## Introduction


#### Abstract

This chapter discusses how changes in exchange rates can lead to an increase in uncertainty about income from operations in foreign countries or from trading with foreign firms. Shifts in foreign exchange rates have the potential to undermine the competitive position of the firm and destroy profits. This chapter describes some of the techniques used to reduce the risk associated with business dealings outside the home base.


## Case study 21.1

## What a difference a few percentage point moves on the exchange rate make

Until autumn 1992 sterling was a member of the European exchange rate mechanism (ERM), which meant the extent it could move in value vis-à-vis the other currencies in the ERM was severely limited. Then came 'Black Wednesday' when in order to prop up the value of sterling the UK government increased bank base rates to 15 percent and instructed the Bank of England to buy billions of pounds to offset the selling pressure in the markets. It was all to no avail. The pound fell out of ERM, the government gave up the fight, and by the end of the year $£ 1$ could only buy you about DM2.35 compared with DM2.90 in the summer (a 19 percent decline).

George Soros was one of the speculators who recognized economic gravity when he saw it, and bet the equivalent of $\$ 10 \mathrm{bn}$ against sterling by buying other currencies. After the fall the money held in other currencies could be converted back to make $\$ 1$ bn in just a few days. He was dubbed the man who 'broke the Bank of England'. While this was not exactly true, he and others did cause severe embarrassment.

When sterling was highly valued against other currencies exporters found life very difficult because, to the foreign buyer, British goods appeared expensive - every DM, franc or guilder bought few pounds. However in the four years following 'Black Wednesday' UK exporters had a terrific boost and helped pull the economy out of recession as overseas customers bought more goods. Other European companies, on the other hand, complained bitterly. The French government was prompted by its hard-pressed importers to ask for compensation from the European Commission for the 'competitive devaluations by their neighbours'. Then things turned around. Between 1996 and 2001 the pound rose against most currencies. For example, whereas you could buy only DM2.2 at the beginning of 1996 by 2001 you could buy DM3.09 for every pound. Looked at from the German importers' viewpoint UK goods relative to domestic goods rose in price by something of the order of 30-40 percent.

UK firms lined up to speak of the enormous impact the high pound was having on profits. British Steel (Corus) cut thousands of jobs in response to sterling's rise and started losing money at an alarming rate. It also passed on the pain by telling 700 of its UK suppliers to cut prices.

James Dyson, the vacuum cleaner entrepreneur, announced in 2000 that he was planning to build a factory in East Asia rather than Britain because of the strength of the pound. In the previous year Dyson had made a loss on its $£ 60 \mathrm{~m}$ of exports. The Japanese car makers, Toyota, Honda and Nissan, which had established plants in Britain, complained bitterly about the high level of the pound. Their factories were set up to export cars. They were hurt by
having to reduce prices and also by their commitment to buy 70 percent of components from UK suppliers (continental European suppliers benefited from a 30-40 percent price advantage because of the high pound).

Then things turned around again. The euro shot up against the pound over the period 2002 to 2004. European companies had a very hard time trying to export, particularly into the US market because the dollar had declined against the euro by around 30 percent making European goods 30 percent more expensive in the eyes of US consumers. Worse, US exporters could compete against their European rivals more effectively when selling to countries in Asia and elsewhere because of the rise in the euro. EADS, the company that holds 80 percent of Airbus, in 2004 announced that the weakness of the dollar could wipe out $€ 3$ billion off profit. All commercial jet revenues are booked in dollars, while 50 percent of its cost base is in euros. As a way of coping it is considering sourcing more inputs from dollar zone countries and the relocation of manufacturing for new products; these moves could have profound effects on employment in continental Europe and the UK (e.g. British Aerospace supplies wings to Airbus).

The message from the ups and downs of sterling and other currencies in the last dozen years is that foreign exchange shifts and the management of the associated risk are not issues to be separated and put into a box marked 'for the attention of the finance specialists only'. The profound implications for jobs, competitiveness, national economic growth and firms' survival mean that all managers need to be aware of the consequences of foreign exchange rate movements and of how to prepare the firm to cope with them.

## The impact of currency rate changes on the firm

Shifts in the value of foreign exchange, from now on to be referred to as simply 'forex' (FOReign EXchange), ${ }^{1}$ can impact on various aspects of a firm's activities:

■ Income to be received from abroad For example, if a UK firm has exported goods to Canada on six months' credit terms, payable in Canadian dollars (C\$), it is uncertain as to the number of pounds it will actually receive because the dollar could move against the pound in the intervening period.

- The amount actually paid for imports at some future date For example, a Japanese firm importing wood from the USA may have a liability to pay dollars a few months later. The quantity of yen ( $¥$ ) it will have to use to exchange for the dollars at that point in the future is uncertain at the time the deal is struck.
■ The valuation of foreign assets and liabilities In today's globalized marketplace many firms own assets abroad and incur liabilities in foreign currencies. The value of these in home-currency terms can change simply because of forex movements.
- The long-term viability of foreign operations The long-term future returns of subsidiaries located in some countries can be enhanced by a favorable forex change. On the other hand firms can be destroyed if they are operating in the wrong currency at the wrong time.
- The acceptability, or otherwise, of an overseas investment project When evaluating the value-creating potential of major new investments a firm must be aware that the likely future currency changes can have a significant effect on estimated NPV.

In summary, fluctuating exchange rates create risk, and badly managed risk can lead to a loss of shareholder wealth.

## Volatility in foreign exchange

Figures 21.1 and 21.2 show the extent to which forex rates can move even over a period as short as a few weeks -5 or 10 percent point shifts are fairly common.

In the mid-1970s a regime of (generally) floating exchange rates replaced the fixed exchange-rate system that had been in place since the 1940s. Today most currencies fluctuate against each other, at least to some extent.

If a UK firm holds dollars or assets denominated in dollars and the value of the dollar rises against the pound a forex profit is made. Conversely, should the pound rise relative to the dollar, a forex loss will be incurred. These potential

FIGURE 21.1
Exchange-rate movements, UK£ to US\$, March 1989-March 2004 (monthly)
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gains or losses can be very large. For example, between March 1992 and February 1993 the dollar appreciated by 17.8 percent against the pound so you could have made a large gain by holding dollars even before the money was put to use, say, earning interest. In other periods fluctuating forex rates may wipe out profits from a project, an export deal or a portfolio investment (for example, a pension fund buying foreign shares).

## The currency markets

The function of the forex markets is to facilitate the exchange of one currency into another. This market has grown dramatically. In 1973 the equivalent of US\$10bn was traded around the globe on average each day. By 1986 this had grown to US $\$ 300 \mathrm{bn}$, and just three years later, by 1989, this had more than doubled to US\$590bn. In 1998 the daily turnover was over US\$1,490bn. In 2001

London is the biggest currency trading center in the world. it was estimated at $\$ 1,210 \mathrm{bn} .^{2}$ London is the biggest currency trading center in the world, with US $\$ 504$ bn traded daily in 2001. The US traded US\$254bn. Japan traded US\$147bn and Singapore comes in fourth place trading US $\$ 101$ bn per day.

To put the figures in perspective consider the total output of all the people in the UK in one day (GDP): this amounts to around US\$4bn - less than one percent of the value of the currency that changes hands in London in one day. In the USA the forex turnover is nine times daily production.

In 2001 the euro entered on one side of 38 percent of all foreign exchange transactions, whereas the dollar was on one side in 90 percent of cases. The yen was on one side of 23 percent of trades and sterling was involved in only 13 percent of trades.

## Who is trading?

The buyers and sellers of foreign currencies are:
■ exporters/importers

- tourists
- fund managers (pensions, insurance companies, etc.)

■ governments (for example, to pay for activities abroad)
■ central banks (smoothing out fluctuations)

- speculators
- banks.

The first five groups account for only a small fraction of the transactions. The big players are the large commercial banks. In addition to dealing on behalf of customers, or acting as market makers, they carry out

The big players are the large commercial banks. 'proprietary' transactions of their own in an attempt to make a profit by taking a position in the market that is, speculating on future movements. Companies and individuals usually obtain their foreign currencies from the banks.

Foreign exchange interbank brokers often act as intermediaries between large buyers and sellers. They allow banks to trade anonymously, thus avoiding having the price move simply because of the revelation of the name of a bank in a transaction.

Most deals are still made over the telephone and later confirmed in writing. However the new electronic trading systems in which computers match deals automatically have taken a rapidly increasing share of deals.

## Twenty-four hour trading

Dealing takes place on a 24 -hour basis, with trading moving from one major financial center to another. Most trading occurs when both the European and New York markets are open - this is when it is afternoon in Frankfurt, Zurich and London and morning on the east coast of the Americas. Later trade passes to San Francisco and Los Angeles, followed by Wellington, Sydney, Tokyo, Hong Kong, Singapore and Bahrain.

Most banks are in the process of concentrating their dealers in three or four regional hubs. These typically include London as well as New York and two sites in Asia, where Tokyo, Hong Kong and Singapore are keen to establish their dominance.

The vast sums of money traded every working day across the world means that banks are exposed to the risk that they may irrevocably pay over currency to a counterparty before they receive another currency in return because settlement systems are operating in different time zones. A bank could fail after receiving one leg of its foreign exchange trades but before paying the other leg this is called Herstatt risk after a German bank that failed in 1974 leaving the dollars that it owed on its foreign exchange deals unpaid. Its failure caused panic and gridlock in the forex market, which took weeks to unravel. A new organization, the CLS Bank,

Under CLS, payments will be made by banks to an orderly schedule in a five-hour slot the day after the deal. will allow both legs of the trade to be paid simultaneously, eliminating the risk that one bank might fail in midstream. Under CLS, payments will be made by banks to an orderly schedule in a five-hour slot the day after the deal. A second major advantage of this system is that the net value of the trades are settled rather than the gross amounts of trades. So if a bank sold $\$ 1 \mathrm{bn}$, but also bought $\$ 900 \mathrm{~m}$, the settlement is for only $\$ 100 \mathrm{~m}$.

## Exchange rates

We now look more closely at exchange rates, starting with some terms used in forex markets. First, we provide a definition of an exchange rate:

An exchange rate is the price of one currency expressed in terms of another.

Therefore if the exchange rate between the US dollar and the pound is US $\$ 1.89=£ 1.00$ this means that $£ 1.00$ will cost US $\$ 1.89$. Taking the reciprocal, US $\$ 1.00$ will cost 52.91 pence. The standardized forms of expression are:

US\$1.89/£
or
US\$/\& : 1.89
Exchange rates are expressed in terms of the number of units of the first currency per single unit of the second currency. Also forex rates are normally given to five or six significant figures. So for the US\$/£ exchange rate on 19 February 2004 the more accurate rate is:

US\$1.8895/\&
However this is still not accurate enough because currency exchange rates are not generally expressed in terms of a single 'middle rate', but are given as a rate at which you can buy the first currency (bid rate) and a rate at which you can sell the first currency (offer rate). In the case of the US $\$ / \AA$ exchange rate the market rates on 19 February 2004 were:

US\$1.8895/£ 'middle rate'

$U S \$ / £ 8$| You can buy dollars |
| :---: | :---: |
| from a bank or |
| broker at this rate. You can sell dollars |
| to a bank or a |
| broker at this rate. |

So if you wished to purchase US\$1m the cost would be:

$$
\frac{\$ 1,000,000}{1.8894}=£ 529,269
$$

However if you wished to sell US\$ $1 m$ you would receive:

$$
\frac{\$ 1,000,000}{1.8896}=£ 529,213
$$

The foreign exchange dealers make profit in two ways. First, they may charge commission on a deal. Depending on the size of the transaction this can vary, but it is generally well below 1 percent. Second, these institutions are dealing with numerous buyers and sellers every day and they make a profit on the difference between the bid price and offer price (the bid/offer spread). In the above example if a dealer sold US $\$ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ and bought US $\$ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ with a bid/offer spread of 0.02 of a cent, a profit of $£ 529,269-£ 529,213=£ 56$ is made.

## The spot and forward exchange markets

There are two main forex markets.

- The 'spot' market In the spot market transactions take place which are to be settled quickly. Officially this is described as immediate delivery, but this usually takes place two business days after the deal is struck. However, this is reduced to the next morning (Greenwich mean time) for those trades going through CLS.
- The 'forward' market In the forward market a deal is arranged to exchange currencies at some future date at a price agreed now. The periods of time are generally one, three or six months, but it is possible to arrange an exchange of currencies at a pre-determined rate many years from now.

Forward transactions represent about one-third to one-half of all forex deals. There are many currencies, however, for which forward quotes are difficult to obtain. The so-called exotic currencies generally do not have forward rates quoted by dealers. These are currencies for which there is little trading
demand to support international business, etc. On the other hand, spot markets exist for most of the

Spot markets exist for most of the world's currencies. world's currencies.

The Financial Times reports the previous day's trading in the forex market. The figures shown in Exhibit 21.1 relate to dealing on 19 February 2004. Of course by the time a newspaper reader receives the information in this table the rates have changed as the 24 -hour markets follow the sun around the world.

The prices shown under the pound columns in Exhibit 21.1 are the middle price of the foreign currency in terms of $£ 1$ in London the previous afternoon. ${ }^{3}$ So, for instance, the mid price of $£ 1$ for immediate delivery is 2.3953 Australian dollars. For the US dollar columns the prices for the pound and euro are the number of dollars per currency unit, either per pound or per one euro. However for other currencies the rate shown is the number of units of the other currency per US $\$ 1$ - for example, 1.3325 Canadian dollars per US dollar. For the euro columns the rate shown is the number of units of the other currency per euro for example the spot mid-rate against the pound is 67.09 pence per euro.

The first forward price (middle price) is given as the 'one month' rate. So you could commit yourself to the sale of a quantity of dollars for delivery in one month at a rate that is fixed at about US $\$ 1.8850$ per pound. In this case you will need fewer US dollars to buy $£ 1$ in one month's time compared with the spot rate of exchange, therefore the dollar is at a premium on the one-month forward rate.

The forward rate for one month shows a different relationship with the spot rate for the South African rand against the pound. Here more rands are required (R12.5816) to purchase $£ 1$ in one month's time compared with an 'immediate’ spot purchase (R12.5326), therefore the rand on one-month forward delivery is at a discount.

The Financial Times table lists quotations up to one year, but, as this is an over-the-counter market (see Chapter 20), you are able to go as far forward in time as you wish - provided you can find a counterparty. For some currencies trading in three-month and one-year forwards is so thin as to not warrant a quotation in the table. However for the major currencies such as the US dollar, sterling, the euro, the Swiss franc and the Japanese yen, forward markets can stretch up to ten years. Airline companies expecting to purchase planes many years hence may use this distant forward market to purchase the foreign currency they need to pay the manufacturer so that they know with certainty how much home currency they have to find when the planes are delivered.

The table in Exhibit 21.1 displays standard periods of time for forward rates. These are instantly available and are frequently traded. However forward rates are not confined to these particular days in the future. It is possible to obtain rates for any day in the future, say, 74 or 36 days hence. But this would require a specific quotation from a bank.
(The Special Drawing Rights (SDRs) of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) shown at the bottom of the table are artificial currencies made up from baskets of other currencies.)

## Currency rates

| Feb 19 | Currency | DOLLAR |  | EURO |  | POUND |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Closing | Day's | Closing | Day's | Closing | Day's |
|  |  | mid | change | mid | change | mid | change |
| Argentina | (Peso) | 2.9400 | -0.0025 | 3.7271 | -0.0471 | 5.5551 | -0.0499 |
| Australia | (A\$) | 1.2677 | +0.0092 | 1.6071 | -0.0071 | 2.3953 | -0.0020 |
| One Month |  |  |  | 0.6004 | -0.0074 | 2.3981 | -0.0021 |
| One Year |  |  |  | 1.6655 | -0.0078 | 2.4273 | -0.0030 |
| Bahrain | (Dinar) | 0.3770 |  | 0.4780 | -0.0056 | 0.7124 | -0.0058 |
| Bolivia | (Boliviano) | 7.8560 |  | 9.9591 | -0.1174 | 14.8439 | -0.1206 |
| Brazil | (R\$) | 2.9465 | +0.0083 | 3.7353 | -0.0334 | 5.5674 | -0.0295 |
| Canada | (C\$) | 1.3325 | +0.0196 | 1.6893 | +0.0053 | 2.5179 | +0.0171 |
| One Month |  | 1.334 | +0.0197 | 1.6898 | +0.0055 | 2.5149 | +0.0177 |
| Three Month |  | 1.3368 | +0.0198 | 1.6904 | +0.0054 | 2.5069 | +0.0169 |
| One Year |  | 1.3458 | +0.0199 | 1.6924 | +0.0053 | 2.4665 | +0.0162 |
| Chile | (Peso) | 578.550 | +4.7000 | 733.428 | -2.6210 | 1093.17 | +0.0700 |
| Colombia | (Peso) | 2693.90 | -5.90 | 3415.06 | -47.84 | 5090.12 | -52.59 |
| Costa Rica | (Colon) | 423.890 | +0.1300 | 537.365 | -6.1710 | 800.940 | -6.2590 |
| Czech Rep. | (Koruna) | 25.8046 | +0.2871 | 32.7125 | -0.0175 | 48.7578 | +0.1509 |
| One Month |  | 25.8236 | +0.2851 | 32.7102 | -0.0186 | 48.6784 | +0.1537 |
| One Year |  | 26.0626 | +0.2841 | 32.7756 | -0.0268 | 47.7649 | +0.1250 |
| Denmark | (DKr) | 5.8780 | +0.0686 | 7.4516 | +0.0001 | 11.1065 | +0.0403 |
| One Month |  | 5.8834 | +0.0684 | 7.4523 | +0.0001 | 11.0904 | +0.0415 |
| Three Month |  | 5.8936 | +0.0686 | 7.4529 | -0.0003 | 11.0524 | +0.0384 |
| One Year |  | 5.9299 | +0.0700 | 7.4573 | +0.0007 | 10.8678 | +0.0382 |
| Egypt | (Egypt £) | 6.1801 |  | 7.8346 | -0.0923 | 11.6773 | -0.0949 |
| Estonia | (Kroon) | 12.3424 | +0.1438 | 15.6465 |  | 23.3210 | +0.0845 |
| Hong Kong | (HK\$) | 7.7737 | +0.0025 | 9.8547 | -0.1130 | 14.6884 | -0.1146 |
| One Month |  | 7.7676 | +0.0031 | 9.8390 | -0.1115 | 14.6422 | -0.1108 |
| Three Month |  | 7.7547 | +0.0028 | 9.8064 | -0.1123 | 14.5426 | -0.1146 |
| One Year |  | 7.7074 | +0.0069 | 9.6927 | -0.1059 | 14.1254 | -0.1055 |
| Hungary | (Forint) | 206.054 | +1.6140 | 261.215 | -1.0100 | 389.340 | -0.0880 |
| One Month |  | 207.974 | +1.5040 | 263.4363 | -1.1649 | 392.03 | -0.2680 |
| One Year |  | 228.859 | +2.4840 | 287.8072 | -0.2490 | 419.431 | +1.0780 |
| India | (Rs) | 45.2400 | -0.0350 | 57.3508 | -0.7212 | 85.4810 | -0.7611 |
| One Month |  | 45.24 | -0.0175 | 57.3045 | -0.6951 | 85.279 | -0.7132 |
| One Year |  | 45.4225 | +0.0100 | 57.1221 | -0.6641 | 83.2458 | -0.6788 |
| Indonesia | (Rupiah) | 8432.50 | +30.50 | 10689.90 | -86.90 | 15933.20 | -71.40 |
| One Month |  |  |  | 10681.26 | -86.30 | 15895.55 | -68.85 |
| One Year |  |  |  | 10604.48 | -86.83 | 15454.23 | -73.14 |
| Iran | (Rial) | 8365.00 |  | 10604.30 | -125.10 | 15805.70 | -128.40 |
| Israel | (Shk) | 4.4480 | +0.0120 | 5.6387 | -0.0512 | 8.4045 | -0.0454 |
| Japan | (Y) | 107.300 | +1.0300 | 136.024 | -0.2830 | 202.743 | +0.3150 |
| One Month |  | 107.205 | +1.0350 | 135.7951 | -0.2665 | 202.088 | +0.3600 |
| Three Month |  | 107 | +1.0250 | 135.3084 | -0.2882 | 200.658 | +0.2850 |
| One Year |  | 105.875 | +0.9950 | 133.1455 | -0.3114 | 194.038 | +0.2150 |
| Kenya | (Shilling) | 76.4000 |  | 96.8523 | -1.1422 | 144.358 | -1.1730 |
| Kuwait | (Dinar) | 0.2947 | +0.0001 | 0.3736 | -0.0043 | 0.5568 | -0.0044 |
| One Month |  | 0.2949 | +0.0001 | 0.3735 | -0.0043 | 0.5559 | -0.0043 |
| One Year |  | 0.2972 | +0.0001 | 0.3737 | -0.0044 | 0.5446 | -0.0046 |
| Malaysia | (M\$) | 3.8000 |  | 4.8173 | -0.0568 | 7.1801 | -0.0584 |
| Mexico | (New Peso) | 10.9605 | +0.0515 | 13.8947 | -0.0977 | 20.7098 | -0.0702 |
| One Month |  | 11.0002 | +0.0494 | 13.9338 | -0.1002 | 20.7358 | -0.0714 |
| Three Month |  | 11.089 | +0.0570 | 14.0228 | -0.0928 | 20.7953 | -0.0638 |
| One Year |  | 11.5255 | +0.0545 | 14.4941 | -0.1024 | 21.1227 | -0.0763 |
| New Zealand | (NZ\$) | 1.4296 | +0.0132 | 1.8123 | -0.0045 | 2.7012 | +0.0031 |
| One Month |  |  |  | 1.8171 | -0.0049 | 2.7042 | +0.0029 |
| One Year |  |  |  | 1.8780 | -0.0045 | 2.7368 | +0.0028 |
| Nigeria | (Naira) | 136.600 |  | 173.168 | -2.0420 | 258.106 | -2.0970 |
| Norway | (NKr) | 6.9684 | +0.0951 | 8.8338 | +0.0177 | 13.1667 | +0.0740 |
| One Month |  | 6.9735 | +0.0947 | 8.8331 | +0.0176 | 13.1452 | +0.0749 |
| Three Month |  | 6.9811 | +0.0949 | 8.8280 | +0.0170 | 13.0917 | +0.0713 |
| One Year |  | 7.0051 | +0.0940 | 8.8094 | +0.0153 | 12.8383 | +0.0662 |
| Pakistan | (Rupee) | 57.3100 | -0.0300 | 72.6519 | -0.8953 | 108.287 | -0.9370 |
| Peru | (New Sol) | 3.4720 | -0.0026 | 4.4014 | -0.0554 | 6.5602 | -0.0585 |
| Phillipines | (Peso) | 56.2250 | +0.1150 | 71.2764 | -0.6931 | 106.237 | -0.6440 |
| One Month |  | 56.599 | +0.1405 | 71.6927 | -0.6616 | 106.691 | -0.5840 |
| Three Month |  | 57.2875 | +0.1205 | 72.4441 | -0.7020 | 107.432 | -0.6580 |
| One Year |  | 60.4755 | +0.1270 | 76.0524 | -0.7395 | 110.833 | -0.6940 |
| Poland | (Zloty) | 3.8563 | +0.0453 | 4.8886 | +0.0005 | 7.2864 | +0.0272 |
| One Month |  | 3.8693 | +0.0446 | 4.9011 | -0.0003 | 7.2937 | +0.0268 |
| One Year |  | 4.0193 | +0.0447 | 5.0545 | -0.0030 | 7.3661 | +0.0211 |


| Feb 19 | Currency | DOLLAR |  | EURO |  | POUND |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Closing | Day's | Closing | Day's | Closing | Day's |
|  |  | mid | change | mid | change | mid | change |
| Romania | (Leu) | 31912.10 | +313.50 | 40455.00 | -75.00 | 60298.00 | +107.30 |
| Russia | (Rouble) | 28.4950 | +0.0101 | 36.1231 | -0.4131 | 53.8413 | -0.4182 |
| Saudi Arabia | (SR) | 3.7502 |  | 4.7542 | -0.0560 | 7.0860 | -0.0576 |
| One Month |  | 3.7508 |  | 4.7511 | -0.0557 | 7.0705 | -0.0563 |
| One Year |  | 3.7623 | +0.0001 | 4.7314 | -0.0559 | 6.8952 | -0.0576 |
| Singapore | (S\$) | 1.6846 | +0.0078 | 2.1356 | -0.0152 | 3.1831 | -0.0111 |
| One Month |  | 1.684 | +0.0078 | 2.1330 | -0.0151 | 3.1744 | -0.0105 |
| One Year |  | 1.6771 | +0.0083 | 2.1090 | -0.0145 | 3.0736 | -0.0105 |
| Slovakia | (Koruna) | 31.9350 | +0.4299 | 40.4840 | +0.0740 | 60.3412 | +0.3287 |
| One Month |  | 32.054 | +0.4244 | 40.6021 | +0.0673 | 60.423 | +0.3247 |
| One Year |  | 33.183 | +0.4394 | 41.7300 | +0.0647 | 60.8145 | +0.3026 |
| Slovenia | (Tolar) | 187.285 | +2.0650 | 237.421 | -0.1510 | 353.875 | +1.0590 |
| South Africa | (R) | 6.6327 | +0.0539 | 8.4084 | -0.0298 | 12.5326 | +0.0011 |
| One Month |  | 6.6744 | +0.0504 | 8.4544 | -0.0345 | 12.5816 | -0.0043 |
| Three Month |  | 6.7602 | +0.0586 | 8.5488 | -0.0259 | 12.6776 | +0.0066 |
| One Year |  | 7.1427 | +0.0651 | 8.9825 | -0.0234 | 13.0906 | +0.0111 |
| South Korea | (Won) | 1164.50 | +12.35 | 1476.24 | -1.57 | 2200.32 | +5.65 |
| One Month |  | 1166.65 | +13.05 | 1477.77 | -0.62 | 2199.17 | +7.26 |
| Three Month |  | 1170.35 | +12.85 | 1479.99 | -1.05 | 2194.77 | +6.19 |
| One Year |  | 1187.45 | +14.55 | 1493.30 | +0.82 | 2176.24 | +8.66 |
| Sweden | (SKr) | 7.2466 | +0.0884 | 9.1865 | +0.0050 | 13.6924 | +0.0570 |
| One Month |  | 7.2553 | +0.0880 | 9.1901 | +0.0048 | 13.6763 | +0.0577 |
| Three Month |  | 7.2722 | +0.0886 | 9.1962 | +0.0047 | 13.6376 | +0.0548 |
| One Year |  | 7.3346 | +0.0880 | 9.2238 | +0.0027 | 13.4421 | +0.0499 |
| Switzerland | (SFr) | 1.2440 | +0.0152 | 1.5771 | +0.0010 | 2.3506 | +0.0099 |
| One Month |  | 1.2432 | +0.0153 | 1.5747 | +0.0010 | 2.3436 | +0.0105 |
| Three Month |  | 1.2414 | +0.0152 | 1.5699 | +0.0009 | 2.3282 | +0.0096 |
| One Year |  | 1.2329 | +0.0152 | 1.5504 | +0.0008 | 2.2595 | +0.0091 |
| Taiwan | (T\$) | 33.0700 | +0.0250 | 41.9229 | -0.4623 | 62.4858 | -0.4600 |
| One Month |  | 33.03 | +0.0750 | 41.8384 | -0.3950 | 62.2627 | -0.3539 |
| One Year |  | 32.415 | +0.0750 | 40.7642 | -0.3876 | 59.407 | -0.3589 |
| Thailand | (Bt) | 39.1800 | +0.1700 | 49.6685 | -0.3677 | 74.0306 | -0.2777 |
| One Month |  | 39.195 | +0.1750 | 49.6474 | -0.3586 | 73.884 | -0.2566 |
| One Year |  | 39.275 | +0.1700 | 49.3912 | -0.3689 | 71.9793 | -0.2888 |
| Tunisia | (Dinar) | 1.2139 | +0.0119 | 1.5389 | -0.0028 | 2.2937 | +0.0041 |
| Turkey | (Lira) | 1331000 | +9500 | 1687309 | -7713 | 2514925 | -2335 |
| UAE | (Dirham) | 3.6730 |  | 4.6563 | -0.0550 | 6.9401 | -0.0565 |
| One Month |  | 3.6732 | - | 4.6527 | -0.0547 | 6.924 | -0.0553 |
| One Year |  | 3.6755 |  | 4.6222 | -0.0548 | 6.7361 | -0.0565 |
| UK (0.5292)* | (£) | 1.8895 | -0.0153 | 0.6709 | -0.0025 | 6.7361 | -0565 |
| One Month |  | 1.885 | -0.0150 | 0.6720 | -0.0025 | - | - |
| Three Month |  | 1.8753 | -0.0154 | 0.6743 | -0.0024 | - | - |
| One Year |  | 1.8326 | -0.0153 | 0.6862 | -0.0024 | - | - |
| Uruguay | (Peso) | 29.4150 |  | 37.2894 | -0.4398 | 55.5797 | -0.4514 |
| USA | (\$) | - | - | 1.2677 | -0.0150 | 1.8895 | -0.0153 |
| One Month |  | - | - | 1.2667 | -0.0149 | 1.885 | -0.0150 |
| Three Month |  | - | - | 1.2646 | -0.0149 | 1.8753 | -0.0154 |
| One Year |  | - |  | 1.2576 | -0.0149 | 1.8326 | -0.0153 |
| Venezuela $\dagger$ | (Bolivar) | 3157.36 | +54.66 | 4002.58 | +22.90 | 5965.82 | +55.64 |
| Vietnam | (Dong) | 15723.00 | -3.00 | 19932.00 | -239.00 | 29708.60 | -247.10 |
| Euro (0.7888)* | (Euro) | 1.2677 | -0.0150 | - |  | 1.4905 | +0.0054 |
| One Month |  | 1.2667 | -0.0149 | - | - | 1.4882 | +0.0055 |
| Three Month |  | 1.2646 | -0.0149 |  | - | 1.4829 | +0.0051 |
| One Year |  | 1.2575 | -0.0150 | - | - | 1.4573 | +0.0050 |
| SDR |  | 0.66720 |  | 0.84585 | -0.0044 | 1.260800 | - |
| Rates are derived from WM/Reuters at 4 pm (London time). *The closing mid-point rates for the Euro and $£$ against the $\$$ are shown in brackets. The other figures in the dollar column of both the Euro and Sterling rows are in the reciprocal form in line with market convention. †Official rate set by Venezuelan government is 1917.60 mid per USD; the WM/Reuters rate is for the valuation of capital assets. Some values are rounded by the F.T. The exchange rates printed in this table are also available on the internet at http://www.FT.com. <br> Euro Locking Rates: Austrian Schilling 13.7603, Belgium/Luxembourg Franc 40.3399, Finnish Markka 5.94573, French Franc 6.55957, German Mark 1.95583, Greek Drachma 340.75, Irish Punt 0.0787564, Italian Lira 1936.27, Netherlands Guilder 2.20371, Portugese Escudo 200.482, Spanish Peseta 166.386. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## EXHIBIT 21.1 Currency rates table in the FT

[^1]
## Covering in the forward market

Suppose that on 19 February 2004 a UK exporter sells goods to a customer in Norway invoiced at NKr5,000,000. Payment is due three months later. With the spot rate of exchange at NKr13.1667/£ (see Exhibit 21.1) the exporter, in deciding to sell the goods, has in mind a sales price of:

$$
\frac{5,000,000}{13.1667}=£ 379,746
$$

The UK firm bases its decision on the profitability of the deal on this amount expressed in pounds.

However the rate of exchange may vary between February and May: the size and direction of the move is uncertain. If sterling strengthens against the Norwegian Krone the UK exporter makes a currency loss by waiting three months and exchanging the dollars received into sterling at spot rates in May. If, say, one pound is worth NKr15 in May the exporter will receive only $£ 333,333$ :

$$
\frac{5,000,000}{15}=£ 333,333
$$

The loss due to currency movement is:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
£ 379,746 \\
£ 333,333 \\
\hline £ 46,413
\end{array}
$$

If sterling weakens to, say, NKr11/£ a currency gain is made. The pounds received in May if dollars are exchanged at the spot rate are:

$$
\frac{5,000,000}{11}=£ 454,545
$$

The currency gain is:
£454,545
$\frac{£ 379,746}{£ 74,799}$
Rather than run the risk of a possible loss on the currency side of the deal the exporter may decide to cover in the forward market at the time of the export (19 February). Under this arrangement the exporter promises to sell NKr5,000,000 against sterling in three months (the agreement is made on 19 February for delivery of currency in May). The 3-month forward rate available ${ }^{4}$ on 19 February 2004 is NKr13.0917/£ (see Exhibit 21.1). This forward contract means that the exporter is assured of the receipt of $£ 381,921$ in May regardless of the way in which spot exchange rate change over the three months:

FIGURE 21.3
Forward market transaction


$$
\frac{5,000,000}{13.0917}=£ 381,921
$$

In May the transactions shown in Figure 21.3 take place.
From the outset the exporter knew the amount to be received in May (assuming away credit risk). It might, with hindsight, have been better not to use the forward market but to exchange the dollars at a spot rate of, say, NKr11/£. This would have resulted in a larger income for the firm. But there was uncertainty about the spot rate in May when the export took place in February. If the spot rate in May had turned out to be NKr15/£ the exporter would have made much less. Covering in the forward market is a form of insurance, which leads to greater certainty - and certainty has a value.

## Types of foreign-exchange risk

There are three types of risk for firms that operate in an international market-place:

- transaction risk
- translation risk

■ economic risk.

## Transaction risk

Transaction risk is the risk that transactions already entered into, or for which the firm is likely to have a commitment in a foreign currency, will have a variable value in the home currency because of exchange-rate movements.

This type of risk is primarily associated with imports or exports. If a company exports goods on credit then it carries a figure for debtors in its accounts. The amount it will receive in home-currency terms is subject to uncertainty if the customer pays in a foreign currency.

Likewise a company that imports on credit will have a creditor figure in its accounts. The amount that is finally paid in terms of the home currency depends on forex movements, if the invoice is in a foreign currency. Transaction risk also arises when firms invest abroad, say, opening a new office or manufacturing

## Balance sheets left reeling by Real

Jonathan Wheatley

It has been a bizarre year for Brazilian companies. Whether or not they supported the campaign of president-elect Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva - and many of them did - senior executives have felt the impact of his election even though he does not take office until January 1.

Concern among investors that a leftwing government under Lula - as he is universally known - might presage a default on Brazil's debts has caused the currency to shed more than 40 per cent of its value to the end of September, wreaking havoc on companies' balance sheets.

For most big companies, many of which borrow in dollars but make their income in Reals, the devaluation has been little short of calamitous.
'They are extremely vulnerable,' says Fernando Excel of Económatica. 'Even if only a small part of a company's debt is unhedged, a devaluation on this scale causes an enormous disaster.'

Many Brazilian companies began hedging their dollar debts when the Real began to slide during the second quarter, as opinion polls showed Lula leading the presidential campaign. But few imagined that the Real would fall so far.

As the situation worsened and international banks began reducing their exposure to Brazil, the cost of hedging

became increasingly prohibitive. Many concluded - incorrectly, as it turned out that hedging was not worth the expense.

Usiminas, one of Brazil's biggest steel producers, saw the value of its sales rise by 37 per cent in the third quarter over last year, to R\$1.68bn. Nevertheless, it recorded a net loss of $\mathrm{R} \$ 1.68 \mathrm{~m}$, because both the operating company and especially, Cosipa, a subsidiary, were not fully hedged.
'Cosipa is one of the most leveraged companies in the industry. Hedging just became too expensive,' says Katia Brullo of Corretora Unibanco, a Sao Paulo brokerage.
plant. If the costs of construction are paid for over a period the firm may be exchanging the home currency for the foreign currency to make the payments. The amounts of the home currency required are uncertain if the exchange rate is subject to rate shifts. Also the cash inflows back to the parent are subject to exchange-rate risk.

In addition, when companies borrow in a foreign currency, committing themselves to regular interest and principal payments in that currency, they are exposed to forex risk. This is a problem that beset a number of Brazilian companies in 2002. They had committed themselves to paying off borrowings in a hard currency (e.g. US dollars, sterling). This became a serious problem when the debt rose by 40 percent simply because of the decline in their currency against the hard currency - see Exhibit 21.2.

## Translation risk

Translation risk arises because financial data denominated in one currency are then expressed in terms of another currency. Between two accounting dates the figures can be affected by exchange-rate movements, greatly distorting comparability. The financial statements of overseas business units are usually translated into the home currency so that they might be consolidated with the group's financial statements. Income, expenses, assets and liabilities have to be re-expressed in terms of the home currency. Note that this is purely a paper-based exercise; it is translation and not the conversion of real money from one currency to another. If exchange rates were stable, comparing subsidiary performance and

This is purely a paper-based exercise; it is translation and not the conversion of real money from one currency to another. asset position would be straightforward. However, if exchange rates move significantly the results can be severely distorted. For example, Courts, the furniture and electrical retailer, which has 60 percent of its turnover overseas found that even though overseas sales rose 8 percent in local currency terms, when the figures were translated into sterling, a fall of 4 percent was reported. This was mainly because sterling rose against the dollar. See Exhibit 21.3.

There are two elements to translation risk.

- The balance sheet effect Assets and liabilities denominated in a foreign currency can fluctuate in value in home-currency terms with forex-market changes. For example, if a UK company acquires A $\$ 1,000,000$ of assets in Australia when the rate of exchange is A $\$ 2.2 / \AA$ this can go into the UK group's accounts at a value of $£ 454,545$. If, over the course of the next year, the Australian dollar falls against sterling to A\$2.7/£, when the consolidated accounts are drawn up and the asset is translated at the current exchange rate at the end of the year it is valued at only $£ 370,370(1,000,000 / 2.7)$ a 'loss' of $£ 84,175$. And yet the asset has not changed in value in A $\$$ terms one jot. These 'losses' are normally dealt with through balance sheet reserves.


## Courts moves to limit foreign exchange damage

By Sophy Buckley

Courts yesterday issued a disappointing trading update for the Christmas and early winter sale period and flagged a full strategic review.

The immediate focus was on news that the weak dollar would cut profits by £ 4 m this year and changes to financing would cost $£ 5 \mathrm{~m}$ and lift borrowing costs by $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$.

This prompted analysts to cut their profit forecasts for the furniture and
electricals group. Seymour Pierce reduced its numbers from $£ 24 \mathrm{~m}$ to $£ 14 \mathrm{~m}$, and Evolution Beeson Gregory moved from $£ 30 \mathrm{~m}$ to $£ 22 \mathrm{~m}$.

For the six weeks to January 11, the weak dollar turned an 8 per cent rise in overseas sales at constant exchange rates into a 4 per cent fall. A 4 per cent rise in like-for-like sales became an 8 per cent fall when translated into sterling.

EXHIBIT 21.3 Courts moves to limit foreign exchange damage
Source: Financial Times 20 January 2004

- The profit and loss account effect Currency changes can have an adverse impact on the group's profits because of the translation of foreign subsidiaries' profits. This often occurs even though the subsidiaries' managers are performing well and increasing profit in terms of the currency in which they operate, as the case of Courts (see Exhibit 21.3) indicates.


## Economic risk

A company's economic value may decline as a result of forex movements causing a loss in competitive strength. The worth of a company is the discounted cash flows payable to the owners. It is possible that a shift in exchange rates can reduce the cash flows of foreign subsidiaries and home-based production far into the future (and not just affect the near future cash flows as in transaction exposure). There are two ways in which competitive position can be undermined by forex changes:

- Directly If your firm's home currency strengthens then foreign competitors are able to gain sales and profits at your expense because your products are more expensive (or you have reduced margins) in the eyes of customers both abroad and at home.
■ Indirectly Even if your home currency does not move adversely vis-à-vis your customer's currency you can lose competitive position. For example suppose a South African firm is selling into Hong Kong and its main competitor is a New Zealand firm. If the New Zealand dollar weakens against the Hong Kong dollar the South African firm has lost some competitive position.

Another indirect effect occurs even for firms that are entirely domestically oriented. For example, the cafés and shops surrounding a large export-oriented manufacturing plant may be severely affected by the closure of the factory caused by an adverse forex movement.

## Transaction risk strategies

This section illustrates a number of strategies available to deal with transaction risk by focussing on the alternatives open to an exporter selling goods on credit.

Suppose a UK company exports $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ of goods to a Canadian firm when the spot rate of exchange is $\mathrm{C} \$ 2.20 / £$. The Canadian firm is given three months to pay, and naturally the spot rate in three months is unknown at the time of the shipment of goods. What can the firm do?

## Invoice the customer in the home currency

One easy way to bypass exchange-rate risk is to insist that all foreign customers pay in your currency and your firm pays for all imports in your home currency. In the case of this example the Canadian importer will be required to send $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ in three months.

However the exchange-rate risk has not gone away, it has just been passed on to the customer. This policy has an obvious drawback: your customer may dislike it, the marketability of your products is reduced and your customers look elsewhere for supplies. If you are a monopoly supplier you might get away with the policy but for most firms this is a non-starter.

## Do nothing

Under this policy the UK firm invoices the Canadian firm for C $\$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}$, waits three months and then exchanges into sterling at whatever spot rate is available then. Perhaps an exchange-rate gain will be made, perhaps a loss will be made. Many firms adopt this policy and take a 'win some, lose some' attitude. Given the fees and other transaction costs of some hedging strategies this can make sense.

There are two considerations for managers here. The first is their degree of risk aversion to higher cash flow variability, coupled with the sensitivity of shareholders to reported fluctuations of earnings due to foreign exchange gains and losses. The second, which is related to the first point, is the size of the transaction. If $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ is a large proportion of annual turnover, and greater than profit, then the managers may be more worried about forex risk. If, however, $£ 1 m$ is a small fraction of turnover and profit, and the firm has numerous forex transactions, it may choose to save on hedging costs.

There is an argument that it would be acceptable to do nothing if it was anticipated that the Canadian dollar will appreciate over the three months. Be

Predicting exchange rates is a dangerous game.
careful. Predicting exchange rates is a dangerous game and more than one 'expert' has made serious errors of judgment.

## Netting

Multinational companies often have subsidiaries in different countries selling to other members of the group. Netting is where the subsidiaries settle intraorganisational currency debts for the net amount owed in a currency rather than the gross amount. For example, if a UK parent owned a subsidiary in Canada and sold C $\$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}$ of goods to the subsidiary on credit while the Canadian subsidiary is owed C $\$ 1.5 \mathrm{~m}$ by the UK company, instead of transferring a total of $\mathrm{C} \$ 3.7 \mathrm{~m}$ the intra-group transfer is the net amount of C $\$ 700,000$ (see Figure 21.4).

The reduction in the size of the currency flows by offsetting inflows and outflows in the same currency diminishes the net exposure that may have to be hedged. It also reduces the transaction costs of currency transfers in terms of fees and commissions.

This type of netting, involving two companies within a group, is referred to as bilateral netting, and is simple to operate without the intervention of a central treasury. However for organizations with a matrix of currency liabilities between numerous subsidiaries in different parts of the world, multilateral netting is required. A central treasury is usually needed so that there is knowledge at any point in time of the overall exposure of the firm and its component parts. Subsidiaries will be required to inform the group treasury about their overseas dealings, which can then co-ordinate payments after netting out intra-company debts. The savings on transfer costs levied by banks can be considerable.

## Matching

Netting only applies to transfers within a group of companies. Matching can be used for both intra-group transactions and those involving third parties. The company matches the inflows and outflows in different currencies caused by

FIGURE 21.4
Netting


FIGURE 21.5
Matching

trade, etc., so that it is only necessary to deal on the forex markets for the unmatched portion of the total transactions.

So if, say, the Canadian importer is not a group company and the UK firm also imported a raw material from another Canadian company to the value of C $\$ 2 \mathrm{~m}$ it is necessary only to hedge the balance of C\$200,000 (see Figure 21.5).

Naturally, to net and match properly, the timing of the expected receipts and payments would have to be the same.

## Leading and lagging

Leading is the bringing forward from the original due date the payment of a debt. Lagging is the postponement of a payment beyond the due date. This speeding up or delaying of payments is particularly useful if you are convinced exchange rates will shift significantly between now and the due date.

So, if the UK exporter who invoiced a Canadian company for C $\$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}$ on three months' credit expects that the Canadian dollar will fall over the forthcoming three months it may try to obtain payment immediately and then exchange for sterling at the spot rate. Naturally the Canadian firm will need an incentive to pay early and this may be achieved by offering a discount for immediate settlement.

An importer of goods in a currency that is anticipated to fall in value may attempt to delay payment as long as possible. This may be achieved either by agreement or by exceeding credit terms.

## Forward market hedge

Although other forms of exchange-risk management are available, forward cover represents the most frequently employed method of hedging. A contract is agreed to exchange two currencies at a fixed time in the future at a predetermined rate. The risk of forex variation is removed.

So if the three-month forward rate is $\mathbf{C} \$ 2.25 / £$ the UK exporter could lock in the receipt of $£ 977,778$ in three months by selling forward $C \$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}$.

$$
\frac{\mathrm{C} \$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}}{2.25}=£ 977,778
$$

No foreign exchange-rate risk now exists because the dollars to be received from the importer are matched by the funds to be exchanged for sterling. (There does remain the risk of the importer not paying, at all or on time, and the risk of the counterparty in the forex market not fulfilling its obligations.)

## Money market hedge

Money market hedging involves borrowing in the money markets. For example, the exporter could, at the time of the export, borrow in Canadian dollars on the money markets for a three-month period. The amount

Money market hedging involves borrowing in the money markets. borrowed, plus three months' interest, will be designed to be equal to the amount to be received from the importer ( $\mathrm{C} \$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}$ ).

If the interest rate charged over three months is 2 percent then the appropriate size of the loan is:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{C} \$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}=\mathrm{C} \$ ?(1+0.02) \\
\mathrm{C} \$ ?=\frac{\mathrm{C} \$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}}{1.02}=\mathrm{C} \$ 2,156,863
\end{gathered}
$$

Thus the exporter has created a liability (borrowed funds) that matches the asset (debt owed by Canadian firm).

The borrowed dollars are then converted to sterling on the spot market for the exporter to receive $£ 980,392$ immediately:

$$
\frac{\mathrm{C} \$ 2,156,863}{2.2}=£ 980,392
$$

The exporter has removed forex risk because it now holds cash in sterling.
Three months later C $\$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}$ is received from the importer and this exactly matches the outstanding debt:

Amount borrowed + interest $=$ debt owed at end of period

$$
\mathrm{C} \$ 2,156,863+\mathrm{C} \$ 2,156,863 \times 0.02=\mathrm{C} \$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}
$$

The receipt of $£ 980,392$ is $£ 19,608$ less than the $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ originally anticipated. However it is received three months earlier and can earn interest.

The steps in the money market hedge are as follows.

1. Invoice customer for $\mathrm{C} \$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}$.
2. Borrow C $\$ 2,156,863$.
3. Sell $\mathrm{C} \$ 2,156,863$ at spot to receive pounds now.
4. In three months receive $\mathbf{C} \$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}$ from customer.
5. Pay lender C $\$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}$.

An importer could also use a money market hedge. So a Swiss company importing Japanese cars for payment in yen in three months could borrow in Swiss francs now and convert the funds at the spot rate into yen. This money is deposited to earn interest, with the result that after three months the principal plus interest equals the invoice amount.

## Futures

A foreign currency futures contract is an agreement to exchange a specific amount of a currency for another at a fixed future date for a predetermined price. Futures are similar to forwards in many ways. They are, however, standardized contracts traded on regulated exchanges. Forwards can be tailor-made in a wide range of currencies as to quantity of currency and delivery date, whereas futures are only available in a limited range of currencies and for a few specific forward time periods.

The Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME) and the FINEX market (New York Board of Trade) operate futures markets in currencies including: US $\$ / \mathcal{L}$, US $\$ / \neq$, US $\$ / \mathrm{SFr}$ (Swiss franc), US $\$ / €$. A single futures contract is for a fixed amount of currency. For example, a sterling contract on CME is for $£ 62,500$. It is not possible to buy or sell a smaller amount than this, nor to transact in quantities other than whole-number multiples of this. On the CME to buy a sterling futures contract is to make a commitment to deliver a quantity of US dollars and receive in return $£ 62,500$. On 19 February 2004 the CME quoted contracts for delivery in late March and June (and for no months in between) ${ }^{5}$ - see last two lines on Exhibit 21.4. For example, the June contract was priced at 1.8766 (the 'open' column indicates the rate at the start of trading on 19 February). This means that if you buy one contract you are committed to deliver US $\$ 1.8766$ for every pound of the $£ 62,500$ you will receive in late June, that is US $\$ 117,287.50$. If you sold one contract at 1.8766 you would deliver £62,500 and receive US $\$ 117,287.50$.

| Currency futures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb 19 |  | Open | Latest | Change | High | Low | Est. vol. | Open int. |
| €-Sterling* | Mar | 0.6730 | 0.6713 | -0.0020 | 0.6726 | 0.6714 | 513 | 11,894 |
| €-Dollar* | Mar | 1.2710 | 1.2690 | +0.0010 |  | 0.0000 | 302 | 734 |
| €-Yen* | Mar | 135.15 | 135.99 | +0.72 | 135.48 | 135.48 | 859 | 10,652 |
| \$-Can \$ $\dagger$ | Mar | 0.7550 | 0.7522 | -0.0016 | 0.7557 | 0.7483 | 7,658 | 58,873 |
| \$-Euro € $\dagger$ | Mar | 1.2690 | 1.2692 | -0.0004 | 1.2728 | 1.2639 | 14,112 | 144,529 |
| \$-Euro € $\dagger$ | Jun | 1.2674 | 1.2662 | -0.0004 | 1.2695 | 1.2611 | 195 | 1,980 |
| \$-Sw Franc † | Mar | 0.8061 | 0.8056 | -0.0012 | 0.8085 | 0.8026 | 5,116 | 46,593 |
| \$-Sw Franc $\dagger$ | Jun | 0.8090 | 0.8074 | -0.0012 | 0.8091 | 0.8045 | 27 | 433 |
| \$-Yen † | Mar | 0.9377 | 0.9330 | -0.0044 | 0.9412 | 0.9313 | 11,921 | 146,746 |
| \$-Yen $\dagger$ | Jun | 0.9421 | 0.9357 | -0.0044 | 0.9426 | 0.9343 | 106 | 9,110 |
| \$-Sterling † | Mar | 1.8860 | 1.8911 | +0.0077 | 1.8944 | 1.8831 | 3,835 | 69,250 |
| \$-Sterling † | Jun | 1.8708 | 1.8766 | +0.0076 | 1.8801 | 1.8695 | 17 | 553 |
| Sources: *FINEX; Sterling $€ 100,000$, Dollar: $€ 200,000$ and Yen: $€ 100,000$. †CME: Canadian $\$$ : C $\$ 100,000$, Euro: $€ 125,000$; Swiss Franc: SFr125,000; Yen: Y12.5m (\$ per Y100); Sterling: $£ 62,500$. CME volume, high \& low for pit \& electronic trading at settlement. Contracts shown are based on the volumes traded in 2001. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

EXHIBIT 21.4 Currency futures on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange and FINEX Source: Financial Times 20 February 2004

A firm hedging with currency futures will usually attempt to have a futures position which has an equal and opposite profit profile to the underlying transaction. Frequently the futures position will be closed before delivery is due, to give a cash profit or loss to offset the spot market profit or loss (for more details on futures see Chapter 20) - although physical delivery of the currency is possible. For example, if a US firm exports $£ 62,500$ worth of goods to a UK firm in February on four months' credit for payment in late June and the current spot exchange rate is US $\$ 1.8895 / £$ there is a foreign exchange risk. If the June future is trading at a price of US $\$ 1.8766$ per $£$ the exporter's position could be hedged by selling one sterling futures contract on CME.

If in June sterling falls against the dollar to US $\$ 1.60 / £$ the calculation is:

Value of $£ 62,500$ received from customer when converted to dollars at spot in June ( $£ 62,500 \times 1.60$ ) US $\$ 100,000$
Amount if exchange rate was constant at US\$1.8895/£ US\$118,094
Forex loss
US\$18,094

However an offsetting gain is made on the futures contract:
Sold at US\$1.8766/£ ( $£ 62,500 \times 1.8766)$
US\$117,288
Bought in June to close position at US $\$ 1.60 / £(£ 62,500 \times 1.60)$ US $\$ 100,000$
Futures gain

Alternatively the exporter could simply deliver the $£ 62,500$ received from the importer to CME in return for US $\$ 117,288$. (Note that the futures contract rate of exchange in June converges with the spot rate at the date of expiry, in late June, i.e. US\$1.60/£.)

In the above example a perfect hedge was not achieved because the gain on the futures contract did not exactly offset the loss on the underlying position (i.e. the pounds to be received from the UK customer). Perfect hedging is frequently unobtainable with futures because of their standardized nature. Perhaps the amount needed to be hedged is not equal to a whole number of contracts, for example $£ 100,000$, or the underlying transaction takes place in November (when no

Perfect hedging is frequently unobtainable with futures because of their standardized nature. future is available).

Futures did not prove very popular in the UK when traded on LIFFE. This was largely due to the existence of more flexible and convenient forms of currency hedges such as forwards and currency options.

## Currency options

The final possible course of action to reduce forex transaction risk to be discussed in this chapter is to make use of the currency option market.

A currency option is a contract giving the buyer (that is, the holder) the right, but not the obligation, to buy or sell a specific amount of currency at a specific exchange rate (the strike price), on a specified future date. ${ }^{6}$

A call option gives the right to buy a particular currency.
A put option gives the right to sell a particular currency.

The option writer (usually a bank) guarantees, if the option buyer chooses to exercise the right, to exchange the currency at the predetermined rate. Because the writer is accepting risk the buyer must pay a premium to the writer - normally within two business days of the option purchase. (For more details on options see Chapter 20.)

Currency options premiums are shown for the currency rates between the US\$ and the euro, the US\$ and the Yen and the US\$ and the UK pound in the Financial Times - see Exhibit 21.5. This data is taken from the trading system of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME). For the US\$/UK£ call options the purchaser has the right but not the obligation to purchase pounds for dollars. The call holder has a number of possible rates of exchange open to himself/herself. The ones shown in the FT ( $\$ 1.8700 / £$ to $\$ 1.9000 / £$ ) represent just a few of the possibilities. The premiums payable, shown in the body of the table, are quoted as US cents per pound. One contract is for $£ 62,500$, and you are only
able to purchase whole numbers of contracts on the exchange. If you purchased a 1870 call option for expiry in April you would pay a premium of 2.64 US cents per UK pound (the total premium payable would be $\$ 0.0264 \times 62,500=$ $\$ 1,650$ ) giving you the right to buy pounds with dollars in April at a rate of $\$ 1.8700 / £$. Note that a less favorable exchange rate, e.g. 1880 commands a lower premium, only 2.16 cents per pound under the contract.

The purchase of a put option gives you the right but not the obligation to sell pounds and receive dollars. Again the quantity of a contract is for $£ 62,500$.

## Currency options

■ US \$/€ OPTIONS (CME)

| Strike price | $\ldots \ldots .$ |  |  | CALLS | $\ldots \ldots .$. | $\ldots \ldots .$. PUTS $\ldots \ldots .$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb 19 | Mar | Apr | May | Mar | Apr | May |  |  |
| 12500 | 2.44 | 3.03 | - | 0.46 | 1.35 | - |  |  |
| 12600 | 1.72 | 2.46 | - | 0.82 | 1.80 | - |  |  |
| 12700 | 1.15 | 1.95 | - | 1.32 | 2.21 | - |  |  |
| 12800 | 0.74 | 1.48 | 2.00 | 1.80 | 2.86 | - |  |  |

Previous day's data: volume, 2,359; calls, 5,250 puts, 7,609; open interest, 80,162. Source: Reuters/CME.

- US \$/YEN OPTIONS (CME)

| Strike price | CALLS |  |  | ........ PUTS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb 19 | Mar | Apr | May | Mar | Apr | May |
| 9200 | 1.50 | 2.38 | 2.58 | 0.19 | 0.46 | 0.58 |
| 9300 | 0.87 | 1.65 | - | 0.47 | 0.78 | 1.00 |
| 9400 | 0.31 | 1.02 | - | 0.96 | 1.09 | 1.40 |
| 9500 | 0.12 | 0.61 | - | 1.43 | 1.90 | - |

Previous day's data: volume, 1,742 ; calls, 1,033 puts, 2,775 ; open interest, 43,064. Source: Reuters/CME.

US \$/UK£ OPTIONS (CME)

| Strike price | CALLS |  |  | PUTS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb 19 | Mar | Apr | May | Mar | Apr | May |
| 1870 | 2.48 | 2.64 | - | 0.71 | 2.74 | - |
| 1880 | 2.16 | 2.26 | - | 1.14 | - | - |
| 1890 | 1.44 | 1.90 | - | 1.56 | - | - |
| 1900 | 1.24 | - | - | 2.74 | - | - |
| Previous day' <br> Source: Reute | a: volu ME | $007 ;$ | $\text { , } 278 \mathrm{r}$ | $1,285 ;$ | inte | $1,826$ |

EXHIBIT 21.5 Currency options displayed in the Financial Times

The $\$ / €$ call and put premiums are quoted as US cents per euro under the contract. One contract is for $€ 125,000$. The yen contracts are different in that the quoted premiums are US cents per 100 yen. Each contract is for 12.5 m yen.

The CME quotes option prices for many more exchange rates than those shown in the FT - see www.cme.com.

The crucial advantage an option has over a forward is the absence of an obligation to buy or sell. It is the option buyer's decision whether to exercise the option and insist on exchange at the strike rate or to let the option lapse.

With a forward there is a hedge against both a favorable and an unfavorable movement in forex rates. This means that if the exchange rate happens to move in your favor after you are committed to a forward contract you cannot take any advantage of that movement. We saw above that if the forward rate was $\mathrm{C} \$ 2.25 / £$ the exporter will receive $£ 977,778$ in three months. If the spot exchange rate had moved to, say, C $\$ 1.9 / £$ over the three months the exporter would have liked to abandon the agreement to sell the dollars at C $\$ 2.25 / £$, but is unable to do so because of the legal commitment. By abandoning the deal and exchanging at spot when the Canadian firm pays the exporter will receive an income of:

$$
\frac{\mathrm{C} \$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}}{1.9}=£ 1,157,895
$$

This is an extra $£ 180,117$.
An option permits both:

- hedging against unfavorable currency movement; and
- profit from favorable currency movement.


## Worked example 21.1 CURRENCY OPTION CONTRACT

Now, imagine that the treasurer of the UK firm hedges by buying a threemonth sterling call option giving the right but not the obligation to deliver Canadian dollars in exchange for pounds with a strike price of C $\$ 2.25 / \&$ when the goods are delivered to the Canadian firm in February.

To induce a bank to make the commitment to exchange at the option holder's behest a premium will need to be paid up front. Assume this is $2 \%$ of the amount covered, that is a non-refundable $0.02 \times \mathrm{C} \$ 2,200,000=$ $\mathrm{C} \$ 44,000$ is payable two business days after the option deal is struck.

## Three months later

The dollars are delivered by the importer on the due date. The treasurer now has to decide whether or not to exercise the right to exchange those dollars for sterling at $\mathbf{C} \$ 2.25 / \&$. Let us consider two scenarios:

## Scenario 1

The dollar has strengthened against the pound to $\mathrm{C} \$ 1.9 / £$. If the treasurer exercises the right to exchange at $\mathbf{C} \$ 2.25 / \AA$ the UK firm will receive:

$$
\frac{\mathrm{C} \$ 2,200,000}{2.25}=£ 977,778
$$

If the treasurer takes the alternative and lets the option lapse - 'abandons it' - and exchanges the dollars in the spot market, the amount received will be:

$$
\frac{\mathrm{C} \$ 2,200,000}{1.9}=£ 1,157,895
$$

Clearly in this case the best course of action would be not to exercise the option, but to exchange at spot rate. Note that the benefit of this action is somewhat reduced by the earlier payment of $\mathrm{C} \$ 44,000$ for the premium.

## Scenario 2

Now assume that the dollar has weakened against sterling to C $\$ 2.5 / £$. If the treasurer contacts the bank (the option writer) to confirm that the exporter wishes to exercise the option the treasurer will arrange delivery of $\mathrm{C} \$ 2,200,000$ to the bank and will receive $£ 977,778$ in return:

$$
\frac{\mathrm{C} \$ 2,200,000}{2.25}=£ 977,778
$$

The alternative, to abandon the option and sell the $\mathrm{C} \$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}$ in the spot forex market, is unattractive:

$$
\frac{\mathrm{C} \$ 2,200,000}{2.5}=£ 880,000
$$

Again, the option premium needs to be deducted to give a more complete picture.

With the option, the worst that could happen is that the exporter receives $£ 977,778$, less the premium. However the upside potential is unconstrained.

Option contracts are generally for sums greater than US\$1m on the OTC (over-the-counter) market (direct deals with banks) whereas one contract on CME is, for example, for $£ 62,500$. The drawback with exchange-based derivatives is the smaller range of currencies available and the inability to tailor-make a hedging position.

Exhibit 21.6 discusses the attitude of some treasurers and analysts to hedging forex risk.

## To hedge or not to hedge

There is a range of futures, swaps and currency options from which to choose.

## Simon Kuper

A company can expend blood, sweat and tears on achieving a 15 per cent rise in exports. But when it converts its foreign income into its home currency, it may be in for a nasty shock. If its domestic currency has risen by 15 per cent, all the extra profits will be wiped out.

The phenomenon is called currency risk. Corporate treasurers, the people who manage this risk for their companies, have a much more complicated life now than they did a decade ago, says Mr John Parry, director of Rostron Parry, a consultancy specialising in financial markets and derivatives.

Ten years ago there was little more a treasurer could do to hedge risk than buy a currency forward - that is, to set a price today for which he agreed to buy the currency at a certain time in the future. Now there is a range of futures, swaps and currency options from which to choose.

Perhaps the form of hedging that is growing fastest is the currency option. It gives a company the right to buy or sell a currency at a set price at a certain time in the future. This can be expensive: a 'plain vanilla' option can cost 4 per cent of the amount of pounds the user needs to buy.

But before treasurers even look into ways of hedging risk, they are faced with a big question: should they bother? Some companies never hedge, choosing instead to live with currency risk. They argue that while exchange rates sometimes move against them, they sometimes change in their favour. For instance, if the pound falls, a UK company will see the value of its foreign earnings rise when it converts
them into sterling. To have hedged would have meant to lose these windfall gains.

UK and US companies would have mostly gained from leaving their currency exposure unhedged in recent years, as the pound and dollar have tended to fall. But there was a turnaround in recent months, when the pound's surge hit UK exporters. According to foreign exchange advisers, most have never hedged. Profits have been sliced at many companies.

Critics of hedging currency risk often cite companies which have come a cropper from dabbling in derivatives. Allied Lyons, the UK foods company, lost £150m after currency options positions went wrong in 1991. Orange County in California, the Belgian government, and the unlucky Nick Leeson of Barings Bank are no advertisements for buying 'derivatives' either. 'Mention the word "derivatives" around a board table and everybody freezes,' says Mr Jeremy Wagener, director-general of the UK's Association of Corporate Treasurers.

The Allied Lyons affair has made UK companies more wary of derivatives than their rivals are in France, the US and Scandinavia, according to bankers. Even a company as large as British Steel proclaims proudly that it never uses currency options. 'We don't go in for anything fancy,' it says. 'We only buy straightforward forwards.'

Companies outside the UK often regard their currency management side as a profit centre, says Ms Lisa Danino, a saleswoman at Bank of America. She adds: 'In sophistication, the UK corporates are quite a way behind.'

Small businesses tend to be those most frightened of hedging. 'They often have no treasurer and no thoughts on the subject at all,' says Mr Wagener. Mr Michele di Stefano, head of forex sales at BZW, says: 'In most cases, treasury operations are understaffed.' Even treasurers who themselves understand complex hedging products have to be able to explain them to their directors, often a tricky task.

Nor can customers always trust banks to give them impartial advice on derivatives. The banks, after all, are trying to sell products. Mr Bill McLuskie, treasurer of Canary Wharf Ltd in the UK, claims: 'I know bankers who say, "Given the quality of some treasurers, it's easy to con them".'

Mr McLuskie and Mr Wagener nonetheless preach the virtues of hedging currency risk. The main thing a
company is buying is certainty, they say. No longer can its cash flow stall and start depending on which way the forex market moves. To hedge is to buy insurance, says Mr Wagener. A risk-averse company should hedge; a company with risk-appetite may well consider not doing so.

Many people regard buying currency derivatives as 'speculation', says Mr McLuskie. In fact, he argues, the opposite is true. Not to buy the products is to speculate on the foreign exchange market. And most companies have no special insight into which way a currency will move. Mr Parry says: 'Your job as a producer of goods and services is not to second-guess the foreign exchange markets.'

Mr Parry says: 'The question in the end is what value you put on being able to sleep at night when the markets are moving all over the place.'

EXHIBIT 21.6 To hedge or not to hedge
Source: Financial Times 18 April 1997

## Managing translation risk

The effect of translation risk on the balance sheet can be lessened by matching the currency of assets and liabilities. For example, Graft plc has decided to go ahead with a US $\$ 190 \mathrm{~m}$ project in the USA. One way of financing this is to borrow $£ 100 \mathrm{~m}$ and exchange this for dollars at the current exchange rate of US $\$ 1.9 / £$. Thus at the beginning of the year the additional entries into the consolidated accounts are as shown in Worked Example 21.2.

Worked example 21.2
TRANSLATION RISK

## Opening balance sheet

| Liabilities |  | Assets |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Loan | 100 m |  |
|  |  |  | 100 m |

The US $\$ 190 \mathrm{~m}$ of US assets are translated at US $\$ 1.9 / £$ so all figures are expressed in the parent company's currency.

Now imagine that over the course of the next year the dollar depreciates against sterling to US $\$ 2.30 / \&$. In the consolidated group accounts there is still a $£ 100 \mathrm{~m}$ loan but the asset bought with that loan, while still worth US $\$ 190 \mathrm{~m},{ }^{7}$ is valued at only $£ 82.61 \mathrm{~m}$ when translated into sterling. In the parent company's currency terms, $£ 17.39 \mathrm{~m}$ needs to be written off:

Year-end balance sheet

| Liabilities |  | Assets |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loan | £ 100m | US assets | $£ 100 \mathrm{~m}$ |
|  | £100m |  | £82.61m |
| Forex loss | -£17.39m |  |  |

Alternatively Graft plc could finance its dollar assets by obtaining a dollar loan. Thus, when the dollar depreciates, both the asset value and the liability value in translated sterling terms becomes less.

## Opening balance sheet

| Liabilities |  | Assets |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Loan | U100m |  |

If forex rates move to US $\$ 2.30 / \&:$
Year-end balance sheet

| Liabilities |  | Assets |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | $£ 82.61 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | US assets |

There is no currency loss to deal with.

One constraint on the solution set out in Worked Example 21.2 is that some governments insist that a proportion of assets acquired within their countries is financed by the parent firm. Another constraint is that the financial markets in some countries are insufficiently developed to permit large-scale borrowing.

Many economists and corporate managers believe that translation hedging is unnecessary because, on average over a period of time, gains and losses from forex movements will even out to be zero. Exhibit 21.7 considers the reasons for most companies taking no steps to hedge against profit translation risk.

## When a hedge is not a gardener's problem

Richard Adams

As the half-yearly company reporting season has got under way, so too have the protests from UK companies that the strength of sterling is cutting profits.

BOC, the gas producer, estimated that sterling's rapid rise in the last 12 months would cut $£ 46 \mathrm{~m}$ off its annual profits because of the cost of translating foreign currency earnings into sterling.

But, as one letter writer to the Financial Times recently asked, surely UK companies could avoid these problems by hedging their currency exposure, using financial instruments to protect against exchange rate fluctuations?

In fact, exporters use a number of techniques to lower currency risks. An engineering firm exporting machinery to Germany, for example, could price its contracts in sterling and shift the exchange rate risk on to its customers. Exporters can also buy forward contracts for an exchange rate fixed at a future date.

An unpublished survey of corporate treasurers by Record Treasury Management, a London consultancy, found that 77 per cent of respondents used forward contracts and other currency derivatives.

But Les Halpin, chief executive of RTM, said while many companies were happy to use derivatives to hedge their cash positions, almost none was prepared to use similar instruments to protect profits earned overseas.

The result is companies with substantial overseas operations, such as BOC, Imperial Chemical Industries and Reuters, have reported translation losses in converting foreign profits. ICI said interim pre-tax profits were down $£ 90 \mathrm{~m}$ because of the rapid rise in sterling. It attributed $£ 30 \mathrm{~m}$ to the translation into sterling.

So why not use derivatives to hedge translation costs? UK companies rarely do, according to Mr Halpin, because they often don't understand them.

The RTM survey found that 30 per cent said 'complexity' was the main risk in using derivatives. 'Most company executives think a hedge is something they get their gardener to trim,' grumbled one City equities analyst.

Another 35 per cent of treasurers said 'lack of control' was a significant risk - the fear that the spirit of Nick Leeson may live in a graduate trainee within the finance department. Since future profit levels are unknown, deciding how much to hedge is one barrier.

Sandvik, the Swedish industrial group, was recently caught out by currency hedging, as it reported an 18 per cent fall in first-half profits. In its case, the weakening of the krona meant its hedged positions made a loss.

UK finance directors are reluctant to hedge for several reasons. Profits lost in translation can often be 'paper losses' it is only when the profits are converted into sterling that a loss is made. And there are complex accounting problems for representing derivatives on balance sheets, especially for instruments spanning several years.

But the most important reservation may be psychological.

If a corporate treasurer gets permission to hedge overseas earnings, and a currency shift makes the hedge unnecessary, then the cost and blame for the decision can be easily identified. But if the treasurer decides not to hedge, then the company is at the whim of the currency markets, an act of God for which no one is responsible.

Ironically, many corporate treasurers are happy to let their organisations dabble
in currency speculation - even though treasurers are no better than anyone else in predicting rate movements.

In 1996, RTM asked them to predict sterling's rate against the D-Mark in a year's time. The highest reply was DM2.50. A year later, the pound rose above DM3.02-25 per cent more than the average forecast of DM2.40.

Hedging cannot protect a company from extended currency movements.

John Rennocks, finance director of British Steel, said: 'Hedging is an important part of any exporter's business activity, but can only defer the impact of violent currency swings.'

But, Mr Halpin replied, well judged hedging can give a company 'breathing space', enabling it to take decisions on moving production or resources before the full impact of a currency swing is felt.

EXHIBIT 21.7 When a hedge is not a gardner's problem
Source: Financial Times 18 August 1997

## Managing economic risk

Economic exposure is concerned with the long-term effects of forex movements on the firm's ability to compete, and add value. These effects are very difficult to estimate in advance, given their long-term nature, and therefore the hedging techniques described for transaction risk are of limited use. The forwards markets may be used to a certain extent, but these only extend for a short period for most currencies. Also the matching principle could be employed, whereby overseas assets are matched as far as possible by overseas liabilities.

The main method of insulating the firm from economic risk is to position the company in such a way as to maintain maximum flexibility - to be able to react to changes in forex rates which may be causing damage to the firm. Internationally diversified firms may have a greater degree of flexibility than those based in one or two markets. For example, a company with production facilities in numerous countries can shift output to those plants where the exchange rate change has been favorable. The international car assemblers have an advantage here over the purely domestic producer.

Forex changes can impact on the costs of raw materials and other inputs. By maintaining flexibility in sourcing supplies a firm could achieve a competitive advantage by deliberately planning its affairs so that it can switch suppliers quickly and cheaply.

Forex changes can impact on the costs of raw materials and other inputs.

An aware multinational could allow for forex changes when deciding in which countries to launch an advertising campaign. For example, it may be pointless increasing marketing spend in a country whose currency has depreciated rapidly recently, making the domestically produced competing product relatively cheap. It might also be sensible to plan in advance the company's response to a forex movement with regard to the pricing of goods so that action can be rapid. For example, a UK company

Being prepared may avert an erroneous knee-jerk decision.
exporting to Norway at a time when sterling is on a rising trend can either keep the product at the same price in sterling terms to maintain profits and face the consequential potential loss of market share, or reduce the sterling price to maintain a constant price in krone and thereby keep its market share. Being prepared may avert an erroneous knee-jerk decision. PSA Peugeot Citroen chose to reduce UK sales rather than price when the euro was high against the pound in 2003.

The principle of contingency planning to permit quick reaction to forex changes applies to many areas of marketing and production strategies. This idea links with the notion of the real option described in Chapter 20. The option to switch sources of supply and output, or to change marketing focus, may have a high value. Despite the cost of creating an adaptable organization, rather than a dedicated fixed one, the option to switch may be worth far more in an uncertain world.

Exhibit 21.8 describes the moves made by a number of UK companies to reduce their economic risk exposure by setting up manufacturing operations in a range of countries.

## A test of company strategy

## Peter Marsh

The US employees of Industrial Acoustics Company, a Winchester-based business that is a world leader in making noise-proof enclosures for installations such as jet testing centres and power stations, could soon be among the beneficiaries of the dollar's weakening.

Brian Quarendon, the company's chief executive, says he is considering switching the manufacture of anti-noise products to IAC's New York plant to meet strong demand from the Middle East. They will be made more cheaply in the US than in the company's factories in the UK and continental Europe. We are hoping for another $\$ 25 \mathrm{~m}$ worth of business in the Middle East in the next two years. The way the dollar has been moving, I envisage most of this being produced from the US,' says Mr Quarendon.

IAC's reaction to the dollar's fragility illustrates the way company managers are thinking about altering their strategies now that several years of relative currency stability appear to be ending. If the dollar's weakness continues and the euro maintains its new-found robustness, how much opportunity does this give UK-based businesses to change the way they operate?

In the short term, the winners are UK-based companies exporting to the rest of Europe. The losers are those selling to dollar-denominated regions, including China and other nations in south-east Asia.

But according to Sir David Lees, chairman of the GKN engineering group, many UK companies are now so internationally spread that they are highly unlikely to make big changes in strategy on the back of short-term currency shifts.
'In GKN's case, we would never decide to switch production from our plants in Germany to the US on the grounds that the dollar has become weak,' says Sir David. 'In six months' time, the situation could reverse and we'd have to switch back again.'

The case of Imperial Chemical Industries shows how globalisation strategies provide inbuilt protection against currency swings. Two decades ago, any sudden weakening of sterling against continental European currencies would have boosted ICI, which was then a large maker of commodity chemicals sold globally but produced mainly in the UK. Today ICI mainly makes smaller-volume, high-value materials that are produced in plants around the world and used in markets close by. Therefore, the company says, the dollar's weakness makes little difference to how it seeks to run its business.

JCB, the UK's biggest maker of construction machinery, is another case in point. Until four years ago, all the company's plants were in Britain, giving the business much more exposure to changes in exchange rates. JCB now has several factories outside the UK, including a US plant employing 200.
'To some degree we anticipated the kind of change [the dollar weakening] that we have seen in the past few months,' says John Patterson, JCB's chief executive. 'Having our own US factory puts us in a much better position to respond if currencies move in an unexpected manner.'

In the past few years, many UKbased manufacturers have also sourced more parts from companies based in continental Europe, capitalising on the euro's relative weakness at the time.

Because UK industry has spread its risk to currency swings in this way, Harry Rawlinson, managing director of Aqulaisa, a Kent-based shower manufacturer, says that today 'it is a moot point' whether it is in the best interests of UK industry for the pound to be strong or weak against the euro.

If most of UK industry has less reason to worry about currency swings than in the past, most industrial managers would argue that this is how it should be: rather than spend time fretting about the ups and downs of currencies, they can get on with making and selling better products.

EXHIBIT 21.8 A test of company strategy
Source: Financial Times 10/11 January 2004

## Conclusion

Managers need to be aware of, and to assess, the risk to which their firms are exposed. The risk that arises because exchange rates move over time is one of the most important for managers to consider. Once the extent of the exposure is known managers then need to judge what, if anything, is to be done about it. Sometimes the threat to the firm and the returns to shareholders are so great as to call for robust risk-reducing action. In other cir-

Managers need to be aware of, and to assess, the risk to which their firms are exposed. cumstances the cost of hedging outweighs the benefit. Analyzing and appraising the extent of the problem and weighing up alternative responses are where managerial judgment comes to the fore.

Knowledge of derivatives markets and money markets, and of the need for flexible manufacturing, marketing and financing structures, is useful background, but the key managerial skill required is discernment in positioning the company to cope with forex risk. The ability sometimes to stand back from the fray, objectively assess the cost of each risk-reducing option and say, 'No, this risk is to be taken on the chin because in my judgment the costs of managing the risk reduce shareholder wealth with little to show for it,' is sometimes required.

## Websites

www.bis.org
www.bloomberg.co.uk
www.reuters.co.uk
www.ft.com
www.bankofengland.co.uk
www.ecb.int
www.nybot.com
www.cme.com

Bank for International Settlements
Bloomberg
Reuters
Financial Times
Bank of England
European Central Bank
New York Board of Trade (FINEX)
Chicago Mercantile Exchange

## Notes

1 It is also shortened to FX.
2 The figures for 2004 will be published by the Bank For International Settlements in its triannual survey in the autumn/winter of 2004. See www.bis.org
3 The Financial Times takes a representative sample of rates from major dealers in London at 4 p.m.
4 If we ignore the marketmakers' bid/offer spread and transaction costs.
5 The CME and FINEX trades later months than those shown by the FT, but these, again, are usually at three-month intervals.
6 With some currency option contracts the exercise can take place any time up to the expiry date, rather than only on the expiry date.
7 Assuming, for the sake of simplicity, no diminution of asset value in dollar terms.

| Interest rates $(\%)$ |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| 1 |  |
| 1 | 1.0100 |
| 2 | 1.0201 |
| 3 | 1.0303 |
| 4 | 1.0406 |
| 5 | 1.0510 |
| 6 | 1.0615 |
| 7 | 1.0721 |
| 8 | 1.0829 |
| 9 | 1.0937 |
| 10 | 1.1046 |
| 11 | 1.1157 |
| 12 | 1.1268 |
| 13 | 1.1381 |
| 14 | 1.1495 |
| 15 | 1.1610 |
| 16 | 1.1726 |
| 17 | 1.1843 |
| 18 | 1.1961 |
| 19 | 1.2081 |
| 20 | 1.2202 |
| 25 | 1.2824 | 은

흔







 $\begin{array}{rrr}1.2100 & 1.2200 & 1.2300 \\ 1.4641 & 1.4884 & 1.5129 \\ 1.7716 & 1.8158 & 1.8609 \\ 2.1436 & 2.2153 & 2.2889 \\ 2.5937 & 2.7027 & 2.8153 \\ 3.1384 & 3.2973 & 3.4628 \\ 3.7975 & 4.0227 & 4.2593 \\ 4.5950 & 4.9077 & 5.2389 \\ 5.5599 & 5.9874 & 6.4439 \\ 6.275 & 7.3046 & 7.9259 \\ 8.1403 & 8.9117 & 9.7489 \\ 9.8497 & 10.8722 & 11.9912 \\ 11.9182 & 13.2641 & 14.7491 \\ 14.4210 & 16.1822 & 18.1414 \\ 17.4494 & 19.7423 & 22.3140 \\ 21.1138 & 24.0856 & 27.4462 \\ 25.5477 & 29.3844 & 33.7588 \\ 30.9127 & 35.8490 & 41.5233 \\ 37.4043 & 43.7358 & 51.0737 \\ 45.2593 & 53.3576 & 62.8206 \\ 111.3909 & 144.2101 & 176.8593\end{array}$
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FUTURE VALUE OF AN ANNUITY OF £1 AT COMPOUND INTEREST

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| 2 | 2.0100 | 2.0200 | 2.0300 | 2.0400 | 2.0500 | 2.0600 | 2.0700 | 2.0800 | 2.0900 | 2.1000 | 2.1200 | 2.1400 | 2.1600 | 2.1800 | 2.2000 | 2.2500 | 2.3000 | 2.3500 | 2.4000 | 2.4500 | 2.5000 |
| 3 | 3.0301 | 3.0604 | 3.0909 | 3.1216 | 3.1525 | 3.1836 | 3.2149 | 3.2464 | 3.2781 | 3.3100 | 3.3744 | 3.4396 | 3.5056 | 3.5724 | 3.6400 | 3.8125 | 3.9900 | 4.1725 | 4.3600 | 4.5525 | 4.7500 |
| 4 | 4.0604 | 4.1216 | 4.1836 | 4.2465 | 4.3101 | 4.3746 | 4.4399 | 4.5061 | 4.5731 | 4.6410 | 4.7793 | 4.9211 | 5.0665 | 5.1254 | 5.3680 | 5.7646 | 6.1870 | 6.6329 | 7.1040 | 7.6011 | 8.1250 |
| 5 | 5.1010 | 5.2040 | 5.3091 | 5.4163 | 5.5256 | 5.6371 | 5.7507 | 5.8666 | 5.9847 | 6.1051 | 6.3528 | 6.6101 | 6.8771 | 7.1542 | 7.4416 | 8.2070 | 9.0431 | 9.9544 | 10.9456 | 12.0216 | 13.1875 |
| 6 | 6.1520 | 6.3081 | 6.4684 | 6.6330 | 6.8019 | 6.9753 | 7.1533 | 7.3359 | 7.5233 | 7.7156 | 8.1152 | 8.5355 | 8.9775 | 9.4420 | 9.9299 | 11,2588 | 12.7560 | 14.4834 | 16.3238 | 18.4314 | 20.7813 |
| 7 | 7.2135 | 7.4343 | 7.6625 | 7.8983 | 8.1420 | 8.3938 | 6.6540 | 8.9228 | 9.2004 | 9.4872 | 10.0890 | 10.7305 | 11.4139 | 12.1415 | 12.9159 | 15.0735 | 17.5828 | 20.4919 | 23.8534 | 27.7255 | 32.1719 |
| 8 | 8.2857 | 8.5830 | 8.8923 | 9.2142 | 9.5491 | 9.8975 | 10.2598 | 10.6366 | 11.0285 | 11.4359 | 12.2997 | 13.2328 | 14.2401 | 15.3270 | 16.4991 | 19.8419 | 23.8577 | 28.6640 | 34.3947 | 41.2019 | 49.2578 |
| 9 | 9.3685 | 9.7546 | 10.1591 | 10.5828 | 11.0266 | 11.4913 | 11.9780 | 12.4876 | 13.0210 | 13.5795 | 14.7757 | 16.0853 | 17.5185 | 19.0857 | 20.7989 | 25.8023 | 32.0150 | 39.6964 | 49.1526 | 60.7428 | 74.886 |
| 10 | 10.4622 | 10.9497 | 11.4639 | 12.0061 | 12.5779 | 13.1808 | 13.816 | 14.4866 | 15.1929 | 15.9374 | 17.5487 | 19.3373 | 21.3215 | 23.5213 | 25.9587 | 33.2529 | 42.6195 | 54.5902 | 49.8137 | 89.0771 | 113.330 |
| 11 | 11.5668 | 12.1687 | 12.8078 | 13.4864 | 14.2068 | 14.916 | 15.7836 | 16.6455 | 17.5603 | 18.5313 | 20.6546 | 23.0445 | 25.7329 | 28.7551 | 32.1504 | 42.5661 | 56.4053 | 74.6967 | 98.7391 | 130.162 | 170.995 |
| 12 | 12.6825 | 13.4121 | 14.1920 | 15.0258 | 15.9171 | 16.8699 | 17.8885 | 18.9771 | 20.1407 | 21.3843 | 24.1331 | 22.2707 | 30.8502 | 34.9311 | 39.5805 | 54.2077 | 74.3270 | 101.841 | 139.235 | 189.735 | 257.493 |
| 13 | 13.8093 | 14.6803 | 15.6178 | 16.6268 | 17.7130 | 18.8821 | 20.1406 | 21.4953 | 22.9534 | 24.5227 | 28.0291 | 32.0887 | 36.7862 | 42.2187 | 48.4966 | 68.7596 | 97.6250 | 138.485 | 195.929 | 276.115 | 387.239 |
| 14 | 14.947 | 15.9739 | 17.0863 | 18.2919 | 19.5986 | 21.0151 | 22.5505 | 24.2149 | 26.0192 | 27.9750 | 32.3926 | 37.5811 | 43.6720 | 50.8180 | 59.1959 | 86.9495 | 127.913 | 187.954 | 275.300 | 401.367 | 581.859 |
| 5 | 16.0969 | 17.2934 | 18.5989 | 20.0236 | 21.5786 | 23.2760 | 25.1290 | 27.1521 | 29.3609 | 31.7725 | 37.2797 | 43.8424 | 51.6595 | 60.9653 | 72.0351 | 109.687 | 167.286 | 254.738 | 386.420 | 582.982 | 873.788 |
| 16 | 17.2579 | 16.6393 | 20.1569 | 21.8245 | 23.6575 | 25.6725 | 27.8881 | 30.3243 | 33.0034 | 35.9497 | 42.7533 | 50.9804 | 60.9250 | 72.9390 | 87.4421 | 138.109 | 218.472 | 344.897 | 541.988 | 846.324 | 1311.68 |
| 17 | 18.4304 | 20.0121 | 21.7616 | 23.6975 | 25.8404 | 28.2129 | 30.8402 | 33.7502 | 36.9737 | 40.5447 | 48.8837 | 59.1176 | 71.6730 | 87.0680 | 105.931 | 173.636 | 285.014 | 466.611 | 759.784 | 1228.17 | 1968.52 |
| 8 | 19.6147 | 21.4123 | 23.4144 | 25.6454 | 28.1324 | 30.9057 | 33.9990 | 37.4502 | 41.3013 | 45.5992 | 55.7497 | 68.3941 | 84.1407 | 103.740 | 128.117 | 218.045 | 371.518 | 630.925 | 1064.70 | 1781.85 | 2953.78 |
|  | 20.8109 | 22.8406 | 25.1169 | 27.6712 | 30.5390 | 33.7600 | 37.3790 | 41.4463 | 46.0185 | 51.1591 | 63.4397 | 78.9692 | 98.6032 | 123.414 | 154.740 | 273.556 | 483.973 | 852.748 | 1491.58 | 2584.68 | 4431.68 |
| 0 | 22.0190 | 24.2974 | 2638704 | 29.7781 | 33.0660 | 36.7856 | 40.9955 | 45.7620 | 51.1601 | 57.2750 | 72.0524 | 91.0249 | 113.380 | 146.628 | 186.688 | 342.945 | 630.165 | 1152.21 | 2089.21 | 3748.78 | 6648.51 |
| 25 | 28.2432 | 32.0303 | 36.4593 | 41.6459 | 47.7271 | 54.8645 | 63.2490 | 73.1059 | 84.7009 | 93.3471 | 133.334 | 181.871 | 249.214 | 42.603 | 471.981 | 1054.79 | 2348.80 | 5176.50 | 1247.1990 | 24040.7 | 50500.3 |
| 30 | 34.7849 | 40.5681 | 47.5754 | 56.0849 | 66.4388 | 79.0582 | 94.4608 | 113.83 | 136.308 | 164.494 | 241.333 | 356.787 | 530.312 | 790.948 | 1181.88 | 3227.17 | 8729.99 | 23221.6 | 60501.1 | 154107 | 383.500 |
| 35 | 41.6603 | 49.9945 | 60.4621 | 73.6522 | 90.3203 | 111.435 | 138.237 | 172.317 | 215.711 | 271.024 | 431.663 | 93.573 | 1120.71 | 1816.65 | 2948.34 | 9856.76 | 32422.9 | 104136 | 325400 | 987794 | 2912217 |
| 40 | 48.8864 | 60.4020 | 75.4013 | 95.0255 | 120.800 | 154.762 | 199.635 | 259.057 | 337.882 | 442.593 | 767.091 | 1342.03 | 2360.76 | 4163.21 | 7343.86 | 30088.7 | 120393 | 466960 | 1750092 | 6331512 | 22114663 |
| 5 | 56.4811 | 71.8927 | 92.7199 | 121.029 | 159.700 | 212.744 | 285.749 | 368.504 | 525.859 | 718.905 | 1358.23 | 2590.56 | 4965.27 | 9531.58 | 18281.3 | 91831.5 | 447019 | 2093876 | 9412424 | 40583319 | 167933233 |
| 50 | 64.4632 | 84.5794 | 112.797 | 152.667 | 209.348 | 290.336 | 406.529 | 573.770 | 815.084 | 1163.91 | 2400.02 | 4994.52 | 10435.6 | 21813.1 | 45497.2 | 280256 | 1659761 | 9389020 | 50622288 | 260128295 | 75242998 |


[^0]:    Source: Thomson Financial Datastream

[^1]:    Source: Financial Times, 20 February 2004

