_0(t), \quad (9)$$

$$\text{yield on a bond with } T \rightarrow \infty: R_L = \kappa\phi_1, \quad (10)$$

$$\text{implied variance of } dr: \sigma^2 = 4\kappa^3\phi_2, \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{risk-adjusted drift rate of } r(t): \mu &\equiv \kappa(m-r) - \lambda\sigma \\ &= (\phi_1 + 2\phi_2)\kappa^2 - \kappa r. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In contrast, Cox et al. (1985b) adopt a specific general-equilibrium approach that allows them to derive both the interest rate dynamics and the corresponding price of risk:

$$dr = \kappa(m-r)dt + \sigma\sqrt{r}dz, \quad (13)$$

$$\lambda(r,t) = \frac{q}{\sigma}\sqrt{r(t)}, \quad (14)$$

where  $q$  is a constant. As a result, the general differential Eq. (2) can be specified as

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial P}{\partial r} [\kappa(m-r) - qr(t)] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial r^2} \sigma^2 r(t) P = 0. \quad (15)$$

With the boundary condition  $P_T(r,T) = 1$  for a maturing discount bond, the solution to Eq. (15) takes the following specific form:

$$P_T(r,t) = \left\{ \frac{\theta_1 e^{\theta_2(T-t)}}{\theta_2 [e^{\theta_1(T-t)} - 1] + \theta_1} \right\}^{\theta_3} \exp \left\{ \frac{-r [e^{\theta_1(T-t)} - 1]}{\theta_2 [e^{\theta_1(T-t)} - 1] + \theta_1} \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where

$$\theta_1 = \sqrt{(\kappa + q)^2 + 2\sigma^2}, \quad (17)$$

$$\theta_2 = (\kappa + q + \theta_1)/2, \quad (18)$$

$$\theta_3 = 2\kappa m / \sigma^2. \quad (19)$$

Also in this model there are four coefficients to be estimated:  $r(t)$ ,  $\theta_1$ ,  $\theta_2$  and  $\theta_3$ . From these estimated coefficients we can derive the implied parameters,

$$\text{yield on a bond with } T \rightarrow \infty: R_L = \theta_3(\theta_1 - \theta_2), \quad (20)$$

$$\text{implied variance of } dr: \sigma^2 r(t) = 2\theta_2(\theta_1 - \theta_2)r(t), \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{risk-adjusted drift rate of } r(t): \mu &\equiv \kappa(m-r) - qr(t) \\ &= \theta_3\sigma^2/2 - (2\theta_2 - \theta_1)r(t). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The cubic spline model<sup>4</sup>, finally, is a purely descriptive model without economic foundations. The term structure function consists of a concatenation of a number of third-degree polynomials, spliced together at  $n$  "knot points",  $s_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , in a way that ensures continuity in the levels as well as the first and second derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned} P_T(r,t) &= 1 + a_i(T-t) + b_i(T-t)^2 + c_i(T-t)^3 \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^n d_{t,i} [\text{Max}\{T - (t + s_i), 0\}]^3. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Usually one selects two knot points — in this study,  $s_1 = 2$  years and  $s_2 = 4$  years — which implies there are five free parameters in the spline model. As will be illustrated below, in the daily cross-sectional estimations the five-parameter spline tends to produce a better fit than the Vasicek or CIR models. This better fit may stem from two sources: first, this spline has one more free parameter, and second, it imposes less restrictions on the shape of the discount function than the other two models. To be able to sort out the relative importance of each explanation, we

from the four obtained with

## 2.2. Data and

The complete BEF interbank Obligations, or procedure.

Like Franc tranches rather than identical term tranches issues than the number. However, for advantages re contrast, the expensive to the corporations. I for OLOs that Third, the coupon OLOs more commonly more actively in a market. In call auction or straight bonds more short-lived

Daily OLO March 27, 1999 *Economische Tijdschrift* thin-trading day of our sample ranging from all with times to report results for few days after the Exchange Rate