# WORKING PAPER SERIES  6

Marek Rusnák:
Nowcasting Czech GDP in Real Time

2013

CNB CZECH
NATIONAL BANK

# WORKING PAPER SERIES

**Nowcasting Czech GDP in Real Time**

Marek Rusnák

6/2013

**CNB WORKING PAPER SERIES**

The Working Paper Series of the Czech National Bank (CNB) is intended to disseminate the results of the CNB's research projects as well as the other research activities of both the staff of the CNB and collaborating outside contributors, including invited speakers. The Series aims to present original research contributions relevant to central banks. It is refereed internationally. The referee process is managed by the CNB Research Department. The working papers are circulated to stimulate discussion. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the CNB.

Distributed by the Czech National Bank. Available at http://www.cnb.cz.

# Nowcasting Czech GDP in Real Time

Marek Rusnák*

## Abstract

The prominent measure of the current state of the Czech economy, gross domestic product (GDP), is available only with a significant lag of roughly 70 days. In this paper, we employ a Dynamic Factor Model (DFM) to nowcast Czech GDP in real time. Using multiple vintages of historical data and taking into account the publication lags of various monthly indicators, we evaluate the real-time performance of the DFM over the 2005–2012 period. The results suggest that the accuracy of model-based nowcasts is comparable to that of the judgmental nowcasts of the Czech National Bank (CNB). Our results also suggest that foreign variables are crucial for the accuracy of the model, while omitting financial and confidence indicators does not worsen the nowcasting performance. Finally, we show how releases of new data can be viewed through the lens of the dynamic factor model.

**JEL Codes:**   C53, C82, E52.
**Keywords:**    Dynamic factor model, GDP, nowcasting, real-time data.

## Nontechnical Summary

Because of sizeable publication delays in the release of new data on gross domestic product (GDP), timely estimates of current-quarter GDP (so-called nowcasts) are crucial for policymakers assessing the state of the economy in real time. Obtaining these nowcasts is not straightforward because of the peculiar structure of real-time data, which is characterized by unbalanced datasets at the end of the sample, data sampled at different frequencies, and substantial data revisions.

The recently developed nowcasting framework of Giannone et al. (2008) can deal with these real-time issues by casting a dynamic factor model in a state-space framework. In addition to the ability of the framework to deal with unbalanced datasets and mixed frequencies, it can utilize a potentially large set of variables by summarizing macroeconomic comovements by a few common factors.

In this paper, we evaluate the performance of the dynamic factor model when applied to nowcasting Czech GDP over the 2005–2012 period, using multiple vintages of real-time data. The model utilizes 28 headline macroeconomic variables. In addition to so-called hard data covering the production, sales, labor, and trade sectors of the economy, we include a handful of financial variables and confidence indicators. Furthermore, we add several foreign variables to account for the fact that the Czech Republic is a small open economy.

Our results suggest that the dynamic factor model can compete successfully with the judgmental nowcasts of the Czech National Bank (CNB). Furthermore, the results indicate that the dynamic factor model provides useful additional information relative to the nowcasts of the CNB, since combining the two nowcasts results in smaller forecasting errors on average. We also find that the inclusion of foreign variables is crucial for the accuracy of the model. On the other hand, excluding financial variables and confidence indicators does not result in a substantial deterioration of the nowcasting accuracy.

We also show how one can decompose changes in the nowcasts into different news coming from newly published data. Moreover, we show that the dynamic factor model can be used successfully to nowcast other variables, such as expenditure components of the Czech national accounts. Finally, we find that the forecasting performance of the DFM at longer horizons (up to six quarters ahead) is comparable to that of the official CNB predictions.

# 1.  Introduction

Because of considerable publication delays in the release of GDP data, the current state of the economy is subject to sizeable uncertainty. Accurate and timely estimates of the current state of the economy are therefore especially important for policymakers, who make their decisions in real time. They utilize these estimates as inputs for core models that produce longer-term projections and to assess potential inflationary pressures. In the present turbulent situation, obtaining the most up-to-date forecasts of GDP, possibly after each new data announcement, is becoming even more important, for example, in the event of irregular monetary policy meetings in the midst of a crisis or other unexpected developments in the economy. Such up-to-date forecasts of Czech GDP produced in real time are the objective of this study.

Forecasters face several problems when producing predictions in real time. Macroeconomic variables are announced in a non-synchronous manner, that is, they have different publication lags. As a result, forecasters have to work with datasets that contain many missing observations towards the end of the sample (the so-called ragged end problem). Another problem forecasters typically face is the fact that data are sampled at different frequencies. Most of the traditional forecasting models – such as leading indicators models and classical vector autoregressions – cannot easily deal with these issues: they cannot utilize the most up-to-date data releases in a model-consistent fashion. Enter nowcasting.

The nowcasting framework of Giannone et al. (2008) has become the workhorse model of short-term forecasters at many central banks and other institutions (for an extensive list of references see Bańbura et al., 2013). The framework is based on a dynamic factor model cast in the state-space representation and on the application of the Kalman filter to deal with mixed frequencies and unbalanced datasets.[1] The framework can accommodate a potentially large number of variables by summarizing the information with a few common factors, thus overcoming the so-called curse of dimensionality (Stock and Watson, 2002a; Bernanke and Boivin, 2003). An additional advantage of the framework is that it allows forecasters not only to predict variables of interest in real time, but also to interpret and comment on the sources of the changes in the forecasts. This provides a story-telling dimension and a deeper understanding of the forecast that is almost as important to policymakers as the accuracy of the forecast itself. This feature is missing from most of the statistical models that are currently used for near-term projections.

An additional challenge for real-time forecasters is the presence of data revisions. Typically, the forecasting exercises and model selection are performed using revised data. It is well known, however, that the revisions to macroeconomic data are frequent and large (Faust et al., 2005; Garratt and Vahey, 2006; Aruoba, 2008; Croushore, 2011; Fernandez et al., 2011). Therefore, working with the last available data may provide starkly different results than those obtained using real-time data (as documented by many studies: Robertson and Tallman, 1998; Faust

---

[1] Previous seminal contributions include Wallis (1986) and Evans (2005). See also Foroni and Marcellino (2013), who provide a survey of state-of-the-art mixed frequency models that can deal with ragged end problems.

et al., 2003; Orphanides, 2001; Kugler et al., 2005; Molodtsova et al., 2008). In particular, in forecasting applications, neglecting data revisions might substantially understate forecast errors (Stark and Croushore, 2002). As for the properties of revisions to Czech GDP, in our previous research (Rusnak, 2013), we find that the revisions are relatively large. Performing a proper real-time forecasting exercise using Czech data therefore seems to be greatly needed.

The short-term forecasting performance of various models of Czech GDP has been assessed before by many studies (Benda and Ruzicka, 2007; Arnostova et al., 2011; Havranek et al., 2012; Horvath, 2012). Unfortunately, most of these studies do not account for publication lags and data revisions, which renders the relevance of their results to policymakers rather questionable.[2] Consider, for example, the official comments that the CNB makes after each release of GDP. Out of the CNB's 32 comments published during the 2005–2012 period, roughly 17 of them mention revisions to the national accounts as one of the sources of the deviation of the official CNB forecasts from the announced data. Obviously, revisions must be therefore considered an important issue to policymakers. Truly real-time exercises to evaluate the performance of dynamic factor models in the presence of data revisions are still relatively scarce. The exceptions are Schumacher and Breitung (2008) for Germany, Camacho and Perez-Quiros (2010) for the euro area, and Bańbura et al. (2013) and Liebermann (2012) for the US. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to investigate the performance of forecasts of Czech GDP in a truly real-time setting that employs unrevised vintages of historical data.

In this paper, we focus on the performance of the DFM in obtaining accurate forecasts of the current quarter (so-called nowcasts). Accurate nowcasts are important since they serve as inputs to the structural models that are used for medium to long-term prediction (the CNB uses a G3 DSGE model, see Andrle et al., 2009, for details). Furthermore, the CNB comments on the releases of the latest GDP growth figures and discusses the deviations from its official predictions. This makes the accuracy of CNB nowcasts of crucial importance.

Formal model-based forecasts are typically compared to naive benchmarks or to other competing models. Comparisons with official central bank forecasts are rare, but do exist, especially in the context of model combinations (Lees et al., 2007; Adolfson et al., 2007; Groen et al., 2009; Edge et al., 2010; McDonald and Thorsrud, 2011). A common finding of these studies is that the accuracy of model-based forecasts of GDP is comparable to that of the official forecasts of the respective central banks.[3] In this paper, we contribute to this literature by evaluating the performance of the dynamic factor model using Czech real-time data and comparing it with the accuracy of the judgmental nowcasts of the Czech National Bank.

In addition, we contribute to the existing literature on the role of confidence indicators, financial variables, and foreign data for the performance of Czech GDP forecasts. Horvath (2012) finds that domestic and foreign confidence indicators do not improve the short-term forecasts

---

[2] Arnostova et al. (2011), in their replication of Rünstler et al. (2009), account for publication lags, but their analysis is based on a revised dataset.

[3] Note that not all of these papers use unrevised data, so the comparability should be interpreted with caution.

of Czech GDP. Havranek et al. (2012) find that financial variables improve VAR forecasts of Czech GDP, but their predictive performance is not stable over time. These studies, however, do not use vintage data and do not account for publication lags. In this study, we revisit their findings using a dynamic factor model in a real-time out-of-sample exercise.

Finally, we show how one can use the methodology of Bańbura and Modugno (2013) to decompose the updates of Czech GDP nowcasts into the contributions of the individual variables – so-called *news*. This is possible since the dynamic factor model produces forecasts for all of the variables included. One can then interpret changes in the forecasts stemming from the differences between the actual data released and their predicted values. For example, it is reasonable to assume that a higher-than-expected value of industrial production will cause the forecast to be revised upwards. The dynamic factor model can quantify such statements. Similar decompositions of forecast updates are now regularly used by many central banks (see for example ECB, 2008; Bundesbank, 2009) to enhance the understanding of their short-term forecasts.

Our results suggest that the nowcasting performance of the medium-scale DFM is comparable to the judgmental nowcasts of the Czech National Bank. In addition, we find that the simple average of the DFM and CNB nowcasts is more accurate than the nowcasts of the DFM and CNB alone. We also find that the DFM nowcasts add value to the CNB nowcasts: conditional on the CNB nowcast, on average, GDP growth turns out to be higher when the DFM nowcast is higher. Similarly to D'Agostino and Giannone (2012) and Liebermann (2012), we find that the relative performance of the DFM is better at times of crisis, which are characterized by large comovements of variables. We also find that the inclusion of foreign variables is crucial: if we exclude foreign variables the performance worsens significantly, while the omission of financial variables or surveys does not result in a dramatic deterioration of the forecasting accuracy.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly discusses the dynamic factor model, Section 3 describes our real-time dataset and provides details of the empirical exercise together with its results. Section 4 presents examples of nowcast update decompositions, while Section 5 provides further results and sensitivity checks. Section 6 concludes.

## 2.   Dynamic Factor Model

Dynamic factor models aim at capturing the most important features of the data while remaining parsimoniously specified. They do so by assuming that the bulk of the comovements in macroeconomic variables are driven by just a few common factors (this seems to be the case in the US, see Giannone et al., 2005). The technology of dynamic factor models has evolved over time. The first generation consisted of small-scale models estimated by maximum likelihood and the Kalman filter (Engle and Watson, 1981; Mariano and Murasawa, 2003; Camacho and Perez-Quiros, 2010). These models were able to handle data irregularities, but were unable to utilize more than a few variables.

Forecasters and policymakers, however, monitor a large number of different time series (Bernanke and Boivin, 2003). Because the time span of most of the series is rather short – a problem of even bigger importance in economies that transformed to a market economy relatively recently – applying traditional models to a large number of variables would result in parameter proliferation and imprecise forecasts. Therefore, the second generation of factor models uses nonparametric principal components estimation of factors from large cross sections (Chamberlain and Rothschild, 1983; Forni and Reichlin, 1998; Forni et al., 2000; Stock and Watson, 2002b,a). However, principal components cannot deal with ragged ends on their own.

The third generation of factor models combines the first and second generations: factors approximated by principal components are utilized within a state-space framework (Giannone et al., 2008; Rünstler et al., 2009; Bańbura and Rünstler, 2011). Thus, they constitute a model that can handle large data sets with data irregularities present in a real-time forecasting setting. The asymptotic properties of these models can be found in Doz et al. (2011).

Finally, the most recent papers use the expectation-maximization algorithm to obtain maximum likelihood estimates of large models that are able to deal with unbalanced datasets (Schumacher and Breitung, 2008; Bańbura and Modugno, 2013). On the whole, this approach consists of iterating between the two steps: estimating the parameters conditional on the factors, and estimating the factors conditional on the parameters from previous iterations. The asymptotic theory is provided in Doz et al. (2012).

An accessible survey of dynamic factor models can be found in Stock and Watson (2010), while Bai and Ng (2008) provide a more technical survey. Bańbura et al. (2010a) and Bańbura et al. (2013) survey the application of factor models with a focus on nowcasting.

In our empirical exercise we will use the latest generation dynamic factor model estimated by the expectation-maximization algorithm. We begin by specifying the model for monthly variables:

$$x_t = \Lambda f_t + \varepsilon_t \tag{2.1}$$

$$f_t = A_1 f_{t-1} + \cdots + A_p f_{t-p} + u_t, \tag{2.2}$$

where $x_t$ is a vector of monthly variables transformed into stationary ones, $f_t$ is a vector of $r$ (unobserved) common factors, and $u_t$ is a vector of idiosyncratic shocks. $\Lambda$ denotes a matrix of factor loadings, while $A_1, \ldots, A_p$ denote the autoregressive coefficients for the factors.

Quarterly variables are modeled using the approximation of Mariano and Murasawa (2003). We adopt the convention that the quarterly GDP level, denoted by $GDP_t^Q$, is assigned to the third month of the quarter. The unobserved monthly counterpart of GDP is denoted by $GDP_t^M$.

$$GDP_t^Q = GDP_t^M + GDP_{t-1}^M + GDP_{t-2}^M \qquad t = 3, 6, 9, \ldots \qquad (2.3)$$

We further define

$$Y_t^Q = 100 * log(GDP^Q) \qquad (2.4)$$
$$Y_t^M = 100 * log(GDP^M), \qquad (2.5)$$

and assume that the monthly growth rate of GDP, $y_t = Y_t^M - Y_{t-1}^M$, admits the same factor model representation as the monthly variables:

$$y_t = \Lambda_Q f_t + \varepsilon_t^Q \qquad (2.6)$$

We link $y_t$ with the observed GDP data by constructing the following partially observed monthly series:

$$y_t^Q = \begin{cases} Y_t^Q - Y_{t-3}^Q & t = 3, 6, 9, \ldots \\ \text{unobserved} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad (2.7)$$

Finally, we use the approximation suggested by Mariano and Murasawa (2003):

$$\begin{aligned} y_t^Q = Y_t^Q - Y_{t-3}^Q &\approx (Y_t^M + Y_{t-1}^M + Y_{t-2}^M) - (Y_{t-3}^M + Y_{t-4}^M + Y_{t-5}^M) \\ &= y_t + 2y_{t-1} + 3y_{t-2} + 2y_{t-3} + y_{t-4} \end{aligned}$$

Our dynamic factor model can be then cast in a state-space form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_t \\ y_t^Q \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Lambda_Q & 2\Lambda_Q & 3\Lambda_Q & 2\Lambda_Q & \Lambda_Q & 1 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_t \\ f_{t-1} \\ f_{t-2} \\ f_{t-3} \\ f_{t-4} \\ \varepsilon_t^Q \\ \varepsilon_{t-1}^Q \\ \varepsilon_{t-2}^Q \\ \varepsilon_{t-3}^Q \\ \varepsilon_{t-4}^Q \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_t \\ \xi_t^Q \end{pmatrix} \qquad (2.8)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_t \\ f_{t-1} \\ f_{t-2} \\ f_{t-3} \\ f_{t-4} \\ \varepsilon_t^Q \\ \varepsilon_{t-1}^Q \\ \varepsilon_{t-2}^Q \\ \varepsilon_{t-3}^Q \\ \varepsilon_{t-4}^Q \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ I_r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_{t-1} \\ f_{t-2} \\ f_{t-3} \\ f_{t-4} \\ f_{t-5} \\ \varepsilon_{t-1}^Q \\ \varepsilon_{t-2}^Q \\ \varepsilon_{t-3}^Q \\ \varepsilon_{t-4}^Q \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} u_t \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \varepsilon_t^Q \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad (2.9)$$

Direct numerical maximization of the likelihood can be computationally challenging and inefficient if a model contains more than a few variables. Therefore, the estimation is performed using the expectation-maximization algorithm (Shumway and Stoffer, 1982; Watson and Engle, 1983; Schumacher and Breitung, 2008). We use the methodology of Bańbura and Modugno (2013), who generalize the method so that the DFM can deal with an arbitrary pattern of missing observations. In brief, the estimation can be described as consisting of iterations of two steps. In the first step, the expectation of the log-likelihood conditional on the estimates from the previous iteration is calculated. In the second step, the parameters are re-estimated using the expected likelihood from the previous step. The initial values are obtained by filling in the missing observations by draws from N(0,1) and estimating the principal components on the balanced part of the sample (similarly as in Giannone et al. (2008)). For further technical details of the EM iterations we use in this application, see Bańbura and Modugno (2013).

## 3.  Real-Time Nowcasting Exercise

### 3.1  Real-Time Data Set

We compose a real-time database of 99 monthly vintages: the first vintage is from October 2004, and the last from December 2012. We collect a panel of 28 headline macroeconomic variables that covers headline hard data, financial variables, surveys, and foreign (exogenous) variables. Most data start in January 2000 and span up to the latest observation available in that particular vintage. The exceptions are the government bond yield and the services confidence indicator, which start in April 2000 and May 2002, respectively. Our dataset is relatively balanced in the number of series pertaining to each group. In particular, we have nine series of hard data covering the production, labor, and trade sectors of the economy. A further seven financial series cover exchange and interest rates, stock prices, and credit aggregates, while five survey series cover confidence indicators of business and consumers. Finally, we add six series of exogenous variables covering hard, financial, and survey variables. The variables are transformed to stationarity by taking log-differences (or first differences in the case of several confidence

indicators).[4] Plots of the series can be found in the Appendix. Further, before estimation, the variables are standardized to have zero mean and unit variance.

For the series that are subject to frequent revisions (ten overall, most of the hard data variables) we use the OECD Real-Time Database. In addition, we collect vintages of credit from CNB Monetary Statistics Monthly Bulletin publications. Most of the financial variables (interest and exchange rates) and surveys are not revised. The exception is the euro area business climate indicator, which is revised due to changes in the composition of the euro area. Therefore, for this variable we collect vintages from press releases available on the European Commission website. Unemployment is not revised, but it is published as not seasonally adjusted. Performing seasonal adjustment on the latest available series first and then using the data sequentially would probably introduce information about trends that was not available at the time of the forecast (see also Orphanides and van Norden, 2002). Therefore, we perform seasonal adjustment sequentially, using only the information available at the time of the relevant forecast.[5]

The number of variables is relatively small compared to what is typically used in factor model applications.[6] However, Bańbura et al. (2010b,a) show that the gains from including more than 20–40 variables are rather modest and that disaggregate information does not improve the forecast accuracy. Arnostova et al. (2011) consider 98 indicators to forecast Czech GDP, but almost half of them are disaggregate information on industrial production and sales. We do not include this disaggregate information since this would probably result in contaminating the estimated common factor with idiosyncratic shocks to industrial production and sales (see also Boivin and Ng, 2006, for a more general discussion). By including only headline variables, we are, in fact, also loosely following the recommendation of Alvarez et al. (2012) to include only one reference series for each economic concept.

Other than dismissing the disaggregate sectoral information and omitting some variables due to unavailability of real-time vintages (such as fiscal data covering monthly government spending and tax revenues), we opt not to pre-select the indicators any further. We find pre-selection of indicators rather problematic. First, the existing procedures recommended by Boivin and Ng (2006) and Bai and Ng (2008) do not take into account the presence of ragged ends and differences in the timeliness of the variables. Arnostova et al. (2011) compute bivariate correlations with GDP and exclude those with a correlation lower than 0.5. We opt not to follow this practice since it neglects the ragged ends and potential dynamic cross-correlation between different variables. Second, it is well known that the predictive content of individual variables is not stable

---

[4] Note that it is not clear whether one should also difference the confidence indicators: some authors prefer to keep them in levels (Camacho and Perez-Quiros, 2010), while others do difference them (Giannone et al., 2008; Bańbura et al., 2013). We followed the suggestion of a referee and also estimated the specification with surveys in levels: the results suggest that the accuracy of the model deteriorated, so we decided to keep the surveys in differences. These results are available upon request.

[5] Seasonal adjustment was performed by employing Demetra software and using the Tramo-Seats procedure. Note that the real-time vintages of construction from the OECD Real-Time Database were also only available as not seasonally adjusted. Therefore, we adjusted them as well.

[6] Note that the Monte Carlo evidence by Doz et al. (2012) suggests that sufficient EM estimation robustness can be obtained with just a handful of variables.

over time (De Mol et al., 2008; Rossi and Sekhposyan, 2010; Stock and Watson, 2012; Kuzin et al., 2013) and therefore pre-selecting the indicators might not be the optimal strategy. Third, a model that includes all of the key variables might be of greater interest to policymakers than a model with pre-selected indicators only, since policymakers might want to comment on various headline data releases. Fourth, pre-selecting indicators using data from tranquil periods might have a negative effect on the accuracy of forecasts during crisis periods. Finally, we believe that by not including too many variables (over)representing the same concept, the dynamic factor model will assign the correct weights to the variables included (see Bańbura et al., 2013, for more details).

*Table 1: Data Set*

| No. | Group | Variable | Revisions | Pub. Lag | Unb. Pat. | Source |
|-----|-------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|--------|
| 1 | Hard | Real GDP | Y | 68 to 71 | 4,5,3–4,5,3 | OECD |
| 2 | Hard | Industrial production index | Y | 37 to 45 | 2–2 | OECD |
| 3 | Hard | Construction output | Y | 37 to 45 | 2–2 | OECD |
| 4 | Hard | Retail Sales | Y | 35 to 49 | 2–2 | OECD |
| 5 | Hard | Unemployment rate | N | 8 to 11 | 1–1 | MLSA |
| 6 | Hard | CPI total | N | 8 to 11 | 1–1 | CZSO |
| 7 | Hard | Exports (current prices) | Y | 35 to 39 | 2–2 | OECD |
| 8 | Hard | Imports (current prices) | Y | 35 to 39 | 2–2 | OECD |
| 9 | Hard | Export price index | N | 43 to 47 | 3–2 | CZSO |
| 10 | Hard | Import price index | N | 43 to 47 | 3–2 | CZSO |
| 11 | Financials | CZK/EUR exchange rate | N | 0 | 1–0 | CNB |
| 12 | Financials | M2 | Y | 30 to 31 | 2–1 | OECD |
| 13 | Financials | Credit | Y | 30 to 31 | 2–1 | CNB MB |
| 14 | Financials | 3M PRIBOR | N | 0 | 1–0 | CNB |
| 15 | Financials | 1Y PRIBOR | N | 0 | 1–0 | CNB |
| 16 | Financials | PX-50 stock index | N | 0 | 1–0 | PSE |
| 17 | Financials | Czech government bond yield (10Y) | N | 0 | 1–0 | CNB |
| 18 | Surveys | Consumer confidence indicator | N | -7 to -2 | 1–0 | CZSO |
| 19 | Surveys | Industry confidence indicator | N | -7 to -2 | 1–0 | CZSO |
| 20 | Surveys | Construction confidence indicator | N | -7 to -2 | 1–0 | CZSO |
| 21 | Surveys | Trade confidence indicator | N | -7 to -2 | 1–0 | CZSO |
| 22 | Surveys | Services confidence indicator | N | -7 to -2 | 1–0 | CZSO |
| 23 | Exogenous | EURIBOR 3M | N | 0 | 1–0 | ECB |
| 24 | Exogenous | EURIBOR 1Y | N | 0 | 1–0 | ECB |
| 25 | Exogenous | Oil price (Brent) | N | 0 | 1–0 | Datastream |
| 26 | Exogenous | Ifo business climate Germany | N | -10 to -4 | 1–0 | IFO |
| 27 | Exogenous | Euro area business climate | Y | -4 to -1 | 1–0 | EC |
| 28 | Exogenous | Germany exports | Y | 40 | 2–2 | OECD |

*Notes:* Pub. Lag stands for publication lag and indicates the typical publication delay of a variable in days (based on 2005–2012 publication calendars), and Unb. Pat. stands for unbalancedness patterns and indicates the number of missing observations for the middle of the month and the end of the month, respectively; for GDP (because it is released quarterly) the numbers correspond to the first, second, and third month of each quarter. CZSO denotes the Czech Statistical Office, CNB denotes the Czech National Bank's ARAD Database, CNB MB denotes the Czech National Bank's Monetary Statistics Monthly Bulletin, PSE denotes the Prague Stock Exchange, ECB denotes the European Central Bank's Statistical Data Warehouse, MLSA denotes the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, OECD denotes the OECD Real-time Database, and EC denotes the European Commission. All indicators except for GDP are at monthly frequency. All of the variables are in logarithms and differenced, except for the industry, construction, trade, and services confidence indicators, which are differenced only.

GDP data are released approximately ten weeks after the end of the reference quarter (in the first half of the third month of the subsequent quarter). Most of the hard data are published with varying delays ranging from one to seven weeks. On the other hand, with the exception of money and credit aggregates the financial variables are available with no lag. The surveys are, in fact, published several days before the end of the reference month. Details about the variables used, including their publication lags and sources, are summarized in Table 1.

## 3.2   Design of the Nowcasting Exercise

Our nowcasting exercise is designed as follows. We perform 31 nowcasting rounds, starting with 2005Q1. For each quarter we perform 14 forecast updates, which reflect the arrival of new information over time. Throughout the text we will refer to forecast origins during the preceding quarter (Q(-1)) as forecasting, those during the current quarter (Q(0)) as nowcasting, and those during the following quarter (Q(+1)) as backcasting. The first forecast is performed in the middle of the first month of the preceding quarter (Q(-1)M1 mid). We update the forecasts in the middle and at the end of each month. The last forecast update is performed at the end of the first month of the following quarter (Q(+1)M1 end). We do not perform any additional update, as the preliminary (flash) estimate of GDP is released in the first half of the second month of the following quarter.[7] Since at the time of writing this paper (December 2012), only 2012Q3 GDP growth is available for evaluation, the last nowcasting round we perform is for 2012Q3.

We could, in principle, perform more updates during a month, i.e., after each publication release. However, in practice trade, industry, construction, unemployment, and the CPI are released early at the beginning of the month – although the relative ordering of publication changes from month to month. Consequently, we prefer to model this as a simultaneous release, since we believe it is closer to reflecting the real-time situation.

As for the evaluation of forecasts, we use both the first release and the latest vintage available (December 2012). The argument for using the former is that the Czech National Bank officially discusses every first release value of GDP and explains the reasons behind the deviations from its nowcast. Therefore, the accuracy of the model with respect to this first release is of importance to the CNB. On the other hand, the latest vintage data are arguably closest to reflecting the "true" value of GDP growth. As a result, we opt for using both series to evaluate the accuracy of the nowcasts.

Given that our time series dimension is rather short (beginning in Jan 2000) we opt for a parsimonious specification with regard to the number of factors and lags. We model comovements with one factor and the dynamics of the factor with two lags. While specifications with one or three lags give virtually same results, increasing the number of factors results in deterioration of the forecasting accuracy (see subsection 5.2 for more details).

---

[7] The correlation between the preliminary and first releases and the preliminary and final releases of GDP over the 2007Q4–2012Q2 period is 0.95 and 0.84, respectively.

### 3.3  In-Sample Properties

Before presenting the results of the out-of-sample exercise, we describe here several properties of the DFM estimated with the data available in September 2012, which corresponds to Q(0) M3 end of our last nowcasting round.

Figure 1 presents the estimated factor, which reflects the common element that drives the co-movements of the variables included in our model. We compare the factor to the leading indicator produced by the OECD, which is designed to predict turning points in the Czech business cycle relative to the trend.[8] Overall, the factor and the OECD leading indicator are very similar and it seems that both track the business cycle dynamics in the Czech Republic quite well. The advantage of the DFM is that it is available in real time, whereas the OECD leading indicator is published with a lag of two months.

*Figure 1: Factor Estimated in September 2012*



Next, to get more insight into the forces driving the DFM nowcasts we report the estimated loadings in Figure 2. Note that the loadings reflect mostly contemporaneous correlations, and we make no attempt to establish the causality. The loadings indicate that most of the series are procyclical, while unemployment, the exchange rate, export and import prices, and the government bond yield seem countercyclical. Except perhaps for the exchange rate, the loadings are in line with what one might expect a priori about the contemporaneous correlations with

---

[8] The components of the OECD leading indicators are: the balance of payments, demand and production evolution surveys, the CPI, consumer confidence, exports, and share prices. For more details see http://stats.oecd.org/mei/default.asp?lang=e&subject=5&country=CZE. We present the vintage of the leading indicator as of September 2012. To facilitate comparison, we present the monthly growth rates of the indicator scaled by the mean and standard deviation of the factor estimated by the DFM.

the business cycle.[9]  As for the relative magnitudes, the exogenous variables have the largest loadings. Notably, the trade variables along with interest rates also have high magnitudes. On the other hand, construction, M2, and government bond yields possess rather small loadings, but we prefer to keep them in the model since we do not want to select variables based on in-sample measures.

*Figure 2: Loadings Estimated in September 2012*



### 3.4 Nowcasting Performance

Figure 3 reports the results from our real-time nowcasting exercise. For each forecasting round, i.e.,for each of the 14 different forecast origins starting from the middle of the first month of the preceding quarter until the end of the first month of the following quarter, we plot the corresponding root mean square error (RMSE). The RMSE gives us an idea of the out-of-sample forecast uncertainty that is tied to a given forecast origin.

First, we consider several naive benchmarks: a model where the last available growth is a new forecast (random walk (RW)), an autoregressive model of order two (AR(2)), and a moving av-

---

[9] The exchange rate is defined as the Czech koruna against the euro, hence an increase corresponds to a depreciation of the currency. Since there might be delays between the time of the exchange rate shock and the effect on trade or the economy as a whole, the negative contemporaneous correlation might be plausible. Alternatively, the loading might be a consequence of the fact that the Czech currency typically depreciates when investors are expecting an overall deterioration in economic activity in the region.

erage of the last four available quarters (MA(4)). We observe that the DFM performs better than any of the naive benchmarks. On the whole, it seems that with the arrival of new information the forecasting errors seem to decrease, although not always.

### *Figure 3: Root Mean Square Errors of Different Forecasts*



(a) Evaluated Using First Releases of GDP Growth     (b) Evaluated Using Latest Vintage (Dec 2012)

We also compare the performance of the DFM to so-called bridge-equation models, which are the tools traditionally used in central banks (Kitchen and Monaco, 2003; Baffigi et al., 2004).[10] In Figure 3, we present the RMSE of the mean of the individual bridge equation forecasts. We observe that the bridge equations become more precise with more information, but cannot really compete with the DFM. They are able to beat the naive benchmarks, except for the forecast origins at the end of the current quarter and the beginning of the next quarter, where they seem to perform worse than the RW and MA(4) benchmarks.

In Figure 3, we also plot the RMSE of the CNB nowcasts. The CNB nowcasts are taken from the final forecast books that are prepared regularly by the Monetary Policy Department for the quarterly Situation Report. The CNB produces its GDP nowcast at the end of the last month

---

[10] More information about the specification of the bridge equations is provided in the Appendix.

of the reference quarter (Q(0)M3 end). The CNB nowcast is produced by a model that consists of a set of equations of expenditure components, estimated at quarterly frequency. The CNB nowcasts are adjusted by expert judgment, typically reflecting the latest developments of leading indicators or other subjective evaluation (see Arnostova et al., 2011, for more details). We also compare the accuracy of the one-quarter-ahead forecasts (Q(-1)M3 end). Overall, the performance of the model-based DFM nowcasts is comparable to that of the judgmental nowcasts of the CNB, while at the one-quarter-ahead horizon the DFM seems to fare rather worse than the CNB. While the CNB nowcasts are a result of a model and expert judgment, the nowcasts produced by the DFM are entirely model-based without imposing subjective judgment. The comparative performance is therefore good news, since the DFM nowcast might serve as a good cross-check of the judgmental nowcast.

Figure 4 presents the nowcasts made by the CNB and the DFM over the 2005–2012 period (nowcasts from Q(0)M3 end forecast origins). The first release GDP growth and the growth as of the latest available vintage are also plotted. The figure suggests that the nowcasts by the CNB and the DFM are very similar in the first half of the evaluation sample, while in the second half they often seem to point in different directions.

*Figure 4: Quarterly GDP Growth and its Nowcasts as of Q(0)M3 end*



Table 2 reports the performance of the DFM and the CNB over the whole sample and two subsamples: a pre-crisis subsample covering the 2005Q1–2008Q2 period and a crisis subsample covering 2008Q3–2012Q3.[11] We present the performance relative to the random walk. The

---

[11] The subsample split also approximately corresponds to the date of change of the core forecasting model used by the CNB. In 2008, the CNB switched from a quarterly projection model to the G3 DSGE model. For more details, see Andrle et al. (2009).

performance of the three naive models is very similar, but we choose the random walk as the benchmark since it has the best performance for the horizon when the CNB nowcasts are produced (Q(0)M3 end).

The average forecasting error of the naive random walk model is 0.93 for the nowcast and almost 1.3 for the one-quarter-ahead horizon. The DFM and CNB are able to reduce the average forecast errors by 30 to 50% relative to the naive RW model. The results also suggest that indirect pooling of information as represented by the bridge equations is not as successful as direct pooling within a single dynamic factor model: the gains in the forecasting accuracy of the bridge equations relative to the naive model are small.

The forecasting improvements seem to come mainly from the crisis period, while the improvements in the pre-crisis period are more modest. This is in line with D'Agostino and Giannone (2012) and Liebermann (2012), who show that the performance of more complex models relative to simple benchmarks is better during more volatile periods characterized by large comovements. Kuzin et al. (2013) note that the forecasting errors of many models are larger in absolute terms during crises and that the improvements in relative performance stem from the fact that the naive benchmarks performed worse. This is also our case: the forecast errors of the naive models are approximately three times higher during crisis periods than in pre-crisis times.

### Table 2: Root Mean Square Errors

| | Full Sample (2005Q1–2012Q3) | | Pre-Crisis (2005Q1–2008Q2) | | Crisis (2008Q3–2012Q3) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Q(-1)M3 end | Q(0)M3 end | Q(-1)M3 end | Q(0)M3 end | Q(-1)M3 end | Q(0)M3 end |
| *Evaluated using first releases of GDP growth* | | | | | | |
| Random Walk (absolute RMSE) | 1.23 | 0.93 | 0.48 | 0.39 | 1.61 | 1.21 |
| *RMSE relative to RW* | | | | | | |
| Bridge | 0.82 | 0.96 | 1.07 | 1.22 | 0.80 | 0.93 |
| DFM | 0.63 | 0.53 | 1.01 | 0.94 | 0.59 | 0.48 |
| CNB | 0.56 | 0.52 | 0.94 | 0.84 | 0.52 | 0.48 |
| Combination CNB & DFM | 0.54 | 0.47 | 0.91 | 0.86 | 0.51 | 0.42 |
| *Evaluated using GDP growth in December 2012 vintage* | | | | | | |
| Random Walk (absolute RMSE) | 1.27 | 0.93 | 0.78 | 0.74 | 1.56 | 1.06 |
| *RMSE relative to RW* | | | | | | |
| Bridge | 0.92 | 1.13 | 1.08 | 1.12 | 0.88 | 1.13 |
| DFM | 0.75 | 0.79 | 1.05 | 1.04 | 0.68 | 0.67 |
| CNB | 0.67 | 0.74 | 1.02 | 0.96 | 0.58 | 0.65 |
| Combination CNB & DFM | 0.68 | 0.74 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 0.58 | 0.61 |

*Notes: Bridge* stands for the nowcast obtained as the average of the nowcasts from the individual bridge equations. *DFM* stands for the nowcast obtained from the dynamic factor model. *CNB* stands for the official nowcast of the Czech National Bank. *Combination CNB & DFM* stands for the nowcast obtained as the simple mean of the CNB and DFM nowcasts.

We also report the performance of the combination of the CNB and DFM nowcasts, which is obtained as the simple mean of the two nowcasts. This combination of nowcasts might serve as insurance against uncertain instabilities, an issue even more important during times of crisis (Clark and McCracken, 2010; Aiolfi et al., 2012). The results suggest that the combination

performs better than the CNB or DFM nowcast alone. The gains are highest during the crisis period. This can also be seen from the forecast errors (which can be found in the Appendix, Figure A5): while in the pre-crisis period the forecast errors seem to be rather correlated, in the crisis period they are frequently going in different directions.

The success of the combination suggests that the purely model-based DFM might add value to the CNB nowcasts in the sense that it contains useful information missing from the CNB nowcasts. We further investigate this issue formally by running the following regression:

$$y_t = \alpha + \beta_1 \widehat{y}_t^{CNB} + \beta_2 \widehat{y}_t^{DFM} + \varepsilon_t, \tag{3.10}$$

where $\widehat{y}_t^{CNB}$ denotes the judgmental CNB forecast and $\widehat{y}_t^{DFM}$ denotes the model-based DFM forecast. Similar regressions are typically employed in the literature (Romer and Romer, 2000; Bjornland et al., 2012).

The results in Table 3 suggest that the DFM could possibly have added value to the CNB nowcasts: conditional on the CNB's forecasts GDP growth turns out to be higher when the DFM nowcast is higher. The subsample results, however, suggest that this result was limited to the crisis period.

**Table 3: Does the DFM Add Value to the CNB's GDP Nowcasts?**

| | $y_t = \alpha + \beta_1 \widehat{y}_t^{CNB} + \beta_2 \widehat{y}_t^{DFM} + \varepsilon_t$ | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Full Sample (2005Q1–2012Q3) | | Pre-Crisis (2005Q1–2008Q2) | | Crisis (2008Q3–2012Q3) | |
| | Q(-1)M3 end | Q(0)M3 end | Q(-1)M3 end | Q(0)M3 end | Q(-1)M3 end | Q(0)M3 end |
| *Dependent variable: first releases of GDP growth* | | | | | | |
| $\alpha$ | -0.46[*] | -0.39[***] | 1.14[*] | 0.57[**] | -0.58[*] | -0.43[***] |
| | (0.27) | (0.06) | (0.57) | (0.22) | (0.28) | (0.07) |
| $\beta_1$ | 0.84[***] | 0.72[***] | 0.41 | 0.53 | 0.58[*] | 0.61[***] |
| | (0.21) | (0.08) | (0.37) | (0.39) | (0.29) | (0.15) |
| $\beta_2$ | 0.71[***] | 0.64[***] | -0.21 | 0.11 | 0.78[***] | 0.68[***] |
| | (0.17) | (0.06) | (0.45) | (0.41) | (0.24) | (0.09) |
| $R^2$ | 0.67 | 0.90 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.57 | 0.90 |
| *Dependent variable: GDP growth in December 2012 vintage* | | | | | | |
| $\alpha$ | -0.53 | -0.46[***] | 2.48[***] | 2.12[**] | -0.73[*] | -0.57[***] |
| | (0.36) | (0.14) | (0.30) | (0.79) | (0.39) | (0.19) |
| $\beta_1$ | 0.92[***] | 0.86[***] | 0.06 | 0.94 | 0.53[**] | 0.57[***] |
| | (0.29) | (0.19) | (0.41) | (0.55) | (0.23) | (0.18) |
| $\beta_2$ | 0.69[***] | 0.56[***] | -1.01[**] | -1.56[**] | 0.81[**] | 0.69[***] |
| | (0.24) | (0.16) | (0.36) | (0.69) | (0.28) | (0.22) |
| $R^2$ | 0.57 | 0.74 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.55 | 0.85 |

*Notes:* Autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity robust standard errors (Newey and West, 1987) in parenthesis.

Finally, we look at the role of financials, surveys, and exogenous variables for the performance of the DFM. Figure 5 presents the out-of-sample RMSE for models that exclude different groups

of variables. Looking at the figure, several observations stand out. First, excluding surveys leaves the accuracy of the model intact, except perhaps for the early forecast origins. Second, the role of the financial variables is ambiguous. Finally, the exogenous variables seem to be crucial for the performance of the model, since their exclusion from the model results in larger errors, consistently so across different forecasting origins. Our results are robust with regard to the actual series used for evaluating the forecasts.

Note also that the role of the various groups of variables is different for different forecast origins, i.e., the timeliness of the variables matters. In our case, there is some role for surveys at the beginning of the nowcasted quarter (Q(0)M1), when little data for that quarter is actually available. In the case of financial variables, excluding them seems to actually decrease the forecast errors during forecasting (Q(-1)). On the other hand, they seem to be important during nowcasting (Q(0)) and backcasting (Q(+1))

The importance of exogenous variables is not surprising, as the Czech Republic is a small open economy (the share of exports and imports in GDP was roughly 146% in 2011).[12] Previous studies employing dynamic factor models seem to suggest that in different countries the inclusion of different blocks of variables is crucial for the accuracy of the DFM. Bańbura et al. (2013) and Bańbura and Rünstler (2011) show that the role of surveys is crucial using US and euro area data, respectively. Aastveit and Trovik (2012) find that the inclusion of foreign variables has a negative impact on the performance of the model using Norwegian data, while financial variables seem to be key to the accuracy of their model. Matheson (2010) finds that excluding surveys worsens the nowcasting performance of the DFM in New Zealand, while Yiu and Chow (2011) find that excluding interest rates increases the forecast errors of the DFM for China. Note, however, that none of the above-mentioned countries is as open as the Czech Republic. The share of exports and imports in GDP for Norway, the most open of these countries, is approximately 70% in 2011, barely half of the Czech Republic's figure. So, it is quite plausible that the shocks hitting the export-dependent Czech economy are different in nature and magnitude from those hitting more closed economies (e.g., terms of trade shocks).

Note that we also performed Diebold-Mariano tests to evaluate the statistical significance of the differences in the predictive abilities of the DFM and CNB nowcasts (Diebold and Mariano, 1995).[13] However, the test results pointed in almost all cases to statistically insignificant (at the 5% level) differences between the competing models. This is not surprising given the small evaluation sample of only 31 observations.[14]

---

[12] See OECD Factbook 2013, available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/factbook-2013-en.
[13] We used the Newey and West (1987) estimator of the long-run variance of the difference between the squared prediction errors.
[14] See also Ashley (2003), who points out that typically more than 100 observations are needed to establish statistically significant differences in forecasting ability across models.

**Figure 5: Performance of the Model when Excluding Various Groups of Data**

(a) Evaluated Using First Releases of GDP Growth



(b) Evaluated Using Latest Vintage (Dec 2012)



# 4.   Interpreting New Data Releases through the Lens of the DFM

In this section, we use the methodology of Bańbura and Modugno (2013) to show how the nowcasting framework can be used to read the flow of data releases through lens of the dynamic

factor model. It is of interest to know the sources of changes in the nowcast that occur after new data are released. For example, when newly released data about the euro area business situation are worse than expected, the model-based nowcast of the GDP will be revised down. Because the DFM produces forecasts for all variables, we can precisely decompose the changes in the nowcasts. Similar decompositions are regularly used in central banks (ECB, 2008; Bundesbank, 2009) to complement their real-time nowcasting exercises with story-telling. In fact, the CNB performs similar decompositions for the interest rate within the core model (Andrle et al., 2009). But the core model is geared towards producing medium to long-term predictions, so it cannot be used directly to decompose the changes in the GDP nowcasts as a result of newly published data.

We denote $\Omega_v$ as the information set at the release $v$ and $\mathbb{D}$ as the set of parameters estimated on the information set $\Omega_v$. Further, we denote $\widetilde{\Omega}_{v+1}$ as the information set with the same unbalancedness pattern as $\Omega_v$, but using the latest data vintage.

We can then decompose the change of the nowcast into three parts: the effect of re-estimation, the effect of data revisions, and the effect of *news*.

1. **The effect of re-estimation** is computed as the difference between the nowcast obtained using the old information set $\Omega_v$ using the new parameters $\mathbb{D}_{v+1}$ and the nowcast obtained using the old information set $\Omega_v$ and the old parameters $\mathbb{D}_v$:

$$\mathbb{E}[y|\Omega_v, \mathbb{D}_{v+1}] - \mathbb{E}[y|\Omega_v, \mathbb{D}_v].$$

2. **The effect of data revisions** is computed as the difference between the nowcast obtained using the new information set with the same unbalancedness pattern as the old one $\widetilde{\Omega}_{v+1}$ and the new parameters $\mathbb{D}_{v+1}$ and the nowcast obtained using the old information set $\Omega_v$ and the new parameters $\mathbb{D}_{v+1}$:

$$\mathbb{E}[y|\widetilde{\Omega}_{v+1}, \mathbb{D}_{v+1}] - \mathbb{E}[y|\Omega_v, \mathbb{D}_{v+1}].$$

3. **The effect of *news*** (the unexpected component of the released data):

$$\mathbb{E}[y|\Omega_{v+1}, \mathbb{D}_{v+1}] - \mathbb{E}[y|\widetilde{\Omega}_{v+1}, \mathbb{D}_{v+1}].$$

In computing the effect of *news* we follow Bańbura and Modugno (2013). They show that one can find coefficients $\delta_{j,v+1}$ such that:

$$\mathbb{E}[y|\Omega_{v+1}, \mathbb{D}_{v+1}] - \mathbb{E}[y|\widetilde{\Omega}_{v+1}, \mathbb{D}_{v+1}] = \sum_j \delta_{j,v+1}(x_{j,T_{j,v+1}} - \mathbb{E}[x_{j,T_{j,v+1}}|\widetilde{\Omega}_{v+1}, \mathbb{D}_{v+1}]). \quad (4.11)$$

The nowcast revision is a weighted average of the *news*. The resulting revision stemming from a release of new data depends on the size as well as the weight of the given variable.

With equation (11) at hand, we are now able to use the lens of the dynamic factor model to interpret the information from the new data releases. Figure 6 presents the evolution of the nowcast as the new information arrives. At each nowcast update, we decompose the size of the update into the contributions of re-estimation, revision, and *news* from the respective variables. To keep the exposition clear, we group the news from individual variables into groups.

*Figure 6: Contribution of News to Nowcast Updates for 2011Q3 Czech GDP Growth (q-o-q)*



We illustrate the contribution of news to the nowcast updates on the example of 2011Q3 Czech GDP growth. We choose this example because the second quarter of 2011 marked the peak of the recovery from the 2009 recession. At the beginning of the preceding quarter the nowcast for 2011Q3 is still rather optimistic, probably reflecting the lack of data corresponding to the 2011Q3 period. The first sizeable downward update of the nowcast is caused by the release of data at the end of May 2011: all of the new data point to a worsening of economic activity. This probably stems from the sharp rises in bond yields and the overall increase in uncertainty during the culmination of the fiscal crisis in Europe. This negative news is corroborated by further data releases pointing to a larger deterioration in expected growth. Following additional negative news coming mostly from the exogenous indicators in August and from the hard data in September, the nowcast at the end of the quarter points to zero quarterly growth. The flash estimate released in the middle of November confirms the stall of the economy, while the first release of the national accounts even points to negative quarterly growth.

In the Appendix, we also show the contribution of news to the nowcast updates for the two most recent nowcasts, i.e., the last two quarters of 2012 (Figure A6). They illustrate other cases one might encounter. Several observations are noteworthy. The plot of the nowcasts of 2012Q3 suggests that the role of re-estimation might be large. This is probably a consequence of the short sample combined with the volatile crisis period, when some of the variables attained extreme values. On the other hand, new data releases might provide conflicting signals, with the news updating the nowcasts going in different directions. This is likely to be more common at times of greater uncertainty. Consider the nowcasts of 2012Q4, which depict the situation where, after certain major news, such as in July and August, which led to a dramatic decrease in the nowcast, the financial data were largely negative, while the surveys and exogenous data pointed to more positive growth. These two sources of news balanced each other out throughout most of the nowcasting periods: the nowcast did not change much after August 2012.

## 5.   Further Results and Robustness Checks

### 5.1   Nowcasting the Expenditure Components of the National Accounts

Dynamic factor models can be useful in nowcasting other policy-relevant quarterly variables, for example, the expenditure components of GDP. Indeed, several papers have employed dynamic factor models to successfully nowcast the components of GDP (Angelini et al., 2010; Godbout and Lombardi, 2012).

To investigate the performance in the Czech case, we add five expenditure components of GDP to our baseline model: consumption, gross fixed capital formation, government consumption, exports, and imports (all at constant prices).[15] The source of the real-time data is again the OECD Real-Time Database. The CNB forecasts/nowcasts for the expenditure components are again taken from the forecast books prepared for the regular quarterly CNB Situation Reports. The forecasts for the components are available in the forecast books only from 2009Q1, so we confine ourselves to presenting the results for this period only.

Looking at the results, several observations emerge. The accuracy of the GDP forecasts is not worsened by adding additional variables. Table 4 presents the results when forecasting one quarter ahead (forecast origin Q(-1)M3 end). The DFM forecasts seem to perform worse than the CNB forecasts for Consumption, GFCF, and Gov. Cons. But the DFM still seems to add value, as suggested by the fact that the forecast combination improves the accuracy of the forecasts. The DFM seems to dominate the CNB when forecasting Exports and Imports.

Table 5 reports the results for nowcasting the current quarter, i.e., forecast origin (Q(-1)M3 end). On the whole, the DFM seems to nowcast better for Consumption and Government Consumption. Note that in the case of exports and imports the dynamic factor model fares worse,

---

[15] We could also impose a restriction that would reflect the national account identities. However, Angelini et al. (2010) find, using the euro area data, that the improvements from imposing this constraint are rather modest.

*Table 4: RMSE, Forecasting GDP Components at Q(-1)M3 end, 2009Q1–2012Q3*

|  | GDP | Consumption | GFCF | Gov. Cons. | Exports | Imports |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Evaluated using first releases of GDP growth* | | | | | | |
| Random Walk (absolute RMSE) | 1.65 | 1.26 | 4.84 | 2.09 | 5.19 | 5.32 |
| *RMSE relative to RW* | | | | | | |
| DFM | 0.53 | 1.02 | 0.80 | 0.99 | 0.75 | 0.82 |
| CNB | 0.50 | 0.95 | 0.69 | 0.90 | 0.87 | 0.96 |
| Combination CNB & DFM | 0.46 | 0.94 | 0.72 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.88 |
| *Evaluated using GDP growth in December 2012 vintage* | | | | | | |
| Random Walk (absolute RMSE) | 1.52 | 1.49 | 5.08 | 1.88 | 4.09 | 3.85 |
| *RMSE relative to RW* | | | | | | |
| DFM | 0.56 | 0.97 | 0.61 | 1.11 | 0.73 | 0.75 |
| CNB | 0.53 | 0.86 | 0.50 | 0.93 | 0.84 | 0.94 |
| Combination CNB & DFM | 0.49 | 0.90 | 0.52 | 0.84 | 0.74 | 0.82 |

*Notes: DFM* stands for the nowcast obtained from the dynamic factor model, and *CNB* stands for the official nowcast of the Czech National Bank. *Combination CNB & DFM* stands for the nowcast obtained as the simple mean of the CNB and DFM nowcasts.

*Table 5: RMSE, Nowcasting GDP Components at Q(0)M3 end, 2009Q1–2012Q3*

|  | GDP | Consumption | GFCF | Gov. Cons. | Exports | Imports |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Evaluated using first releases of GDP growth* | | | | | | |
| Random Walk (absolute RMSE) | 1.19 | 1.01 | 6.12 | 2.07 | 4.86 | 5.15 |
| *RMSE relative to RW* | | | | | | |
| DFM | 0.48 | 1.14 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.96 | 1.05 |
| CNB | 0.47 | 1.28 | 0.68 | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.91 |
| Combination CNB & DFM | 0.42 | 1.10 | 0.68 | 0.66 | 0.75 | 0.83 |
| *Evaluated using GDP growth in December 2012 vintage* | | | | | | |
| Random Walk (absolute RMSE) | 0.90 | 1.64 | 5.57 | 1.84 | 3.96 | 3.70 |
| *RMSE relative to RW* | | | | | | |
| DFM | 0.69 | 0.78 | 0.74 | 0.86 | 0.90 | 1.12 |
| CNB | 0.62 | 0.80 | 0.63 | 0.95 | 0.89 | 1.04 |
| Combination CNB & DFM | 0.58 | 0.73 | 0.64 | 0.75 | 0.67 | 0.80 |

*Notes: DFM* stands for the nowcast obtained from the dynamic factor model, and *CNB* stands for the official nowcast of the Czech National Bank. *Combination CNB & DFM* stands for the nowcast obtained as the simple mean of the CNB and DFM nowcasts.

but still seems to add value, as combining the DFM and CNB nowcasts decreases the nowcast errors.

Note that one could also perform the *news* exercise with components similar to those presented in the previous section.

## 5.2 Performance of the DFM Under Different Specifications

Motivated by the short sample available for the Czech Republic, we largely opted for the simple parsimonious specification of our dynamic factor model. While the results of our baseline model seem to be satisfactory and comparable to the judgmental CNB nowcasts, it might be of interest to investigate the sensitivity of the results to the specification of the number of factors

or the number of lags. Furthermore, we also consider several extensions, such as modeling the dynamics of the idiosyncratic component or restricting the factors to a domestic and a foreign one.

## Figure 7: *Performance of the DFM Model Under Various Specifications*

(a) Evaluated Using First Releases of GDP Growth



(b) Evaluated Using the Latest Vintage (Dec 2012)



In Figure 7, we present the results for several variations of the baseline model. First, we consider the possibility that Czech GDP is driven by two distinct factors: a factor extracted from domestic variables (Hard data, Financials, Surveys) and a factor extracted from exogenous variables. This specification is labeled *Two restricted factors.* The restrictions are imposed as zeros in

the loadings matrix. Next, we consider two factors, but both of them are extracted from all of the monthly indicators. This specification is labeled *Two unrestricted factors*. As an additional extension, we consider modeling the idiosyncratic shock $\varepsilon_t$ as an autoregressive process of order one, to capture possible persistence in these shocks. This specification is labeled *AR idio*. Finally, we consider two variations of the modeling of the factor dynamics: *One lag* and *Three lags* denote the specification where the factor follows an autoregressive process of order one and three, respectively.

The results suggest that the results of various specifications are comparable with the baseline model. Specifications with two factors seem to perform slightly worse, while modeling the dynamics of factors and idiosyncratic components matters only marginally.

### 5.3 Forecasting Performance of the DFM at Longer Horizons

While the DFM is geared towards nowcasting, it might be of interest to evaluate the accuracy at longer horizons as well. Because the variables are transformed to stationarity, the forecast of the DFM at longer horizons will converge to the steady states (historical means). As for the CNB forecasts, these are also converging to the steady states implied by the DSGE model, but they are conditional on expected shocks (largely coming from external developments).

*Table 6: Root Mean Square Errors for Longer Horizons – 2005Q1–2012Q3*

| | Forecast | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2Q ahead | 3Q ahead | 4Q ahead | 5Q ahead | 6Q ahead |
| *Evaluated using first releases of GDP growth* | | | | | |
| Random Walk (absolute RMSE) | 1.29 | 1.38 | 1.52 | 1.56 | 1.52 |
| *RMSE relative to RW* | | | | | |
| DFM | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.78 | 0.75 | 0.79 |
| CNB | 0.75 | 0.77 | 0.76 | 0.78 | 0.84 |
| Combination CNB & DFM | 0.77 | 0.79 | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.81 |
| *Evaluated using GDP growth in December 2012 vintage* | | | | | |
| Random Walk (absolute RMSE) | 1.44 | 1.53 | 1.67 | 1.70 | 1.67 |
| *RMSE relative to RW* | | | | | |
| DFM | 0.83 | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.78 | 0.80 |
| CNB | 0.74 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.86 |
| Combination CNB & DFM | 0.76 | 0.80 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.83 |

*Notes:* The forecasts are produced at the forecast origin Q(0)M3 end. The first forecast is produced in March 2005 and the last forecast in September 2012. *DFM* stands for the forecast obtained from the dynamic factor model, and *CNB* stands for the official forecast of the Czech National Bank. *Combination CNB & DFM* stands for the nowcast obtained as the simple mean of the CNB and DFM nowcasts.

In Table 6 we report the average accuracy of the RW, DFM, and CNB forecasts at horizons two to six quarters ahead. These forecasts are produced at the forecast origin (Q(0)M3 end). The gains relative to the naive random walk forecasts are smaller than during nowcasting and one-quarter-ahead forecasting. Furthermore, the results suggest that the accuracy of the forecasts is comparable, with the CNB slightly dominating at the two to three-quarter horizon, while the

DFM seems to be slightly more accurate at longer horizons.[16] Combining the forecasts does not result in any apparent improvements. Again, the Diebold-Mariano test of differences in the accuracy of the forecasts indicates no statistical differences between the CNB and DFM forecasts. Since the CNB's monetary policy horizon is four to six quarters ahead, it might be of interest to use forecasts from the DFM as a cross-check even at forecasting horizons beyond the current quarter.

Figure A7 in the Appendix presents the forecasts plotted against the GDP growth outturn as of the last vintage. It can be seen that neither model anticipated the downturn of 2009 earlier than two quarters ahead. In the crisis period, the longer-term forecasts of the CNB underestimated the recovery in 2009–2010, while the DFM forecasts did quite well. On the other hand, both models again failed to predict the second recession sooner than two quarters ahead.

## 6.  Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we evaluate the real-time accuracy of the nowcasts produced by the dynamic factor model over the 2005–2012 period. We find that the accuracy of the model-based nowcasts is comparable to the judgmental nowcasts of the Czech National Bank. The accuracy improves if the two nowcasts are combined. Furthermore, we find that the role of foreign variables is crucial for the performance of the DFM: excluding them results in larger forecast errors. We also show how one can interpret the changes in the nowcasts as news contributions from new data releases. The framework might be useful in nowcasting other variables as well. We demonstrated good performance for nowcasting of the expenditure components of Czech GDP. Finally, the forecasting abilities of the DFM even at longer horizons (up to six quarters ahead) are also competitive with the CNB's judgmental forecasts.

Our results are in line with the anecdotal evidence provided by Sims (2002), who documents that the advantage of judgmental forecasts probably stems mainly from their ability to utilize disparate sources of data in real time and is largely limited to the current and one-quarter-ahead horizon. Our results suggest that, indeed, because of the ability of the dynamic factor model to exploit the latest releases of new data, it is able to compete successfully with the judgmental CNB forecasts.

Further research could focus on comparing the accuracy of the DFM with other recently developed mixed-frequency models, such as MIDAS (Andreou et al., 2012; Kuzin et al., 2011) or Mixed Frequency Bayesian VARs (Schorfheide and Song, 2012). Moreover, with regard to the current period of increased uncertainty, accounting for stochastic volatility might bring further forecasting improvements (Marcellino et al., 2013; Carriero et al., 2012).

Finally, note that our analysis focused on the accuracy of point forecasts only. By focusing on the root mean square forecast errors, we assumed that the loss function of policymakers is

---

[16] We also tried a specification that includes outlooks for foreign demand, the foreign PPI, and EURIBOR. There were no improvements in the accuracy of the forecasts. These results are available upon request.

quadratic or that the world is linear. Therefore, in future research, it might be of interest to focus on characterizing the uncertainty surrounding the nowcasts in a fashion similar to Aastveit et al. (2011).

# References

AASTVEIT, K. AND TROVIK, T. (2012): "Nowcasting norwegian GDP: the role of asset prices in a small open economy." *Empirical Economics,* 42(1):95–119.

AASTVEIT, K. A., GERDRUP, K. R., JORE, A. S., AND THORSRUD, L. A. (2011): "Nowcasting GDP in real-time: A density combination approach." Working Paper 2011/11, Norges Bank

ADOLFSON, M., ANDERSSON, M. K., LINDÉ, J., VILLANI, M., AND VREDIN, A. (2007): "Modern Forecasting Models in Action: Improving Macroeconomic Analyses at Central Banks." *International Journal of Central Banking,* 3(4):111–144.

AIOLFI, M., CAPISTRAN, C., AND TIMMERMANN, A. (2012): *Forecast Combinations.* In Clements, M. and Hendry, D., editors, *Forecast Handbook.* Oxford. forthcoming

ALVAREZ, R., CAMACHO, M., AND PÉREZ-QUIRÓS, G. (2012): "Finite sample performance of small versus large scale dynamic factor models." CEPR Discussion Papers 8867, C.E.P.R. Discussion Papers

ANDREOU, E., GHYSELS, E., AND KOURTELLOS, A. (2012): *Forecasting with mixed-frequency data.* In Clements, M. P. and Hendry, D., editors, *Oxford Handbook of Economic Forecasting..*

ANDRLE, M., HLEDIK, T., KAMENIK, O., AND VLCEK, J. (2009): "Implementing the New Structural Model of the Czech National Bank." Working Papers 2009/2, Czech National Bank

ANGELINI, E., BANBURA, M., AND RÜNSTLER, G. (2010): "Estimating and forecasting the euro area monthly national accounts from a dynamic factor model." *OECD Journal: Journal of Business Cycle Measurement and Analysis,* 2010(1):1–22.

ARNOSTOVA, K., HAVRLANT, D., RUZICKA, L., AND TOTH, P. (2011): "Short-Term Forecasting of Czech Quarterly GDP Using Monthly Indicators." *Czech Journal of Economics and Finance (Finance a uver),* 61(6):566–583.

ARUOBA, S. B. (2008): "Data Revisions Are Not Well Behaved." *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking,* 40(2-3):319–340.

ASHLEY, R. (2003): "Statistically significant forecasting improvements: how much out-of-sample data is likely necessary?" *International Journal of Forecasting,* 19(2):229–239.

BAŃBURA, M. AND MODUGNO, M. (2013): "Maximum likelihood estimation of factor models on data sets with arbitrary pattern of missing data." *Journal of Applied Econometrics,* (forthcoming.

BAŃBURA, M. AND RÜNSTLER, G. (2011): "A look into the factor model black box: Publication lags and the role of hard and soft data in forecasting GDP." *International Journal of Forecasting,* 27(2):333–346.

BAŃBURA, M., GIANNONE, D., AND REICHLIN, L. (2010): "Nowcasting." Working Paper Series 1275, European Central Bank

BAŃBURA, M., GIANNONE, D., AND REICHLIN, L. (2010): "Large Bayesian vector auto regressions." *Journal of Applied Econometrics,* 25(1):71–92.

BAŃBURA, M., GIANNONE, D., MODUGNO, M., AND REICHLIN, L. (2013): "Now-Casting and the Real-Time Data Flow." Working Paper Series 1564, European Central Bank

BAFFIGI, A., GOLINELLI, R., AND PARIGI, G. (2004): "Bridge models to forecast the euro area GDP." *International Journal of Forecasting,* 20(3):447–460.

BAI, J. AND NG, S. (2008): "Forecasting economic time series using targeted predictors." *Journal of Econometrics,* 146(2):304–317.

BENDA, V. AND RUZICKA, L. (2007): "Short-term Forecasting Methods Based on the LEI Approach: The Case of the Czech Republic." Research and Policy Notes 2007/01, Czech National Bank

BERNANKE, B. S. AND BOIVIN, J. (2003): "Monetary policy in a data-rich environment." *Journal of Monetary Economics,* 50(3):525–546.

BJORNLAND, H. C., GERDRUP, K., JORE, A. S., SMITH, C., AND THORSRUD, L. A. (2012): "Does Forecast Combination Improve Norges Bank Inflation Forecasts?" *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics,* 74(2):163–179.

BOIVIN, J. AND NG, S. (2006): "Are more data always better for factor analysis?" *Journal of Econometrics,* 132(1):169–194.

BUNDESBANK (2009): *Short-Term forecasting methods as instruments of business cycle analysis.* In *Monthly Report,* number April 2009 of, pages 31–44. Deutsche Bundesbak.

CAMACHO, M. AND PEREZ-QUIROS, G. (2010): "Introducing the euro-sting: Short-term indicator of euro area growth." *Journal of Applied Econometrics,* 25(4):663–694.

CARRIERO, A., CLARK, T. E., AND MARCELLINO, M. (2012): "Real-time nowcasting with a Bayesian mixed frequency model with stochastic volatility." Working Paper 1227, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland

CHAMBERLAIN, G. AND ROTHSCHILD, M. (1983): "Arbitrage, Factor Structure, and Mean-Variance Analysis on Large Asset Markets." *Econometrica,* 51(5):1281–304.

CLARK, T. E. AND MCCRACKEN, M. W. (2010): "Averaging forecasts from VARs with uncertain instabilities." *Journal of Applied Econometrics,* 25(1):5–29.

CROUSHORE, D. (2011): "Frontiers of Real-Time Data Analysis." *Journal of Economic Literature,* 49(1):72–100.

D'AGOSTINO, A. AND GIANNONE, D. (2012): "Comparing Alternative Predictors Based on Large-Panel Factor Models." *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics,* 74(2): 306–326.

DE MOL, C., GIANNONE, D., AND REICHLIN, L. (2008): "Forecasting using a large number of predictors: Is Bayesian shrinkage a valid alternative to principal components?" *Journal of Econometrics,* 146(2):318–328.

DIEBOLD, F. X. AND MARIANO, R. S. (1995): "Comparing Predictive Accuracy." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics,* 13(3):253–63.

DOZ, C., GIANNONE, D., AND REICHLIN, L. (2011): "A two-step estimator for large approximate dynamic factor models based on Kalman filtering." *Journal of Econometrics,* 164(1):188–205.

DOZ, C., GIANNONE, D., AND REICHLIN, L. (2012): "A Quasi–Maximum Likelihood Approach for Large, Approximate Dynamic Factor Models." *The Review of Economics and Statistics,* 94(4):1014–1024.

ECB (2008): *Short-term forecasts of economic activity in the euro area.* In *Monthly Bulletin,* pages 69–74. European Central Bank.

EDGE, R. M., KILEY, M. T., AND LAFORTE, J.-P. (2010): "A comparison of forecast performance between Federal Reserve staff forecasts, simple reduced-form models, and a DSGE model." *Journal of Applied Econometrics,* 25(4):720–754.

ENGLE, R. AND WATSON, M. (1981): "A one-factor multivariate time series model of metropolitan wage rates." *Journal of American Statistical Association,* 76:774–781.

EVANS, M. D. D. (2005): "Where Are We Now? Real-Time Estimates of the Macroeconomy." *International Journal of Central Banking,* 1(2).

FAUST, J., ROGERS, J. H., AND H. WRIGHT, J. (2003): "Exchange rate forecasting: the errors we've really made." *Journal of International Economics,* 60(1):35–59.

FAUST, J., ROGERS, J. H., AND WRIGHT, J. H. (2005): "News and Noise in G-7 GDP Announcements." *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking,* 37(3):403–19.

FERNANDEZ, A. Z., KOENIG, E. F., AND NIKOLSKO-RZHEVSKYY, A. (2011): "A real-time historical database for the OECD." Globalization and Monetary Policy Institute Working Paper 96, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas

FORNI, M. AND REICHLIN, L. (1998): "Let's Get Real: A Factor Analytical Approach to Disaggregated Business Cycle Dynamics." *Review of Economic Studies,* 65(3):453–73.

FORNI, M., HALLIN, M., LIPPI, M., AND REICHLIN, L. (2000): "The Generalized Dynamic-Factor Model: Identification And Estimation." *The Review of Economics and Statistics,* 82(4):540–554.

FORONI, C. AND MARCELLINO, M. (2013): "A survey of econometric methods for mixed-frequency data." Norges Bank Working Papers 06/2013, Norges Bank

GARRATT, A. AND VAHEY, S. P. (2006): "UK Real-Time Macro Data Characteristics." *Economic Journal,* 116(509):F119–F135.

GIANNONE, D., REICHLIN, L., AND SALA, L. (2005): *Monetary Policy in Real Time.* In

*NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2004, Volume 19*NBER Chapters, *pages 161–224.* National Bureau of Economic Research.

GIANNONE, D., REICHLIN, L., AND SMALL, D. (2008): "Nowcasting: The real-time informational content of macroeconomic data." *Journal of Monetary Economics,* 55(4): 665–676.

GODBOUT, C. AND LOMBARDI, M. J. (2012): "Short-term forecasting of the Japanese economy using factor models." Working Paper Series 1428, European Central Bank

GROEN, J. J., KAPETANIOS, G., AND PRICE, S. (2009): "A real time evaluation of Bank of England forecasts of inflation and growth." *International Journal of Forecasting,* 25(1): 74–80.

HAVRANEK, T., HORVATH, R., AND MATEJU, J. (2012): "Monetary transmission and the financial sector in the Czech Republic." *Economic Change and Restructuring,* 45:135–155.

HORVATH, R. (2012): "Do Confidence Indicators Help Predict Economic Activity? The Case of the Czech Republic." *Czech Journal of Economics and Finance (Finance a uver),* 62: 398–412.

KITCHEN, J. AND MONACO, R. (2003): "Real-Time Forecasting in Practice: The U.S. Treasury Staff's Real-Time GDP Forecast System." *Business Economics,* 10–19.

KUGLER, P., JORDAN, T. J., LENZ, C., AND SAVIOZ, M. R. (2005): "GDP data revisions and forward-looking monetary policy in Switzerland." *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance,* 16(3):351–372.

KUZIN, V., MARCELLINO, M., AND SCHUMACHER, C. (2011): "MIDAS vs. mixed-frequency VAR: Nowcasting GDP in the euro area." *International Journal of Forecasting,* 27(2):529–542.

KUZIN, V., MARCELLINO, M., AND SCHUMACHER, C. (2013): "Pooling versus model selection for nowcasting GDP with many predictors: empirical evidence for six industrialized countries." *Journal of Applied Econometrics,* (forthcoming.

LEES, K., MATHESON, T., AND SMITH, C. (2007): "Open economy DSGE-VAR forecasting and policy analysis - head to head with the RBNZ published forecasts." Reserve Bank of New Zealand Discussion Paper Series DP2007/01, Reserve Bank of New Zealand

LIEBERMANN, J. (2012): "Real-time forecasting in a data-rich environment." MPRA Paper 39452, University Library of Munich, Germany

MARCELLINO, M., PORQUEDDU, M., AND VENDITTI, F. (2013): "Short-term GDP forecasting with a mixed frequency dynamic factor model with stochastic volatility." Temi di discussione (Economic working papers) 896, Bank of Italy, Economic Research and International Relations Area

MARIANO, R. S. AND MURASAWA, Y. (2003): "A new coincident index of business cycles

based on monthly and quarterly series." *Journal of Applied Econometrics,* 18(4):427–443.

MATHESON, T. D. (2010): "An analysis of the informational content of New Zealand data releases: The importance of business opinion surveys." *Economic Modelling,* 27(1): 304–314.

MCDONALD, C. AND THORSRUD, L. A. (2011): "Evaluating density forecasts: model combination strategies versus the RBNZ." Reserve Bank of New Zealand Discussion Paper Series DP2011/03, Reserve Bank of New Zealand

MOLODTSOVA, T., NIKOLSKO-RZHEVSKYY, A., AND PAPELL, D. H. (2008): "Taylor rules with real-time data: A tale of two countries and one exchange rate." *Journal of Monetary Economics,* 55:S63–S79.

NEWEY, W. K. AND WEST, K. D. (1987): "A Simple, Positive Semi-definite, Heteroskedasticity and Autocorrelation Consistent Covariance Matrix." *Econometrica,* 55(3):703–08.

ORPHANIDES, A. (2001): "Monetary Policy Rules Based on Real-Time Data." *American Economic Review,* 91(4):964–985.

ORPHANIDES, A. AND VAN NORDEN, S. (2002): "The Unreliability of Output-Gap Estimates in Real Time." *The Review of Economics and Statistics,* 84(4):569–583.

RÜNSTLER, G., BARHOUMI, K., BENK, S., CRISTADORO, R., DEN REIJER, A., JAKAITIENE, A., JELONEK, P., RUA, A., RUTH, K., AND VAN NIEUWENHUYZE, C. (2009): "Short-term forecasting of GDP using large datasets: a pseudo real-time forecast evaluation exercise." *Journal of Forecasting,* 28(7):595–611.

ROBERTSON, J. C. AND TALLMAN, E. W. (1998): "Data Vintages and Measuring Forecast Model Performance." *Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta Economic Review,* b:4–20.

ROMER, D. H. AND ROMER, C. D. (2000): "Federal Reserve Information and the Behavior of Interest Rates." *American Economic Review,* 90(3):429–457.

ROSSI, B. AND SEKHPOSYAN, T. (2010): "Have economic models' forecasting performance for US output growth and inflation changed over time, and when?" *International Journal of Forecasting,* 26(4):808–835.

RUSNAK, M. (2013): "Revisions to the Czech National Accounts: Properties and Predictability." *Czech Journal of Economics and Finance (Finance a uver),* 63(3):244–261.

SCHORFHEIDE, F. AND SONG, D. (2012): "Real-time forecasting with a mixed-frequency VAR." Working Papers 701, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis

SCHUMACHER, C. AND BREITUNG, J. (2008): "Real-time forecasting of German GDP based on a large factor model with monthly and quarterly data." *International Journal of Forecasting,* 24(3):386–398.

SHUMWAY, R. H. AND STOFFER, D. S. (1982): "An Approach to Time Series Smoothing and Forecasting Using the EM Algorithm." *Journal of Time Series Analysis,* 3(4):253–264.

SIMS, C. A. (2002): "The Role of Models and Probabilities in the Monetary Policy Process." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity,* 33(2):1–62.

STARK, T. AND CROUSHORE, D. (2002): "Forecasting with a real-time data set for macroeconomists." *Journal of Macroeconomics,* 24(4):507–531.

STOCK, J. AND WATSON, M. W. (2010): *Dynamic Factor Models.* In Clements, M. and Hendry, D., editors, *Oxford Handbook of Economic Forecasting.* Oxford Unversity Press.

STOCK, J. H. AND WATSON, M. W. (2002): "Macroeconomic Forecasting Using Diffusion Indexes." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics,* 20(2):147–62.

STOCK, J. H. AND WATSON, M. W. (2002): "Forecasting Using Principal Components From a Large Number of Predictors." *Journal of the American Statistical Association,* 97: 1167–1179.

STOCK, J. H. AND WATSON, M. W. (2012): "Generalized Shrinkage Methods for Forecasting Using Many Predictors." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics,* 30(4):481–493.

WALLIS, K. F. (1986): "Forecasting with an econometric model: The "ragged edge" problem." *Journal of Forecasting,* 5(1):1–13.

WATSON, M. W. AND ENGLE, R. F. (1983): "Alternative algorithms for the estimation of dynamic factor, mimic and varying coefficient regression models." *Journal of Econometrics,* 23(3):385–400.

YIU, M. S. AND CHOW, K. K. (2011): "Nowcasting Chinese GDP: Information Content of Economic and Financial Data." Working Papers 042011, Hong Kong Institute for Monetary Research

## A.  Appendix

### A.1  Description of Benchmark Models

We denote quarterly GDP growth as $y_t$. In all cases only the data available at the time of the forecast are used. Therefore, in the following equations, $k = 1$ for forecast origins from *Q(0)M3 mid* to *Q(+1)M1 end*, $k = 2$ for forecast origins from *Q(-1)M3 mid* to *Q(0)M2 end*, and $k = 3$ for forecast origins from *Q(-1)M1 mid* to *Q(-1)M2 end*.

**Random walk(RW)**

$$y_t = y_{t-k} + \varepsilon_t$$

**Autoregressive model (AR(2))**

$$y_t = \rho_0 + \rho_1 y_{t-k} + \rho_2 y_{t-k-1} + \varepsilon_t$$

**Moving average (MA(4))**

$$y_t = \frac{1}{4}(y_{t-k} + y_{t-k-1} + y_{t-k-2} + y_{t-k-3}) + \varepsilon_t$$

**Bridge equations**    Forecasting with bridge equations is performed in two steps:

1. First step: Forecasting of monthly indicators to get rid of ragged ends, using an AR process, where the lag is chosen using the AIC.

2. Second step: The monthly predictors are averaged to quarterly frequency and the following equation is estimated:

$$y_t = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \beta_i^j(L)x_{it}^j + \varepsilon_t$$

The lag is chosen using the AIC.

## A.2   Supplementary Figures

*Figure A1: Evolution of Loadings Over Time: Hard Data Variables*



*Figure A2: Evolution of Loadings Over Time: Financial Variables*

*Figure A3: Evolution of Loadings Over Time: Survey Variables*



*Figure A4: Evolution of Loadings Over Time: Exogenous Variables*

**Figure A5: Nowcast (Q(0) M3 end) Errors**

(a) Evaluated using First Releases of GDP Growth



(b) Evaluated using the Latest Vintage (Dec 2012)

**Figure A6: Contribution of News to Nowcast Updates**

(a) Nowcasting 2012Q4 Czech GDP Growth (q-o-q)



(b) Nowcasting 2012Q3 Czech GDP Growth (q-o-q)

**Figure A7: Forecasts at Longer Horizons**

(a) one-quarter-ahead forecasts



(b) two-quarters-ahead forecasts



(c) three-quarters-ahead forecasts



(d) four-quarters-ahead forecasts



(e) five-quarters-ahead forecasts



(f) six-quarters-ahead forecasts

## A.3   Data Used in the Nowcasting Exercises

*Figure A8: Data*

### (a) GDP



### (b) Industrial Production



### (c) Construction Output



### (d) Retail Sales



### (e) Unemployment Rate



### (f) Consumer Price Index

## Figure A9: Data (continued)

(a) Exports (current prices)

(b) Imports (current prices)

(c) Export Prices

(d) Import Prices

(e) CZK/EUR Exchange Rate

(f) M2

**Figure A10: Data (continued)**

(a) Credit

(b) 3M PRIBOR

(c) 1Y PRIBOR

(d) PX-50 Stock Index

(e) Czech Government Bond Yield (10Y)

(f) Consumer Confidence Indicator

*Figure A11: Data (continued)*



(a) Industry Confidence

(b) Construction Confidence

(c) Trade Confidence

(d) Services Confidence

(e) 3M EURIBOR

(f) 1Y EURIBOR

## *Figure A12: Data (continued)*

(a) Oil Price (Brent)



(b) Ifo Business Climate Germany



(c) Euro Area Business Climate



(d) Germany Exports

## CNB WORKING PAPER SERIES

| 6/2013 | Marek Rusnák | *Nowcasting Czech GDP in real time* |
|---|---|---|
| 5/2013 | Tomáš Havránek<br>Roman Horváth<br>Petra Valičková | *Financial development and economic growth: A meta-analysis* |
| 4/2013 | Peter Tóth | *Currency shocks to export sales of importers: A heterogeneous firms model and Czech micro estimates* |
| 3/2013 | Aleš Bulíř<br>Jaromír Hurník<br>Kateřina Šmídková | *Inflation reports and models: How well do central banks really write?* |
| 2/2013 | František Brázdik | *Expected regime change: Transition toward nominal exchange rate stability* |
| 1/2013 | Adam Geršl<br>Jitka Lešanovská | *Explaining the Czech interbank market risk premium* |
| 15/2012 | Róbert Ambriško<br>Jan Babecký<br>Jakub Ryšánek<br>Vilém Valenta | *Assessing the impact of fiscal measures on the Czech economy* |
| 14/2012 | Václav Hausenblas<br>Ivana Kubicová<br>Jitka Lešanovská | *Contagion risk in the Czech financial system: A network analysis and simulation approach* |
| 13/2012 | Michal Franta | *Macroeconomic effects of fiscal policy in the Czech Republic: Evidence based on various identification approaches in a VAR framework* |
| 12/2012 | Konstantin Belyaev<br>Aelita Belyaeva<br>Tomáš Konečný<br>Jakub Seidler<br>Martin Vojtek | *Macroeconomic factors as drivers of LGD prediction: Empirical evidence from the Czech Republic* |
| 11/2012 | Adam Geršl<br>Petr Jakubík<br>Tomáš Konečný<br>Jakub Seidler | *Dynamic stress testing: The framework for testing banking sector resilience used by the Czech National Bank* |
| 10/2012 | Tomáš Havránek<br>Marek Rusnák | *Transmission lags of monetary policy: A meta-analysis* |
| 9/2012 | Volha Audzei<br>František Brázdik | *Monetary policy and exchange rate dynamics: The exchange rate as a shock absorber* |
| 8/2012 | Alexis Derviz<br>Jakub Seidler | *Coordination incentives in cross-border macroprudential regulation* |
| 7/2012 | Peter Claeys<br>Bořek Vašíček | *Measuring sovereign bond spillover in Europe and the impact of rating news* |
| 6/2012 | Michal Franta<br>Jan Libich<br>Petr Stehlík | *Tracking monetary-fiscal interactions across time and space* |
| 5/2012 | Roman Horváth<br>Jakub Seidler<br>Laurent Weill | *Bank capital and liquidity creation: Granger causality evidence* |
| 4/2012 | Jaromír Baxa<br>Miroslav Plašil | *Changes in inflation dynamics under inflation targeting? Evidence from Central European countries* |

Bořek Vašíček

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3/2012 | Soňa Benecká<br>Tomáš Holub<br>Narcisa Liliana<br>Kadlčáková<br>Ivana Kubicová | *Does central bank financial strength matter for inflation?*<br>*An empirical analysis* |
| 2/2012 | Adam Geršl<br>Petr Jakubík<br>Dorota Kowalczyk<br>Steven Ongena<br>José-Luis Peydró<br>Alcalde | *Monetary conditions and banks' behaviour in the Czech Republic* |
| 1/2012 | Jan Babecký<br>Kamil Dybczak | *Real wage flexibility in the European Union: New evidence from*<br>*the labour cost data* |
| 15/2011 | Jan Babecký<br>Kamil Galuščák<br>Lubomír Lízal | *Firm-level labour demand: Adjustment in good times and during*<br>*the crisis* |
| 14/2011 | Vlastimil Čadek<br>Helena Rottová<br>Branislav Saxa | *Hedging behaviour of Czech exporting firms* |
| 13/2011 | Michal Franta<br>Roman Horváth<br>Marek Rusnák | *Evaluating changes in the monetary transmission mechanism*<br>*in the Czech Republic* |
| 12/2011 | Jakub Ryšánek<br>Jaromír Tonner<br>Osvald Vašíček | *Monetary policy implications of financial frictions in the Czech*<br>*Republic* |
| 11/2011 | Zlatuše Komárková<br>Adam Geršl<br>Luboš Komárek | *Models for stress testing Czech banks´ liquidity risk* |
| 10/2011 | Michal Franta<br>Jozef Baruník<br>Roman Horváth<br>Kateřina Šmídková | *Are Bayesian fan charts useful for central banks?*<br>*Uncertainty, forecasting, and financial stability stress tests* |
| 9/2011 | Kamil Galuščák<br>Lubomír Lízal | *The impact of capital measurement error correction*<br>*on firm-level production function estimation* |
| 8/2011 | Jan Babecký<br>Tomáš Havránek<br>Jakub Matějů<br>Marek Rusnák<br>Kateřina Šmídková<br>Bořek Vašíček | *Early warning indicators of economic crises:*<br>*Evidence from a panel of 40 developed countries* |
| 7/2011 | Tomáš Havránek<br>Zuzana Iršová | *Determinants of horizontal spillovers from FDI: Evidence from a*<br>*large meta-analysis* |
| 6/2011 | Roman Horváth<br>Jakub Matějů | *How are inflation targets set?* |
| 5/2011 | Bořek Vašíček | *Is monetary policy in the new EU member states asymmetric?* |
| 4/2011 | Alexis Derviz | *Financial frictions, bubbles, and macroprudential policies* |

| 3/2011 | Jaromír Baxa<br>Roman Horváth<br>Bořek Vašíček | *Time-varying monetary-policy rules and financial stress:<br>Does financial instability matter for monetary policy?* |
|---|---|---|
| 2/2011 | Marek Rusnák<br>Tomáš Havránek<br>Roman Horváth | *How to solve the price puzzle? A meta-analysis* |
| 1/2011 | Jan Babecký<br>Aleš Bulíř<br>Kateřina Šmídková | *Sustainable real exchange rates in the new EU member states:<br>What did the Great Recession change?* |
| 15/2010 | Ke Pang<br>Pierre L. Siklos | *Financial frictions and credit spreads* |
| 14/2010 | Filip Novotný<br>Marie Raková | *Assessment of consensus forecasts accuracy: The Czech National<br>Bank perspective* |
| 13/2010 | Jan Filáček<br>Branislav Saxa | *Central bank forecasts as a coordination device* |
| 12/2010 | Kateřina Arnoštová<br>David Havrlant<br>Luboš Růžička<br>Peter Tóth | *Short-term forecasting of Czech quarterly GDP using monthly<br>indicators* |
| 11/2010 | Roman Horváth<br>Kateřina Šmídková<br>Jan Zápal | *Central banks´ voting records and future policy* |
| 10/2010 | Alena Bičáková<br>Zuzana Prelcová<br>Renata Pašaličová | *Who borrows and who may not repay?* |
| 9/2010 | Luboš Komárek<br>Jan Babecký<br>Zlatuše Komárková | *Financial integration at times of financial instability* |
| 8/2010 | Kamil Dybczak<br>Peter Tóth<br>David Voňka | *Effects of price shocks to consumer demand. Estimating the<br>QUAIDS demand system on Czech Household Budget Survey data* |
| 7/2010 | Jan Babecký<br>Philip Du Caju<br>Theodora Kosma<br>Martina Lawless<br>Julián Messina<br>Tairi Rõõm | *The margins of labour cost adjustment: Survey evidence from<br>European firms* |
| 6/2010 | Tomáš Havránek<br>Roman Horváth<br>Jakub Matějů | *Do financial variables help predict macroeconomic environment?<br>The case of the Czech Republic* |
| 5/2010 | Roman Horváth<br>Luboš Komárek<br>Filip Rozsypal | *Does money help predict inflation? An empirical assessment for<br>Central Europe* |
| 4/2010 | Oxana Babecká<br>Kucharčuková<br>Jan Babecký<br>Martin Raiser | *A gravity approach to modelling international trade in South-<br>Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States:<br>The role of geography, policy and institutions* |
| 3/2010 | Tomáš Havránek<br>Zuzana Iršová | *Which foreigners are worth wooing? A Meta-analysis of vertical<br>spillovers from FDI* |
| 2/2010 | Jaromír Baxa | *How does monetary policy change? Evidence on inflation* |

|  |  | *targeting countries* |
|---|---|---|
| 1/2010 | Adam Geršl<br>Petr Jakubík | *Relationship lending in the Czech Republic* |
| 15/2009 | David N. DeJong<br>Roman Liesenfeld<br>Guilherme V. Moura<br>Jean-Francois Richard<br>Hariharan<br>Dharmarajan | *Efficient likelihood evaluation of state-space representations* |
| 14/2009 | Charles W. Calomiris | *Banking crises and the rules of the game* |
| 13/2009 | Jakub Seidler<br>Petr Jakubík | *The Merton approach to estimating loss given default: Application to the Czech Republic* |
| 12/2009 | Michal Hlaváček<br>Luboš Komárek | *Housing price bubbles and their determinants in the Czech Republic and its regions* |
| 11/2009 | Kamil Dybczak<br>Kamil Galuščák | *Changes in the Czech wage structure: Does immigration matter?* |
| 10/2009 | Jiří Böhm<br>Petr Král<br>Branislav Saxa | *Percepion is always right: The CNB´s monetary policy in the media* |
| 9/2009 | Alexis Derviz<br>Marie Raková | *Funding costs and loan pricing by multinational bank affiliates* |
| 8/2009 | Roman Horváth<br>Anca Maria Podpiera | *Heterogeneity in bank pricing policies: The Czech evidence* |
| 7/2009 | David Kocourek<br>Filip Pertold | *The impact of early retirement incentives on labour market participation: Evidence from a parametric change in the Czech Republic* |
| 6/2009 | Nauro F. Campos<br>Roman Horváth | *Reform redux: Measurement, determinants and reversals* |
| 5/2009 | Kamil Galuščák<br>Mary Keeney<br>Daphne Nicolitsas<br>Frank Smets<br>Pawel Strzelecki<br>Matija Vodopivec | *The determination of wages of newly hired employees: Survey evidence on internal versus external factors* |
| 4/2009 | Jan Babecký<br>Philip Du Caju<br>Theodora Kosma<br>Martina Lawless<br>Julián Messina<br>Tairi Rõõm | *Downward nominal and real wage rigidity: Survey evidence from European firms* |
| 3/2009 | Jiri Podpiera<br>Laurent Weill | *Measuring excessive risk-taking in banking* |
| 2/2009 | Michal Andrle<br>Tibor Hlédik<br>Ondra Kameník<br>Jan Vlček | *Implementing the new structural model of the Czech National Bank* |
| 1/2009 | Kamil Dybczak<br>Jan Babecký | *The impact of population ageing on the Czech economy* |

| 14/2008 | Gabriel Fagan<br>Vitor Gaspar | *Macroeconomic adjustment to monetary union* |
|---|---|---|
| 13/2008 | Giuseppe Bertola<br>Anna Lo Prete | *Openness, financial markets, and policies: Cross-country and dynamic patterns* |
| 12/2008 | Jan Babecký<br>Kamil Dybczak<br>Kamil Galuščák | *Survey on wage and price formation of Czech firms* |
| 11/2008 | Dana Hájková | *The measurement of capital services in the Czech Republic* |
| 10/2008 | Michal Franta | *Time aggregation bias in discrete time models of aggregate duration data* |
| 9/2008 | Petr Jakubík<br>Christian Schmieder | *Stress testing credit risk: Is the Czech Republic different from Germany?* |
| 8/2008 | Sofia Bauducco<br>Aleš Bulíř<br>Martin Čihák | *Monetary policy rules with financial instability* |
| 7/2008 | Jan Brůha<br>Jiří Podpiera | *The origins of global imbalances* |
| 6/2008 | Jiří Podpiera<br>Marie Raková | *The price effects of an emerging retail market* |
| 5/2008 | Kamil Dybczak<br>David Voňka<br>Nico van der Windt | *The effect of oil price shocks on the Czech economy* |
| 4/2008 | Magdalena M. Borys<br>Roman Horváth | *The effects of monetary policy in the Czech Republic:<br>An empirical study* |
| 3/2008 | Martin Cincibuch<br>Tomáš Holub<br>Jaromír Hurník | *Central bank losses and economic convergence* |
| 2/2008 | Jiří Podpiera | *Policy rate decisions and unbiased parameter estimation in conventionally estimated monetary policy rules* |
| 1/2008 | Balázs Égert<br>Doubravko Mihaljek | *Determinants of house prices in Central and Eastern Europe* |
| 17/2007 | Pedro Portugal | *U.S. unemployment duration: Has long become longer or short become shorter?* |
| 16/2007 | Yuliya Rychalovská | *Welfare-based optimal monetary policy in a two-sector small open economy* |
| 15/2007 | Juraj Antal<br>František Brázdik | *The effects of anticipated future change in the monetary policy regime* |
| 14/2007 | Aleš Bulíř<br>Kateřina Šmídková<br>Viktor Kotlán<br>David Navrátil | *Inflation targeting and communication: Should the public read inflation reports or tea leaves?* |
| 13/2007 | Martin Cinncibuch<br>Martina Horníková | *Measuring the financial markets' perception of EMU enlargement: The role of ambiguity aversion* |
| 12/2007 | Oxana Babetskaia-Kukharchuk | *Transmission of exchange rate shocks into domestic inflation: The case of the Czech Republic* |
| 11/2007 | Jan Filáček | *Why and how to assess inflation target fulfilment* |
| 10/2007 | Michal Franta<br>Branislav Saxa<br>Kateřina Šmídková | *Inflation persistence in new EU member states: Is it different than in the Euro area members?* |

| 9/2007 | Kamil Galuščák<br>Jan Pavel | *Unemployment and inactivity traps in the Czech Republic:*<br>*Incentive effects of policies* |
|---|---|---|
| 8/2007 | Adam Geršl<br>Ieva Rubene<br>Tina Zumer | *Foreign direct investment and productivity spillovers:*<br>*Updated evidence from Central and Eastern Europe* |
| 7/2007 | Ian Babetskii<br>Luboš Komárek<br>Zlatuše Komárková | *Financial integration of stock markets among new EU member*<br>*states and the euro area* |
| 6/2007 | Anca<br>Pruteanu-Podpiera<br>Laurent Weill<br>Franziska Schobert | *Market power and efficiency in the Czech banking sector* |
| 5/2007 | Jiří Podpiera<br>Laurent Weill | *Bad luck or bad management? Emerging banking market*<br>*experience* |
| 4/2007 | Roman Horváth | *The time-varying policy neutral rate in real time: A predictor for*<br>*future inflation?* |
| 3/2007 | Jan Brůha<br>Jiří Podpiera<br>Stanislav Polák | *The convergence of a transition economy:*<br>*The case of the Czech Republic* |
| 2/2007 | Ian Babetskii<br>Nauro F. Campos | *Does reform work?*<br>*An econometric examination of the reform-growth puzzle* |
| 1/2007 | Ian Babetskii<br>Fabrizio Coricelli<br>Roman Horváth | *Measuring and explaining inflation persistence:*<br>*Disaggregate evidence on the Czech Republic* |
| 13/2006 | Frederic S. Mishkin<br>Klaus Schmidt-<br>Hebbel | *Does inflation targeting make a difference?* |
| 12/2006 | Richard Disney<br>Sarah Bridges<br>John Gathergood | *Housing wealth and household indebtedness: Is there a household*<br>*'financial accelerator'?* |
| 11/2006 | Michel Juillard<br>Ondřej Kameník<br>Michael Kumhof<br>Douglas Laxton | *Measures of potential output from an estimated*<br>*DSGE model of the United States* |
| 10/2006 | Jiří Podpiera<br>Marie Raková | *Degree of competition and export-production relative prices*<br>*when the exchange rate changes: Evidence from a panel of Czech*<br>*exporting companies* |
| 9/2006 | Alexis Derviz<br>Jiří Podpiera | *Cross-border lending contagion in multinational banks* |
| 8/2006 | Aleš Bulíř<br>Jaromír Hurník | *The Maastricht inflation criterion: "Saints" and "Sinners"* |
| 7/2006 | Alena Bičáková<br>Jiří Slačálek<br>Michal Slavík | *Fiscal implications of personal tax adjustments in the Czech*<br>*Republic* |
| 6/2006 | Martin Fukač<br>Adrian Pagan | *Issues in adopting DSGE models for use in the policy process* |
| 5/2006 | Martin Fukač | *New Keynesian model dynamics under heterogeneous expectations*<br>*and adaptive learning* |
| 4/2006 | Kamil Dybczak<br>Vladislav Flek | *Supply-side performance and structure in the Czech Republic*<br>*(1995–2005)* |

|         |                                                                          |                                                                                                                                      |
|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|         | Dana Hájková<br>Jaromír Hurník                                           |                                                                                                                                      |
| 3/2006  | Aleš Krejdl                                                              | *Fiscal sustainability – definition, indicators and assessment of Czech public finance sustainability*                               |
| 2/2006  | Kamil Dybczak                                                            | *Generational accounts in the Czech Republic*                                                                                        |
| 1/2006  | Ian Babetskii                                                            | *Aggregate wage flexibility in selected new EU member states*                                                                        |
| 14/2005 | Stephen G. Cecchetti                                                     | *The brave new world of central banking: The policy challenges posed by asset price booms and busts*                                 |
| 13/2005 | Robert F. Engle<br>Jose Gonzalo Rangel                                   | *The spline GARCH model for unconditional volatility and its global macroeconomic causes*                                            |
| 12/2005 | Jaromír Beneš<br>Tibor Hlédik<br>Michael Kumhof<br>David Vávra          | *An economy in transition and DSGE: What the Czech national bank's new projection model needs*                                       |
| 11/2005 | Marek Hlaváček<br>Michael Koňák<br>Josef Čada                           | *The application of structured feedforward neural networks to the modelling of daily series of currency in circulation*              |
| 10/2005 | Ondřej Kameník                                                          | *Solving SDGE models: A new algorithm for the sylvester equation*                                                                    |
| 9/2005  | Roman Šustek                                                            | *Plant-level nonconvexities and the monetary transmission mechanism*                                                                 |
| 8/2005  | Roman Horváth                                                           | *Exchange rate variability, pressures and optimum currency area criteria: Implications for the central and eastern european countries* |
| 7/2005  | Balázs Égert<br>Luboš Komárek                                          | *Foreign exchange interventions and interest rate policy in the Czech Republic: Hand in glove?*                                      |
| 6/2005  | Anca Podpiera<br>Jiří Podpiera                                          | *Deteriorating cost efficiency in commercial banks signals an increasing risk of failure*                                            |
| 5/2005  | Luboš Komárek<br>Martin Melecký                                        | *The behavioural equilibrium exchange rate of the Czech koruna*                                                                      |
| 4/2005  | Kateřina Arnoštová<br>Jaromír Hurník                                   | *The monetary transmission mechanism in the Czech Republic (evidence from VAR analysis)*                                             |
| 3/2005  | Vladimír Benáček<br>Jiří Podpiera<br>Ladislav Prokop                   | *Determining factors of Czech foreign trade: A cross-section time series perspective*                                                |
| 2/2005  | Kamil Galuščák<br>Daniel Münich                                        | *Structural and cyclical unemployment: What can we derive from the matching function?*                                               |
| 1/2005  | Ivan Babouček<br>Martin Jančar                                         | *Effects of macroeconomic shocks to the quality of the aggregate loan portfolio*                                                     |
| 10/2004 | Aleš Bulíř<br>Kateřina Šmídková                                       | *Exchange rates in the new EU accession countries: What have we learned from the forerunners*                                        |
| 9/2004  | Martin Cincibuch<br>Jiří Podpiera                                       | *Beyond Balassa-Samuelson: Real appreciation in tradables in transition countries*                                                   |
| 8/2004  | Jaromír Beneš<br>David Vávra                                            | *Eigenvalue decomposition of time series with application to the Czech business cycle*                                               |
| 7/2004  | Vladislav Flek, ed.                                                      | *Anatomy of the Czech labour market: From over-employment to under-employment in ten years?*                                         |

| 6/2004 | Narcisa Kadlčáková<br>Joerg Keplinger | *Credit risk and bank lending in the Czech Republic* |
|--------|--------|--------|
| 5/2004 | Petr Král | *Identification and measurement of relationships concerning inflow of FDI: The case of the Czech Republic* |
| 4/2004 | Jiří Podpiera | *Consumers, consumer prices and the Czech business cycle identification* |
| 3/2004 | Anca Pruteanu | *The role of banks in the Czech monetary policy transmission mechanism* |
| 2/2004 | Ian Babetskii | *EU enlargement and endogeneity of some OCA criteria: Evidence from the CEECs* |
| 1/2004 | Alexis Derviz<br>Jiří Podpiera | *Predicting bank CAMELS and S&P ratings: The case of the Czech Republic* |

## CNB RESEARCH AND POLICY NOTES

| 3/2012 | Jan Frait<br>Zlatuše Komárková | *Macroprudential policy and its instruments in a small EU economy* |
|--------|--------|--------|
| 2/2012 | Zlatuše Komárková<br>Marcela Gronychová | *Models for stress testing in the insurance sector* |
| 1/2012 | Róbert Ambriško<br>Vítězslav Augusta<br>Dana Hájková<br>Petr Král<br>Pavla Netušilová<br>Milan Říkovský<br>Pavel Soukup | *Fiscal discretion in the Czech Republic in 2001-2011: Has it been stabilizing?* |
| 3/2011 | František Brázdik<br>Michal Hlaváček<br>Aleš Maršál | *Survey of research on financial sector modeling within DSGE models: What central banks can learn from it* |
| 2/2011 | Adam Geršl<br>Jakub Seidler | *Credit growth and capital buffers: Empirical evidence from Central and Eastern European countries* |
| 1/2011 | Jiří Böhm<br>Jan Filáček<br>Ivana Kubicová<br>Romana Zamazalová | *Price-level targeting – A real alternative to inflation targeting?* |
| 1/2008 | Nicos Christodoulakis | *Ten years of EMU: Convergence, divergence and new policy priorities* |
| 2/2007 | Carl E. Walsh | *Inflation targeting and the role of real objectives* |
| 1/2007 | Vojtěch Benda<br>Luboš Růžička | *Short-term forecasting methods based on the LEI approach: The case of the Czech Republic* |
| 2/2006 | Garry J. Schinasi | *Private finance and public policy* |
| 1/2006 | Ondřej Schneider | *The EU budget dispute – A blessing in disguise?* |
| 5/2005 | Jan Stráský | *Optimal forward-looking policy rules in the quarterly projection model of the Czech National Bank* |

| 4/2005 | Vít Bárta | *Fulfilment of the Maastricht inflation criterion by the Czech Republic: Potential costs and policy options* |
|---|---|---|
| 3/2005 | Helena Sůvová<br>Eva Kozelková<br>David Zeman<br>Jaroslava Bauerová | *Eligibility of external credit assessment institutions* |
| 2/2005 | Martin Čihák<br>Jaroslav Heřmánek | *Stress testing the Czech banking system: Where are we? Where are we going?* |
| 1/2005 | David Navrátil<br>Viktor Kotlán | *The CNB's policy decisions – Are they priced in by the markets?* |
| 4/2004 | Aleš Bulíř | *External and fiscal sustainability of the Czech economy: A quick look through the IMF's night-vision goggles* |
| 3/2004 | Martin Čihák | *Designing stress tests for the Czech banking system* |
| 2/2004 | Martin Čihák | *Stress testing: A review of key concepts* |
| 1/2004 | Tomáš Holub | *Foreign exchange interventions under inflation targeting: The Czech experience* |

## CNB ECONOMIC RESEARCH BULLETIN

| April 2013 | *Transmission of Monetary Policy* |
|---|---|
| November 2012 | *Financial stability and monetary policy* |
| April 2012 | *Macroeconomic forecasting: Methods, accuracy and coordination* |
| November 2011 | *Macro-financial linkages: Theory and applications* |
| April 2011 | *Monetary policy analysis in a central bank* |
| November 2010 | *Wage adjustment in Europe* |
| May 2010 | *Ten years of economic research in the CNB* |
| November 2009 | *Financial and global stability issues* |
| May 2009 | *Evaluation of the fulfilment of the CNB's inflation targets 1998–2007* |
| December 2008 | *Inflation targeting and DSGE models* |
| April 2008 | *Ten years of inflation targeting* |
| December 2007 | *Fiscal policy and its sustainability* |
| August 2007 | *Financial stability in a transforming economy* |
| November 2006 | *ERM II and euro adoption* |
| August 2006 | *Research priorities and central banks* |
| November 2005 | *Financial stability* |
| May 2005 | *Potential output* |
| October 2004 | *Fiscal issues* |
| May 2004 | *Inflation targeting* |
| December 2003 | *Equilibrium exchange rate* |