

RESEARCH AND POLICY NOTES 2

Adam Geršl, Jakub Seidler:
Credit Growth and Capital Buffers:
Empirical Evidence from Central and Eastern European Countries

2011

RESEARCH AND POLICY NOTES

Credit Growth and Capital Buffers: Empirical Evidence from Central and Eastern European Countries

Adam Geršl
Jakub Seidler

2/2011

CNB RESEARCH AND POLICY NOTES

The Research and Policy Notes of the Czech National Bank (CNB) are 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 Notes aim to present topics related to strategic issues or specific aspects of monetary policy and financial stability in a less technical manner than the CNB Working Paper Series. The Notes are refereed internationally. The referee process is managed by the CNB Research Department. The Notes are circulated to stimulate discussion. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the CNB.

Printed and distributed by the Czech National Bank. Available at <http://www.cnb.cz>.

Reviewed by: Balázs Égert (OECD)
Dobromil Serwa (BNP)
Alexis Derviz (Czech National Bank)

Project Coordinator: Bořek Vašíček

© Czech National Bank, November 2011
Adam Geršl, Jakub Seidler

Credit Growth and Capital Buffers: Empirical Evidence from Central and Eastern European Countries

Adam Geršl and Jakub Seidler*

Abstract

Excessive credit growth is often considered to be an indicator of future problems in the financial sector. This paper examines the issue of how to determine whether the observed level of private sector credit is excessive in the context of the “countercyclical capital buffer”, a macroprudential tool proposed in the new regulatory framework of Basel III by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. An empirical analysis of selected Central and Eastern European countries, including the Czech Republic, provides alternative estimates of excessive private credit and shows that the HP filter calculation proposed by the Basel Committee is not necessarily a suitable indicator of excessive credit growth for converging countries.

JEL Codes: G01, G18, G21.

Keywords: Basel regulation, credit growth, financial crisis countercyclical buffer.

* Adam Geršl, Czech National Bank and Charles University in Prague, email: adam.gersl@cnb.cz

Jakub Seidler, Czech National Bank and Charles University in Prague, email: jakub.seidler@cnb.cz

This research was supported by Czech National Bank Research Project No. C1/09. The authors would like to thank Alexis Derviz, Balázs Égert, Jan Frait, David Hendry, Michal Hlaváček, Roman Horváth, Luboš Komárek, Jesús Saurina, Jan Sobotka, Dobromil Serwa, Kateřina Šmídková and Jeffrey Wooldridge for helpful comments and useful recommendations. However, all errors and omissions are those of the authors. The findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this paper are entirely those of the authors and do not represent the views of any of the above-mentioned institutions.

Nontechnical Summary

The historical experience of the CEE countries with the credit boom in 2004–2007 offers the possibility of applying the method proposed by the Basel Committee within its Basel III regulatory package to calculate and discuss what countercyclical capital buffer level these countries might have had if the newly proposed regulation on the creation of capital buffers had existed before the crisis.

The motivation for this analysis is to determine how suitable the Basel Committee's proposed method for calculating excessive credit using the Hodrick-Prescott (HP) filter for the credit-to-GDP series is for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. In these countries, rapid credit expansion may simply mean convergence to values typical of the advanced nations, and not excessive borrowing. For this type of country, we propose to use a method involving estimation of the equilibrium private credit level obtained using economic fundamentals.

The HP filter method applied on credit-to-GDP has its drawbacks. A time series trend is dependent to a significant extent on the length of the chosen time series and the calculation is very sensitive to the smoothing parameter (λ). A big problem as regards practical application in macroprudential policy is "end-point bias", which generates a highly unreliable estimate of the trend at the end of the data period. Another relevant question is whether the credit ratio should take into account other denominators besides GDP, such as financial assets or total assets of the private sector.

The paper offers a so-called "out of sample method" (OOS) based on estimating the model on a different sample of countries and applying the elasticities so obtained to the data for the countries for which the equilibrium credit level is being estimated. We draw upon the existing studies on this topic, which use the developed countries of the EU or OECD as appropriate countries for OOS comparison (Kiss et al., 2006; Égert et al., 2006).

We use the PMG (pooled mean group) estimation method, introduced for panel estimates by Pesaran et al. (1999). This method can be used to estimate the long-run relationship between the credit-to-GDP ratio and other variables, which is identical for all countries, whereas the short-run adjustment to this long-run relationship can differ across countries. The PMG model therefore allows heterogeneity of the estimates for individual countries in the short run. However, the long-run relationship of the cointegrated variables is common to all the countries in the sample.

The OOS calculations may in some cases imply significantly different conclusions regarding excessive credit compared to the calculations using the HP filter. According to the HP filter, the credit-to-GDP gap indicates excessive credit in the recent period not only for the Czech Republic, but also, for example, for Slovakia, Lithuania, Romania and Poland, whereas the OOS estimate does not confirm this excessive credit level. By contrast, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia and Slovenia had excessive credit-to-GDP ratios according to the OOS method. Finally, the size of the capital buffer was calculated for individual CEE countries using the two alternative methods using the mid-2008 data as the starting point for the buffer calculation.

1. Introduction

The Basel III reforms to the banking sector regulatory framework agreed in 2010 contain an important macroprudential element intended to dampen the potential procyclicality of the previous capital regulation. The Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS, 2010a) has introduced a “countercyclical capital buffer” aimed at protecting the banking sector from periods of excessive credit growth, which have often been associated with growth in systemic risk. In good times, banks will – in accordance with set rules – create a capital reserve which can then be used to moderate contractions in the supply of credit by banks in times of recession.

One region that recorded a boom in lending to the private sector in the lead-up to the global financial crisis was the Central and East European (CEE) countries.¹ The observed credit expansion was driven by many factors relating to both the demand and supply side of the credit market. Although the credit growth in these transition economies started from very low levels, the rate of growth in many countries has raised concerns about how sustainable such growth is in the medium term and whether it poses significant risks to the stability of the financial sector.

This paper aims to draw on the historical experience of the CEE countries with credit expansion and, using the method proposed by the Basel Committee, to calculate and discuss what the countercyclical capital buffer level these countries might have had if the newly proposed regulation on the creation of capital buffers had existed before the crisis. The motivation for this analysis is to determine how suitable the Basel Committee’s proposed method for calculating excessive credit using the Hodrick-Prescott (HP) filter is for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. In these countries, rapid credit expansion may simply mean convergence to values typical of the advanced nations, and not excessive borrowing. For this type of country, we propose to use a method involving estimation of the equilibrium private credit level computed using economic fundamentals. Given that different countries have different characteristics, the Basel Committee allows national regulators to exercise discretion and specify different methods for setting the countercyclical capital buffer.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses the risks associated with excessive credit expansion, looks at the situation in selected EU countries before the global financial crisis broke out, and briefly examines the logic of the countercyclical capital buffer as proposed by the Basel Committee. Section 3 takes a closer look at the disadvantages of applying the HP filter method and proposes an alternative technique for calculating excessive credit – the out-of-sample method. Both these calculation methods are then used on data for ten CEE countries. Section 4 illustrates the different implications of the alternative indicators of excessive credit growth for the countercyclical capital buffer settings of the banking sectors of the countries analysed. The conclusion attempts to generalise the results of the analysis and formulate recommendations for the national authorities responsible for macroprudential policy.


¹ In this study, the group of CEE countries consists of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia.

2. Excessive Credit Growth

Credit growth in CEE countries has caught the attention of many studies over the past decade. These studies have tried to identify not only the determinants of credit growth, but also its equilibrium level (Enoch and Ötoker-Robe, 2007; Égert et al., 2006). The credit boom in some transition economies was strong enough to raise concerns about whether this trend was simply a manifestation of convergence to the average credit levels in advanced nations, or whether it was a case of excessive growth posing a risk to macroeconomic and financial stability (Hilbers et al., 2005). The central banks and supervisory authorities of some countries even assessed the situation as critical and in 2004–2007 introduced a series of tools for limiting credit growth (Dragulin, 2008; Herzberg, 2008). These tools generally included monetary policy tools (increases in official interest rates or reserve requirements justified by policymakers with reference to “rapid credit growth”), regulatory measures (increased risk weights on selected loans, restrictions on loan-to-value and/or debt-to-income ratios, increases in provisioning rates, tighter regulation of large exposures and tougher rules on collateral valuation), soft non-binding measures (the introduction of guidelines and recommendations) and also very “hard” administrative restrictions on credit portfolio growth (as applied, for example, in Bulgaria). The extent of the measures, as measured by the number of different tools used to limit credit growth in individual countries, was correlated to a large degree with the credit growth rate (see Figure 1). While the number of policy measures might not be the best proxy for the degree of policy interventions, given the available data and information it at least serves as a relatively reliable indicator of policymakers’ effort. At the same time, it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of the tools used, since most of them were applied just before the global financial crisis erupted. The decline in credit growth observed since then may thus have been due more to the sharp economic contraction and reduced demand for loans. The studies conducted up to now tend to conclude that the aforementioned tools are pretty ineffective and that credit booms can be limited in only a very limited way during good times (Kraft, 2005; Herzberg, 2008).

Figure 1: Credit Growth and Number of Tools Applied to Limit Credit Booms


(x-axis: number of measures; y-axis: average year-on-year real credit growth in 2005–2007)



Source: IMF, national authorities' websites

Figure 2: Private Credit Ratios in Selected EU Countries

(x-axis: credit-to-GDP ratio as of 2007 Q4)



Source: IMF IFS, authors' calculations

Despite the comparatively strong credit boom observed in 2003–2007, the stock of loans in many CEE countries in the pre-crisis year 2007 was still relatively low, especially in comparison with other EU countries (see Figure 2). Nevertheless, in terms of the private-credit-to-GDP ratio, some countries of the region had reached levels typical of some euro area countries. The question therefore arises whether they were already showing excessive credit levels. One limitation of this comparison is that it is based solely on data on domestic bank loans. This indicator understates total private credit, as it neglects loans provided by non-bank financial intermediaries and loans provided directly from abroad.


Excessive credit growth can threaten macroeconomic stability in many ways. Given that lending supports consumption, growth in private sector loans can over-stimulate aggregate demand beyond the framework of potential output and cause the economy to overheat, with knock-on effects on inflation, the current account deficit, interest rates and the real exchange rate.

At the same time, lending institutions can, in an economic growth phase, have over-optimistic expectations about borrowers' future ability to repay their debts and therefore very often lend to high-risk borrowers. The upshot is that the bulk of "potentially" bad loans arise during upward phases of the credit cycle. In some CEE countries, private loans were provided in foreign currency because foreign interest rates were lower (see Figure 3). This further increases the risks for the banking sector, because if the domestic currency depreciates, the volume of credit expressed in the domestic currency rises, debt servicing costs go up, and foreign exchange risk turns into credit risk. In many cases, therefore, the aforementioned measures to contain credit growth were targeted primarily at reducing growth in foreign currency loans (Steiner, 2011). Furthermore, if a domestic credit boom is financed from foreign sources, as was the case in several CEE countries (except for the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland), the risk of the domestic banking sector having insufficient balance-sheet liquidity (roll-over risk) increases. In economic bad times,

domestic banks face a high risk of outflows of short-term foreign funds that cannot be financed by the sale of liquid assets (Hilbers et al., 2005).² Although this study, focusing on excessive credit growth, would benefit from an analysis of different loan types, such detailed disaggregated data is not available in a sufficiently long time series for the countries under examination.

Figure 3: Shares of Foreign Currency Bank Loans

(as of end-2009; as % of total loans to given sector)




Note: Slovak Republic and Slovenia were already members of the euro area in 2009, so their foreign currency loans comprise currencies other than EUR.

Source: ECB

Figure 4: Countercyclical Capital Buffer

(% of RWA as function of credit-to-GDP gap in p.p.)



Source: CNB

A bursting of the credit bubble and negative macroeconomic developments, leading to external financing constraints and growth in non-performing loans (NPLs), can therefore cause the banking sector serious difficulties. IMF (2004) estimates that more than 75% of credit booms were followed by banking or currency crises. This fear is consistent with existing studies in the field of early warning signals, according to which excessive credit growth can be considered one of the most reliable indicators of future problems in the banking sector (Borio and Lowe, 2002; Borio and Drehmann, 2009; Jimenez and Saurina, 2006; Saurina et al., 2008).

As part of the preparation of the new Basel III regulatory framework for banks, the Basel Committee (BCBS, 2010) has proposed several tools for reducing the procyclical behaviour of the banking sector.³ One of the key tools is a proposal for banks to create countercyclical capital buffers during credit booms.⁴ Such buffers, expressed as a percentage of risk-weighted assets (RWA) and covered by high quality capital (Tier 1, or even core Tier 1), would be set by the regulator within the range of 0% to 2.5%. As a guide for the setting of the buffer, the Basel

² In this regard, the Czech Republic has a very favourable deposit-to-loan ratio. For a comparison with other EU countries, see CNB (2010, section 1.3.1).

³ The issue of procyclicality of the financial system and its sources and potential consequences was discussed in a thematic paper in last year's CNB Financial Stability Report 2009/2010 (Geršl and Jakubík, 2010).

⁴ With regard to the objective of reducing the procyclicality of the financial system, the Basel Committee stated explicitly in its December 2009 consultative document (BCBS, 2009) that the aim of this buffer was to "achieve the broader macroprudential goal of protecting the banking sector from periods of excess credit growth".

Committee is proposing to use and regularly publish the difference between the current private credit ratio as a percentage of GDP and its trend value estimated using the HP filter (the “credit-to-GDP gap”). However, regulators may also use other methods to calculate the trend and other variables, such as the prices of various relevant assets and credit conditions. In bad times, this capital buffer would be “released” in order to slow any fall in the credit supply and thereby reduce the procyclicality of the financial system.

The Basel Committee document itself (BCBS, 2010b) proposes to use the aforementioned guide as follows. The capital buffer would start to be created when the credit-to-GDP gap exceeded two percentage points. If the gap reached 10 percentage points or more, the buffer would reach the aforementioned maximum of 2.5% of RWA. For gaps of between 2 and 10 percentage points, the buffer would vary linearly between 0% and 2.5%. For example, for a gap of six percentage points the buffer would be 1.25% of RWA (see Figure 4). For cross-border exposures, the buffer set by the regulator in the foreign jurisdiction would apply. For cross-border banking groups, the capital buffer would be applied on both a solo and a consolidated basis.

It became clear during the discussion phase within the Basel Committee that a simple filtering technique would in many cases not necessarily lead to reliable estimates of excessive credit, so the final version of Basel III (BCBS, 2010b) gives regulators considerable discretion to set the buffer. The primary aim of the buffer, however, is not to restrict credit growth, but to create a capital reserve to give the banking sector greater protection from sudden changes in the credit cycle. At the same time, the Basel Committee documents emphasise the complementarity of this buffer with other macroprudential tools (BCBS, 2010b, p. 5), such as various limits on key indicators of borrowers’ ability to repay loans (the loan-to-collateral and loan-to-income ratios).

3. Methods for Estimating the Equilibrium Credit Level

A major problem in constructing an excessive credit growth indicator is determining what level of credit is excessive and might pose a threat to the financial sector. One traditional method is to apply the statistical Hodrick-Prescott (HP) filter, which obtains the trend from a time series. By comparing the actual credit-to-GDP ratio with its long-term trend obtained using the HP filter we can then estimate whether or not the credit level is excessive. This method is used quite routinely in the literature (Borio and Lowe, 2002; Borio and Drehmann, 2009). Hilbers et al. (2005), for example, consider a credit-to-GDP gap of greater than five percentage points to be an indicator of excessive credit in the economy.

Although the HP filter method is used quite often to determine trends in macroeconomic variables, it does have its drawbacks. A time series trend is dependent to a significant extent on the length of the chosen time series and the calculation is very sensitive to the smoothing parameter (λ). A big problem as regards practical application in macroprudential policy is “end-point bias”, which generates a highly unreliable estimate of the trend at the end of the data period.⁵ Macroprudential policy, which, by contrast, requires assessment of the trend on the basis


⁵ One way of dealing with end-point bias is to extend the time series into the future by means of prediction. This, however, can introduce further uncertainty into the estimate linked with the quality of the prediction.

of current (i.e. end-of-period) data, would therefore be reliant on indicators subject to a high degree of uncertainty. In the case of some CEE countries with relatively short time series, credit growth is incorporated directly into the trend itself by the HP filter, i.e. excess credit growth is counted as a trend (Cottarelli et al., 2005). Another relevant question is whether the credit ratio should take into account other denominators besides GDP, such as financial assets or total assets of the private sector. Although GDP is correlated to a significant extent with private sector income and therefore serves as an indicator of the ability to repay a given amount of loans, holdings of financial assets (deposits and securities investments) and non-financial assets (e.g. real estate) are also relevant to the evaluation of excessive credit.

Figure 5 presents credit gaps with alternative denominators (GDP and financial assets and total assets of the private sector) calculated using the HP filter on data for bank loans in the Czech Republic with a high lambda parameter equal to 400,000. Such a high value of lambda was proposed in Basel III with the argument that the credit cycle is usually longer than the business cycle. The filter is applied to quarterly data for the period 1998–2010, which, however, is regarded as relatively short from the international perspective (Basel III recommends at least a 20-year period). The estimates indicate that the current level of bank loans is below the long-term trend. However, the trend estimate is subject to a range of problems related to the short time series and above all to extraordinary factors linked with a fall in credit volume in 1998–2002 caused by a banking crisis in the 1990s and the clean-up of bank balance sheets ahead of the privatisation of large banks.

As regards simulating possible macroprudential policy in the past, it makes more sense to apply the HP filter recursively, i.e. in each past period using only the data that were available in that period (at the end of 2005, for example, the trend value and therefore also the gap between the observed credit level and the trend is calculated on 1998–2005 data). This simulates the situation that the macroprudential policy-maker would hypothetically have found itself in had it been required to decide whether excessive credit growth was emerging. The calculated credit gaps expressed as a percentage of GDP indicate that the Czech Republic would have found itself in a situation of excessive credit as early as 2004 (see Figure 5). However, the aforementioned drawbacks of the HP filter play an even greater role in the calculated gap, as the problem period of 1998–2002 influences the trend.


Figure 5: Credit Gaps in the Czech Republic with Alternative Denominators



Source: CNB, authors' calculations

Figure 6: Credit-to-GDP Ratios for a Similar Level of Economic Development

(in %; GDP per capita, in PPP, constant 2005 international \$; approximately \$22,500 for the Czech Rep as of 2010)



Source: IMF IFS, WB WDI, authors' calculations

The main criticism of the HP filter technique, however, is that it does not take into account economic fundamentals that affect the equilibrium stock of loans. An alternative method is to estimate the equilibrium private credit level in relation to key economic variables (such as the level of development of the economy measured in terms of real GDP per capita). This method says that if GDP per capita – as a proxy for the standard of living of an economy – is the main and only economic fundamental, all countries with the same level of development should have a similar equilibrium credit level. Poorer countries should have a lower equilibrium credit level than wealthier countries. A positive linkage between the credit-to-GDP ratio and the economic development of a country is referred to as financial deepening (see Terrones and Mendoza, 2004). A comparison of bank loans as a percentage of GDP for the Czech Republic in 2010 and selected euro area countries in years when they were at a similar level of economic development indicates, in contrast to the HP filter findings, that the credit ratio in the Czech Republic is below the level consistent with its economic level (see Figure 6).

Other economic fundamentals besides the above-mentioned GDP per capita should also be considered as factors influencing the equilibrium credit level in a particular country, and a suitable econometric model should therefore be employed. However, given that the CEE countries started from very low private credit levels, the estimation of such a model on data for these countries would capture the rapid growth caused by convergence towards the average level of the advanced nations. As Égert et al. (2006, p. 14) point out, such estimated elasticities of the relationships between fundamentals and credit would be overstated. At the same time, the estimates would reflect not the equilibrium level, but only the present relationship between economic fundamentals and private credit.

For this reason, the existing literature suggests using out-of-sample (OOS) panel estimation, i.e. estimating the model on a different sample of countries (“in-sample countries”) and applying the elasticities obtained to the data for the countries for which the equilibrium credit level is being estimated (“out-of-sample countries”). This approach assumes a priori that the stock of credit of the in-sample countries, which serve for estimating elasticities, is at equilibrium on average, which is quite a significant assumption. Therefore, one needs to choose a suitable group of “in-sample” countries that best meets the need to estimate the correct equilibrium relationships between economic fundamentals and private credit. The existing studies on this topic therefore normally use the developed countries of the EU or OECD as appropriate countries for comparison (Kiss et al., 2006; Égert et al., 2006). For this study, the advanced EU countries were used as in-sample countries. While a possible approach would be to narrow down the number of sample countries to the ones similar in structure to the CEE countries, the econometric methodology used and the availability of data in the time dimension do not allow us to significantly reduce the number of in-sample countries. However, owing to the current debate regarding the excessive debt of the PIIGS⁶ countries, these countries were omitted from the calculation of the equilibrium credit level.⁷

However, to estimate the equilibrium elasticities for the given countries, the proper set of fundamental variables influencing the credit-to-GDP ratio must be found. As the analysis of possible credit determinants is beyond the scope of this paper, we refer to previous studies for a comprehensive discussion regarding possible credit determinants; see, for example, Égert et al. (2006) and the references therein. Based on these studies, we use data on aggregate household consumption, government debt, short-term interest rates, unemployment, inflation measured by the GDP deflator and the CPI index, and GDP per capita.

The data were mostly obtained from the International Monetary Fund’s IFS (International Financial Statistics) database, which provides the required macroeconomic data with a sufficient history (which is vital for estimating long-run relationships). For this reason, we used data for a 30-year period (1980–2010). The available statistics on bank loans to the private sector were used as the credit indicator. As stated earlier, these statistics slightly underestimate the total credit of the private sector, as they do not include non-bank financial intermediaries (e.g. leasing) and cross-border loans.⁸ However, as the financial system in CEE countries is primarily bank-based, using bank credit only should not introduce considerable bias into our estimates.

We applied a set of panel unit root tests for the above-mentioned variables, and some of them were found to be nonstationary in levels, i.e. I(1) processes. A more detailed summary of the results is provided in the Appendix. Further, cointegration was tested for selected groups of variables using the Johansen Fisher Panel Cointegration Test. The results confirmed one cointegration relationship between the credit-to-GDP ratio, the household consumption-to-GDP ratio and GDP per capita for the set of in-sample countries. As discussed above, the presence of the GDP per capita variable in the long-run relationship is desirable as it captures the different

⁶ Portugal, Italy, Ireland, Greece and Spain.

⁷ However, nations that are structurally quite different from the CEE countries, such as the United Kingdom, remain in the sample of control countries. This may skew the results of the analysis towards higher equilibrium credit values for a given set of economic fundamentals. Nevertheless, the method used (see later in the text) would control for the cyclical component of excessive debt in the sample of countries used.

⁸ A detailed description of the available data is provided in the Appendix.

degree of wealth of the economy, which therefore also influences the equilibrium private credit level (Terrones and Mendoza, 2004).

A variety of econometric methods can be used for OOS estimation. Nevertheless, given the properties of the variables used, traditional panel methods run into the problem of nonstationary time series, mutual regression of which can lead to spurious results. The traditional solution to the problem of nonstationarity of variables involves differentiating them. This step allows us to obtain the short-run relationship between the variables by regression, but the longer-run relationship is lost in the differentiation. The long-run relationship between nonstationary variables can be better estimated if the variables are cointegrated. This fact is used by the ECM (error correction model) method, which estimates not only the long-run relationship between the cointegrated variables, but also the potential deviation from this long-run relationship, which is gradually corrected through short-run adjustments.

Based on the characteristics of the time series used and the character of our study, focusing on the long-term equilibrium credit level, we employ the PMG (pooled mean group) estimation method, introduced for panel estimates by Pesaran et al. (1999). The PMG estimator is an error correction form of the autoregressive distributive lag (ARDL) model, where the dependent variable in its first differences is explained by the lagged independent and dependent variables in both levels and first differences. This method can be used to estimate the long-run relationship between the credit-to-GDP ratio and other variables, which is identical for all countries, whereas the short-run adjustment to this long-run relationship can differ across countries. The PMG model therefore allows heterogeneity of the estimates for individual countries in the short run. However, the long-run relationship of the cointegrated variables is common to all the countries in the sample. The equation is expressed as follows:

$$\Delta y_{i,t} = \rho_i (y_{i,t-1} - \sum_{h=1}^v \alpha_{i,h} x_{i,h,t}) + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \beta_{i,j} \Delta y_{i,t-j} + \sum_{h=1}^v \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \gamma_{i,h,j} \Delta x_{i,h,t-j} + c_i + \varepsilon_{i,t},$$

where y is the dependent variable, x is the independent variable, $\max 1$ and $\max 2$ represent the maximum lags used, and α , β , γ and ρ are the estimated coefficients. Parameter ρ is the country specific error correction term. Coefficient α represents the long-term relationship, which is specific for each cross-section in the case of the so-called mean-group (MG) estimator or the same for every country in the case of the PMG estimator. For more details see Pesaran et al. (1999).

The long-term relationship of the given equation is taken as a cointegrated relationship, which was found for the credit-to-GDP ratio, the household consumption-to-GDP ratio and GDP per capita. We also employed a different set of other variables and their lags that might affect the short-run adjustment of the credit-to-GDP ratio to its long-run relationship. For example, the government debt-to-GDP ratio might capture any crowding out of bank lending to the private sector.⁹ Also, the real interest rate, or changes therein, should, as the cost of financing, be in a

⁹ For this reason, we would expect a negative relationship between the government debt ratio and loans to the private sector. The fact that a less indebted government sector would be able to provide more significant support if the banking sector ran into serious problems is relevant for assessing whether the current private sector credit level is excessive with regard to financial stability.

negative relationship with the explained variable. However, these variables were not significant even at the 15% level.

The following equation gives the final estimates of the coefficients of the long-run relationship between the cointegrated variables and the values of the coefficients and the constant term in the short run, which are presented below as the mean of all the estimates for the countries concerned.¹⁰

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\text{credit/gdp})_t = & -0.035(\text{credit/gdp}_{t-1} - (0.7\text{cons/gdp}_t + 0.013\text{gdp/pop}_t)) + & \text{long-run relationship} \\ & \text{(**)} & \text{(***)} & \text{(***)} \\ & + 0.87\Delta(\text{cons/gdp})_t - 0.07\text{inf}_t + 0.014 & \text{short-run adjustment} \\ & \text{(**)} & \text{(*)} & \text{(***)} \end{aligned}$$

Note: *, ** and *** denote significance of the estimated coefficients at the 10, 5 and 1% levels respectively.

Credit/gdp represents the ratio of private sector credit to GDP, *cons/gdp* denotes the ratio of household consumption to GDP, *gdp/pop* is GDP per capita in thousands of dollars and *inf* is the change in the price level, expressed as the year-on-year change in the GDP deflator.

On the basis of the model, short-run adjustment dynamics towards the long-run trend is given as a function of the change in the consumption-to-GDP ratio and as a function of inflation. Based on the estimated coefficients, we can conclude that in the long-run relationship the credit-to-GDP ratio increases with increasing wealth of the economy and with an increasing consumption-to-GDP ratio. This factor then positively affects the explained variable in the short-run relationship as well, while inflation acts in the opposite direction. These conclusions are in accordance with intuition as regards the effects of the variables used on the credit-to-GDP ratio.


The estimated parameters of the model were applied to the data for the CEE countries to obtain values of the “equilibrium” credit ratio. As we are interested in the long-run fundamental-based level of the credit-to-GDP ratio, we used only the coefficients of the estimated long-run relationship between the cointegrated variables. This approach controls in parallel for the credit cycle of in-sample countries, as only equilibrium sensitivities between credit and economic fundamentals are extracted. The results indicate that the OOS calculations may in some cases imply significantly different conclusions regarding excessive credit compared to the HP filter values computed on the end-2009 data (see Figure 7). According to the HP filter, the credit-to-GDP gap indicates excessive credit in the recent period not only for the Czech Republic, but also, for example, for Slovakia, Lithuania, Romania and Poland, whereas the econometric estimate does not confirm this excessive credit level (values in the positive part of the chart indicates excessive private credit-to-GDP ratios). By contrast, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia and Slovenia now

¹⁰ Based on the Hausman test, we cannot reject the null hypothesis of PMG being an efficient estimator, so PMG is preferred over its mean-group (MG) counterpart. The MG estimator is the simple non-weighted mean of the regression estimates for each country. The Hausman statistic $\chi^2(2)$ is equal to 0.9 (p-value = 0.637). Furthermore, only those variables which were significant at least at the 10% confidence level were kept in the estimated equation. Also, a more empirical approach was used as in Sekine (2001), so inflation is present in the short-run part of the equation but not in the long-run part. Moreover, the low value of the correlation coefficient between *cons/gdp* and *gdp/pop* indicates no possible multicollinearity problem.

have excessive credit-to-GDP ratios according to the OOS method. It is clear, therefore, that the two calculation methods used give contradictory results in some cases.

Figure 7: Comparison of Credit-to-GDP Ratios for Various Calculation Methods

(in p.p.)



Source: IMF IFS, authors' calculations

As mentioned at the beginning of the study, further refinement of the estimates with respect to different loan types and their currency denomination would be desirable. However, current data limitations leave this additional analysis as a future research question.

4. Implications for the Size of the Capital Buffer

One of the questions associated with the new Basel III rules is whether the requirement to create a countercyclical capital buffer would contribute to the creation of capital reserves in those CEE countries which experienced significant problems in their banking sectors during the global financial crisis. In the following simulation, the size of the capital buffer is calculated for individual CEE countries using the two aforementioned methods, i.e. the HP filter method and the econometric OOS method. As the crisis did not manifest itself fully in the CEE countries until late 2008 and (in particular) 2009, i.e. after the collapse of Lehman Brothers in September 2008, we set mid-2008 as the starting point for the buffer calculation.

Table 1: Simulation of Countercyclical Buffer Calculation

(data as of 2008 Q2)


	Credit-to-GDP gap (%)		Countercyclical capital buffer (% of RWA)	
	HP filter	Out-of-sample	HP filter	Out-of-sample
Bulgaria	11.4	10.8	2.5	2.5
Czech Rep.	9.5	-15.0	2.4	0.0
Estonia	5.3	27.9	1.0	2.5
Lithuania	6.9	-8.3	1.5	0.0
Latvia	1.0	19.6	0.0	2.5
Hungary	-1.4	-10.7	0.0	0.0
Poland	3.0	-23.3	0.3	0.0
Romania	6.1	-27.3	1.3	0.0
Slovakia	6.1	-22.8	1.3	0.0
Slovenia	5.4	5.5	1.1	1.1

Source: authors' calculations


The results of this simple simulation indicate that only four countries needed a countercyclical capital buffer according to the OOS method (Bulgaria, Estonia and Latvia needed the maximum possible 2.5% of RWA, while Slovenia needed 1.1% of RWA).

Figure 8: Credit-to-GDP gap via out-of-sample and Tier 1 ratio in 2008

(gap in p.p.; Tier 1 capital ratio in 2008)

*Source:* IMF, authors' calculations**Figure 9: Credit-to-GDP gap via out-of-sample and change in RoE**

(gap in p.p.; change in RoE of banking sector in p.p.)

*Source:* IMF, authors' calculations

It is relevant to ask whether the banking sectors of these countries had a sufficient capital reserve already in 2008 and were building a “would-be” capital buffer composed of high-quality loss-bearing capital (such as common shares and retained earnings, i.e. in essence a major part of Tier 1 capital) in anticipation of possible problems in the banking sector due to the credit boom. Figure 8 indicates that the countries identified by the OOS method as having excessive credit ratios (i.e. Estonia, Latvia and Slovenia) had relatively low Tier 1 capitalisation. The only exception was Bulgaria, which had set its minimum regulatory limit for total capital adequacy at a higher level (12%) than the traditional 8%, a fact which is also reflected in a higher observed Tier 1 ratio.

Several indicators can be used to compare the impacts of the crisis on the banking sectors of individual countries. In this paper, we look at the change in banking sector profits between 2008 and 2009 (in p.p. of return on equity, RoE), as profitability reflects both credit and market losses as well as the impact of possible higher funding costs on pre-provision income. A simple graphical analysis reveals that two countries identified by the OOS method as having excessive credit ratios (Estonia and Latvia) recorded large losses in their banking sectors in 2009, causing the RoE to decline dramatically (see Figure 9). Two of the countries identified, namely Latvia and Slovenia, saw their governments stepping in and providing public support in 2009. It is worth mentioning that the HP method would not have identified the problems building up in the Latvian and Estonian economies, which were hit hard by the crisis and, especially in the case of Latvia, suffered very high real costs.

5. Conclusions and Policy Lessons

This paper discusses methods for calculating excessive private sector credit in the Central and Eastern European countries and their suitability as regards the input needed to calculate the countercyclical capital buffer introduced by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS, 2010). The BCBS has recommended the use of an excessive credit indicator based on the Hodrick-Prescott (HP) filter technique as a guide for setting this buffer.

The paper shows that the HP filter-based calculation of the excessive credit indicator is not necessarily appropriate in certain cases. For the CEE countries in particular, rapid credit expansion may simply mean convergence to values typical of the advanced nations, and not excessive borrowing. As an alternative, the paper suggests considering excessive credit calculation methods that better reflect the evolution of a country's economic fundamentals. One such method is an out-of-sample technique based on estimates for advanced EU countries which are subsequently used to calculate the equilibrium credit levels of the CEE countries.

Although statistical filtering techniques such as the HP filter do have a role to play in the analysis as a first step in the interpretation of the available data, a broader set of indicators and methods should be employed to determine a country's position in the credit cycle. Our chosen method, based on economic fundamentals, would have better identified the problem of excessive credit in those CEE countries whose banking sectors recorded serious problems during the crisis. Although this calculation technique also has its limitations and could be further developed, it can at least be considered by the macroprudential authority responsible for setting capital buffers as a complementary indicator of excessive credit, especially for small converging economies.

There is a clear policy lesson arising from our analysis for macroprudential policy, in which countercyclical buffers will serve as one of the main instruments: national authorities cannot rely on a single indicator only and have to apply judgement, ideally supported by a variety of analyses that help them to identify the position of the economy in the credit cycle with respect to economic fundamentals. Given the current preparatory phase for the implementation of Basel III, including the countercyclical capital buffer, it is crucial to start building a robust, credible and transparent buffer regime that policymakers will apply through the credit cycle once Basel III is fully implemented.

This issue is especially important within the EU, as Basel III will be implemented in the EU countries as part of the Capital Requirements Directive (“CRD IV”) and the Capital Requirements Regulation, which will be binding on all EU countries and will be centred on the idea of a “single rulebook” (or “maximum harmonisation”). The European Commission published rather advanced drafts of both documents in July 2011 and wants to finalise them by the end of 2011 or in early 2012. Throughout the proposal, the call for a single rulebook is clearly visible and national discretions are limited across a number of regulatory issues. In the area of capital buffers, while the July 2011 proposal gives national policymakers discretion in setting the buffer rate, it limits the discretion regarding the methods and variables used to calculate the buffer, as it requires the set of variables to be agreed on within the European Systemic Risk Board.¹¹ Nevertheless, the idea of “maximum harmonisation” is still under review in relevant European fora given that it could effectively prevent national policymakers from strengthening the prudential requirements and thus hamper their ability to conduct national macroprudential policy effectively.

¹¹ The proposal allows for a part of the buffer to be set independently of ESRB guidance, but this part could be reviewed only annually (as opposed to the quarterly review of the countercyclical buffer), the variables used could be of a structural nature and no international reciprocity would apply. Clearly, such a “structural” buffer at hand for national policymakers would not be a too effective instrument for macroprudential policy.

References

- BACCHETTA, P. AND S. GERLACH (1997): “Consumption and Credit Constraints: International Evidence.” *Journal of Monetary Economics* 40(2), Monetary Policy and Financial Markets, pp. 207–238.
- BACKÉ, P. AND T. ZUMER (2005): “Developments in Credit to the Private Sector in Central and Eastern European EU Member States: Emerging from Financial Repression, Comparative Overview.” In: *Focus on European Economic Integration*, Vienna: Oesterreichische Nationalbank.
- BCBS (2009): “Strengthening the Resilience of the Banking Sector.” December 2009.
- BCBS (2010A): “Consultative Document: Countercyclical Capital Buffer Proposal.” July 2010.
- BCBS (2010B): “Guidance for National Authorities Operating the Countercyclical Capital Buffer.” December 2010.
- BLACKBURNE, E. F. AND M. W. FRANK (2007): “Estimation of Nonstationary Heterogeneous Panels.” *The Stata Journal* 7(2), pp. 197–208.
- BOISSAY, F., O. CALVO-GONZALES, AND T. KOZLUK (2006): “Is Lending in Central and Eastern Europe Developing Too Fast?” Finance and Consumption Workshop presentation.
- BORIO, C. AND M. DREHMANN (2009): “Assessing the Risk of Banking Crises – Revisited.” *BIS Quarterly Review*, March, pp. 29–46.
- BORIO, C. AND P. LOWE (2002): “Assessing the Risk of Banking Crises.” *BIS Quarterly Review*, December, pp. 43–54.
- BREITUNG, J. (2000): “The Local Power of Some Unit Root Tests for Panel Data”, in B. Baltagi (ed.), *Advances in Econometrics*, Vol. 15: Nonstationary Panels, Panel Cointegration, and Dynamic Panels, Amsterdam: JAI Press, pp. 161–178.
- BRZOZA-BRZEZINA, M. (2005): “Lending Booms in Europe’s Periphery: South-Western Lessons for Central-Eastern Members.” EconWPA, February.
- CALZA, A., C. GARTNER AND J. SOUSA (2003): “Modelling the Demand for Loans to the Private Sector in the Euro Area.” *Applied Economics* 35(1), pp. 107–117.
- CHOI, I. (2001): “Unit Root Tests for Panel Data.” *Journal of International Money and Finance* 20, pp. 249–272.
- CNB (2010): “Analyses of the Czech Republic’s Current Economic Alignment with the Euro Area.” Czech National Bank.
- COTTARELLI, C., D. GIOVANNI, AND I. VLADKOVA-HOLLAR (2005): “Early Birds, Late Risers, and Sleeping Beauties: Bank Credit Growth to the Private Sector in Central and Eastern Europe and in the Balkans.” *Journal of Banking & Finance* 29(1), pp. 83–104.
- DRAGULIN, I. (2008): “Coping with Credit Growth: The Romanian Experience”, presentation at the IMF-BSC Workshop on Credit Growth in Central and Eastern Europe, Vienna, January 2008.

- ÉGERT, B., P. BACKÉ, AND T. ZUMER (2006): “Credit Growth in Central and Eastern Europe – New (Over)shooting Stars?” European Central Bank Working Paper No. 687.
- ELLER, M., M. FRÖMMEL, AND N. SRZENTIC (2010): “Private Sector Credit in CESEE: Long-Run Relationships and Short-Run Dynamics.” *Focus on European Economic Integration*, No. 2.
- ENOCH, C. AND I. ÖTKER-ROBE (2007): “Rapid Credit Growth in Central and Eastern Europe: Endless Boom or Early Warning?” International Monetary Fund, Palgrave Macmillan Ltd., p. 373.
- GERALI, A., S. NERI, L. SESSA, AND F. SIGNORETTI (2010): “Credit and Banking in a DSGE Model of the Euro Area.” Working Paper No. 740, Bank of Italy, Economic Research Department.
- GERŠL, A. AND P. JAKUBÍK (2010): “Procyclicality of the Financial System and Simulation of the Feedback Effect.” Financial Stability Report 2009/2010, Czech National Bank, pp. 88–96.
- HERZBERG, V. (2008): “The Role of Macro Prudential Measures in Containing Credit Expansions: A Short Overview.” Presentation at the IMF-BSC Workshop on Credit Growth in Central and Eastern Europe, Vienna, January 2008.
- HILBERS, P., I. ÖTKER-ROBE, C. PAZARBASIOGLU, AND G. JOHNSEN (2005): “Assessing and Managing Rapid Credit Growth and the Role of Supervisory and Prudential Policies.” IMF Working Paper WP/05/151.
- HOFMANN, B. (2001): “The Determinants of Private Sector Credit in Industrialized Countries: Do Property Prices Matter?” BIS Working Paper 108.
- IM, K. S., M. H. PESARAN, AND Y. SHIN (2003): “Testing for Unit Roots in Heterogeneous Panels.” *Journal of Econometrics* 115, pp. 53–74.
- IMF (2004): “Are Credit Booms in Emerging Markets a Concern?” *World Economic Outlook*, April 2004, Chapter 4.
- JIMÉNEZ, G. AND J. SAURINA (2006): “Credit Cycles, Credit Risk, and Prudential Regulation.” *International Journal of Central Banking* 2(2), pp. 65–98.
- KISS, G., M. NAGY, AND B. VONNÁK (2006): “Credit Growth in Central and Eastern Europe: Convergence or Boom?” MNB Working Papers 2006/10, Magyar Nemzeti Bank (The Central Bank of Hungary).
- KRAFT, E. AND L. JANKOV (2005): “Does Speed Kill? Lending Booms and Their Consequences in Croatia.” *Journal of Banking and Finance* 29(1), pp. 105–121.
- LEVIN, A., C. F. LIN, AND C. CHU (2002): “Unit Root Tests in Panel Data: Asymptotic and Finite-Sample Properties.” *Journal of Econometrics* 108, pp. 1–24.
- MADDALA, G. S. AND S. WU (1999): “A Comparative Study of Unit Root Tests with Panel Data and a New Simple Test.” *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 61, pp. 631–652.
- PESARAN, M. H., Y. SHIN, AND R.P. SMITH (1999): “Pooled Mean Group Estimation of Dynamic Heterogeneous Panels.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 94, pp. 621–634.

- SAURINA, J., J. GABRIEL, S. ONGENA, AND J. PEYDRÓ (2008): “Hazardous Times for Monetary Policy: What Do 23 Million Bank Loans Say about the Effects of Monetary Policy on Credit Risk?” Discussion Paper No. 75, Center for Economic Research, Tilburg University.
- SAURINA, J., S.F. LIS, AND J.M. PAGÉS (2000): “Credit Growth, Problem Loans and Credit Risk Provisioning in Spain.” Bank of Spain Working Paper No. 0018.
- SEKINE, T. (2001): “Modelling and Forecasting Inflation in Japan.” IMF Working Paper 01/82.
- STEINER, K. (2011): “Households’ Exposure to Foreign Currency Loans in CESEE EU Member States and Croatia.” *Focus on European Economic Integration* Q1/11, pp. 6–24.
- TERRONES, M. AND E. MENDOZA (2004): “Are Credit Booms in Emerging Markets a Concern?” IMF, *World Economic Outlook*, pp. 147–166.

Appendix

A. Detailed Description of the Data Time Series Used

Table A1

Time Series' Codes	Description
IMF IFS: AF.ZF...	National Currency per US Dollar average period
IMF IFS: 22D..Z	Claims on private sector
IMF IFS: 32D..ZF...	
IMF IFS: 32AN.ZW...	Claims on general government (net)
IMF IFS: 222A..ZF...	Claims on general government (net)
IMF IFS: 60P..ZF...	Interest rate
IMF IFS: 64...ZF...	Index CPI
IMF IFS: 67R..ZF...	Unemployment rate
IMF IFS: 99Z..ZF...	Population
IMF IFS: 96F..ZW...	Household consumption expenditures (incl. NPISH) *
IMF IFS: 99BIPZF...	Deflator HDP (base year = 2005)
IMF IFS: 99B..ZF...	Gross Domestic Product in the National Currency
WB WDI: NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.KD	GDP per capita, PPP (constant 2005 international \$) **

Note: *NPISH = Non-Profit Institutions Serving Households

** Linearly interpolated from yearly to quarterly frequency

Source: IMF IFS Database, WB WDI Database

Time series of interest rates for some countries were completed using the ECB and Eurostat databases and data provided by national central banks.

B. Panel Unit Root Tests

The standard set of panel unit root tests was applied, i.e. Levin, Lin and Chu (2002), Breitung (2000), Im, Pesaran and Shin (2003) and Fisher-type tests using ADF and PP tests – see Maddala and Wu (1999) and Choi (2001). Since the set of tests generates extensive output, the results are presented parsimoniously as a summary table for particular variables. However, detailed results are available upon request.

Table A2

Variable	Result	Note
consumption / gdp	I(1)	Not confirmed by LLCH
credit / gdp	I(1)	
gdp per capita	I(1)	
gdp per capita in PPP	I(1)	
government debt / gdp	I(0)	
inflation (cpi)	I(0)	Not confirmed by LLCH
inflation (deflator)	I(0)	
lending rate	I(0)	Not confirmed by LLCH
real lending rate	I(0)	
unemployment rate	I(0)	

Note: LLCH = Levin, Lin and Chu test for common unit roots across countries.

Source: authors' computation

CNB WORKING PAPER SERIES

9/2011	Kamil Galuščák Lubomír Lízal	<i>The impact of capital measurement error correction on firm-level production function estimation</i>
8/2011	Jan Babecký Tomáš Havránek Jakub Matějů Marek Rusnák Kateřina Šmídková Bořek Vašíček	<i>Early warning indicators of economic crises: Evidence from a panel of 40 developed countries</i>
7/2011	Tomáš Havránek Zuzana Iršová	<i>Determinants of horizontal spillovers from FDI: Evidence from a large meta-analysis</i>
6/2011	Roman Horváth Jakub Matějů	<i>How are inflation targets set?</i>
5/2011	Bořek Vašíček	<i>Is monetary policy in the new EU member states asymmetric?</i>
4/2011	Alexis Derviz	<i>Financial frictions, bubbles, and macroprudential policies</i>
3/2011	Jaromír Baxa Roman Horváth Bořek Vašíček	<i>Time-varying monetary-policy rules and financial stress: Does financial instability matter for monetary policy?</i>
2/2011	Marek Rusnák Tomáš Havránek Roman Horváth	<i>How to solve the price puzzle? A meta-analysis</i>
1/2011	Jan Babecký Aleš Bulíř Kateřina Šmídková	<i>Sustainable real exchange rates in the new EU member states: What did the Great Recession change?</i>
15/2010	Ke Pang Pierre L. Siklos	<i>Financial frictions and credit spreads</i>
14/2010	Filip Novotný Marie Raková	<i>Assessment of consensus forecasts accuracy: The Czech National Bank perspective</i>
13/2010	Jan Filáček Branislav Saxa	<i>Central bank forecasts as a coordination device</i>
12/2010	Kateřina Arnoštová David Havrlant Luboš Růžička Peter Tóth	<i>Short-term forecasting of Czech quarterly GDP using monthly indicators</i>
11/2010	Roman Horváth Kateřina Šmídková Jan Zápál	<i>Central banks' voting records and future policy</i>
10/2010	Alena Bičáková Zuzana Prelcová Renata Pašaličová	<i>Who borrows and who may not repay?</i>
9/2010	Luboš Komárek Jan Babecký Zlataše Komárková	<i>Financial integration at times of financial instability</i>
8/2010	Kamil Dybczak Peter Tóth David Voňka	<i>Effects of price shocks to consumer demand. Estimating the QUAIDS demand system on Czech Household Budget Survey data</i>
7/2010	Jan Babecký Philip Du Caju	<i>The margins of labour cost adjustment: Survey evidence from European Firms</i>

	Theodora Kosma Martina Lawless Julián Messina Tairi Rõõm	
6/2010	Tomáš Havránek Roman Horváth Jakub Matějů	<i>Do financial variables help predict macroeconomic environment? The case of the Czech Republic</i>
5/2010	Roman Horváth Luboš Komárek Filip Rozsypal	<i>Does money help predict inflation? An empirical assessment for Central Europe</i>
4/2010	Oxana Babecká Kucharčuková Jan Babecký Martin Raiser	<i>A Gravity approach to modelling international trade in South- Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States: The role of geography, policy and institutions</i>
3/2010	Tomáš Havránek Zuzana Iršová	<i>Which foreigners are worth wooing? A Meta-analysis of vertical spillovers from FDI</i>
2/2010	Jaromír Baxa Roman Horváth Bořek Vašíček	<i>How does monetary policy change? Evidence on inflation targeting countries</i>
1/2010	Adam Geršl Petr Jakubík	<i>Relationship lending in the Czech Republic</i>
15/2009	David N. DeJong Roman Liesenfeld Guilherme V. Moura Jean-Francois Richard Hariharan Dharmarajan	<i>Efficient likelihood evaluation of state-space representations</i>
14/2009	Charles W. Calomiris	<i>Banking crises and the rules of the game</i>
13/2009	Jakub Seidler Petr Jakubík	<i>The Merton approach to estimating loss given default: Application to the Czech Republic</i>
12/2009	Michal Hlaváček Luboš Komárek	<i>Housing price bubbles and their determinants in the Czech Republic and its regions</i>
11/2009	Kamil Dybczak Kamil Galuščák	<i>Changes in the Czech wage structure: Does immigration matter?</i>
10/2009	Jiří Böhm Petr Král Branislav Saxa	<i>Perception is always right: The CNB's monetary policy in the media</i>
9/2009	Alexis Derviz Marie Raková	<i>Funding costs and loan pricing by multinational bank affiliates</i>
8/2009	Roman Horváth Anca Maria Podpiera	<i>Heterogeneity in bank pricing policies: The Czech evidence</i>
7/2009	David Kocourek Filip Pertold	<i>The impact of early retirement incentives on labour market participation: Evidence from a parametric change in the Czech Republic</i>
6/2009	Nauro F. Campos Roman Horváth	<i>Reform redux: Measurement, determinants and reversals</i>
5/2009	Kamil Galuščák Mary Keeney Daphne Nicolitsas	<i>The determination of wages of newly hired employees: Survey evidence on internal versus external factors</i>

	Frank Smets Pawel Strzelecki Matija Vodopivec	
4/2009	Jan Babecký Philip Du Caju Theodora Kosma Martina Lawless Julián Messina Tairi Rõõm	<i>Downward nominal and real wage rigidity: Survey evidence from European firms</i>
3/2009	Jiri Podpiera Laurent Weill	<i>Measuring excessive risk-taking in banking</i>
2/2009	Michal Andrle Tibor Hlédik Ondra Kameník Jan Vlček	<i>Implementing the new structural model of the Czech National Bank</i>
1/2009	Kamil Dybczak Jan Babecký	<i>The impact of population ageing on the Czech economy</i>
14/2008	Gabriel Fagan Vitor Gaspar	<i>Macroeconomic adjustment to monetary union</i>
13/2008	Giuseppe Bertola Anna Lo Prete	<i>Openness, financial markets, and policies: Cross-country and dynamic patterns</i>
12/2008	Jan Babecký Kamil Dybczak Kamil Galuščák	<i>Survey on wage and price formation of Czech firms</i>
11/2008	Dana Hájková	<i>The measurement of capital services in the Czech Republic</i>
10/2008	Michal Franta	<i>Time aggregation bias in discrete time models of aggregate duration data</i>
9/2008	Petr Jakubík Christian Schmieder	<i>Stress testing credit risk: Is the Czech Republic different from Germany?</i>
8/2008	Sofia Bauducco Aleš Bulíř Martin Čihák	<i>Monetary policy rules with financial instability</i>
7/2008	Jan Brůha Jiří Podpiera	<i>The origins of global imbalances</i>
6/2008	Jiří Podpiera Marie Raková	<i>The price effects of an emerging retail market</i>
5/2008	Kamil Dybczak David Voňka Nico van der Windt	<i>The effect of oil price shocks on the Czech economy</i>
4/2008	Magdalena M. Borys Roman Horváth	<i>The effects of monetary policy in the Czech Republic: An empirical study</i>
3/2008	Martin Cincibuch Tomáš Holub Jaromír Hurník	<i>Central bank losses and economic convergence</i>
2/2008	Jiří Podpiera	<i>Policy rate decisions and unbiased parameter estimation in conventionally estimated monetary policy rules</i>
1/2008	Balázs Égert Doubravko Mihaljek	<i>Determinants of house prices in Central and Eastern Europe</i>
17/2007	Pedro Portugal	<i>U.S. unemployment duration: Has long become longer or short become shorter?</i>

16/2007	Yuliya Rychalovská	<i>Welfare-based optimal monetary policy in a two-sector small open economy</i>
15/2007	Juraj Antal František Brázdk	<i>The effects of anticipated future change in the monetary policy regime</i>
14/2007	Aleš Bulíř Kateřina Šmídková Viktor Kotlán David Navrátil	<i>Inflation targeting and communication: Should the public read inflation reports or tea leaves?</i>
13/2007	Martin Cinnibuch Martina Horníková	<i>Measuring the financial markets' perception of EMU enlargement: The role of ambiguity aversion</i>
12/2007	Oxana Babetskaia- Kukharchuk	<i>Transmission of exchange rate shocks into domestic inflation: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
11/2007	Jan Filáček	<i>Why and how to assess inflation target fulfilment</i>
10/2007	Michal Franta Branislav Saxa Kateřina Šmídková	<i>Inflation persistence in new EU member states: Is it different than in the Euro area members?</i>
9/2007	Kamil Galuščák Jan Pavel	<i>Unemployment and inactivity traps in the Czech Republic: Incentive effects of policies</i>
8/2007	Adam Geršl Ieva Rubene Tina Zumer	<i>Foreign direct investment and productivity spillovers: Updated evidence from Central and Eastern Europe</i>
7/2007	Ian Babetskii Luboš Komárek Zlataše Komárková	<i>Financial integration of stock markets among new EU member states and the euro area</i>
6/2007	Anca Pruteanu-Podpiera Laurent Weill Franziska Schobert	<i>Market power and efficiency in the Czech banking sector</i>
5/2007	Jiří Podpiera Laurent Weill	<i>Bad luck or bad management? Emerging banking market experience</i>
4/2007	Roman Horváth	<i>The time-varying policy neutral rate in real time: A predictor for future inflation?</i>
3/2007	Jan Brůha Jiří Podpiera Stanislav Polák	<i>The convergence of a transition economy: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
2/2007	Ian Babetskii Nauro F. Campos	<i>Does reform work? An econometric examination of the reform-growth puzzle</i>
1/2007	Ian Babetskii Fabrizio Coricelli Roman Horváth	<i>Measuring and explaining inflation persistence: Disaggregate evidence on the Czech Republic</i>
13/2006	Frederic S. Mishkin Klaus Schmidt- Hebbel	<i>Does inflation targeting make a difference?</i>
12/2006	Richard Disney Sarah Bridges John Gathergood	<i>Housing wealth and household indebtedness: Is there a household 'financial accelerator'?</i>
11/2006	Michel Juillard Ondřej Kameník Michael Kumhof Douglas Laxton	<i>Measures of potential output from an estimated DSGE model of the United States</i>

10/2006	Jiří Podpiera Marie Raková	<i>Degree of competition and export-production relative prices when the exchange rate changes: Evidence from a panel of Czech exporting companies</i>
9/2006	Alexis Derviz Jiří Podpiera	<i>Cross-border lending contagion in multinational banks</i>
8/2006	Aleš Bulíř Jaromír Hurník	<i>The Maastricht inflation criterion: “Saints” and “Sinners”</i>
7/2006	Alena Bičáková Jiří Slačálek Michal Slavík	<i>Fiscal implications of personal tax adjustments in the Czech Republic</i>
6/2006	Martin Fukač Adrian Pagan	<i>Issues in adopting DSGE models for use in the policy process</i>
5/2006	Martin Fukač	<i>New Keynesian model dynamics under heterogeneous expectations and adaptive learning</i>
4/2006	Kamil Dybczak Vladislav Flek Dana Hájková Jaromír Hurník	<i>Supply-side performance and structure in the Czech Republic (1995–2005)</i>
3/2006	Aleš Krejdl	<i>Fiscal sustainability – definition, indicators and assessment of Czech public finance sustainability</i>
2/2006	Kamil Dybczak	<i>Generational accounts in the Czech Republic</i>
1/2006	Ian Babetskii	<i>Aggregate wage flexibility in selected new EU member states</i>
<hr/>		
14/2005	Stephen G. Cecchetti	<i>The brave new world of central banking: The policy challenges posed by asset price booms and busts</i>
13/2005	Robert F. Engle Jose Gonzalo Rangel	<i>The spline GARCH model for unconditional volatility and its global macroeconomic causes</i>
12/2005	Jaromír Beneš Tibor Hlédik Michael Kumhof David Vávra	<i>An economy in transition and DSGE: What the Czech national bank’s new projection model needs</i>
11/2005	Marek Hlaváček Michael Koňák Josef Čada	<i>The application of structured feedforward neural networks to the modelling of daily series of currency in circulation</i>
10/2005	Ondřej Kameník	<i>Solving SDGE models: A new algorithm for the Sylvester equation</i>
9/2005	Roman Šustek	<i>Plant-level nonconvexities and the monetary transmission mechanism</i>
8/2005	Roman Horváth	<i>Exchange rate variability, pressures and optimum currency area criteria: Implications for the central and eastern European countries</i>
7/2005	Balázs Égert Luboš Komárek	<i>Foreign exchange interventions and interest rate policy in the Czech Republic: Hand in glove?</i>
6/2005	Anca Podpiera Jiří Podpiera	<i>Deteriorating cost efficiency in commercial banks signals an increasing risk of failure</i>
5/2005	Luboš Komárek Martin Melecký	<i>The behavioural equilibrium exchange rate of the Czech koruna</i>
4/2005	Kateřina Arnoštová Jaromír Hurník	<i>The monetary transmission mechanism in the Czech Republic (evidence from VAR analysis)</i>

3/2005	Vladimír Benáček Jiří Podpiera Ladislav Prokop	<i>Determining factors of Czech foreign trade: A cross-section time series perspective</i>
2/2005	Kamil Galuščák Daniel Münich	<i>Structural and cyclical unemployment: What can we derive from the matching function?</i>
1/2005	Ivan Babouček Martin Jančar	<i>Effects of macroeconomic shocks to the quality of the aggregate loan portfolio</i>
10/2004	Aleš Bulíř Kateřina Šmídková	<i>Exchange rates in the new EU accession countries: What have we learned from the forerunners</i>
9/2004	Martin Cincibuch Jiří Podpiera	<i>Beyond Balassa-Samuelson: Real appreciation in tradables in transition countries</i>
8/2004	Jaromír Beneš David Vávra	<i>Eigenvalue decomposition of time series with application to the Czech business cycle</i>
7/2004	Vladislav Flek, ed.	<i>Anatomy of the Czech labour market: From over-employment to under-employment in ten years?</i>
6/2004	Narcisa Kadlčáková Joerg Keplinger	<i>Credit risk and bank lending in the Czech Republic</i>
5/2004	Petr Král	<i>Identification and measurement of relationships concerning inflow of FDI: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
4/2004	Jiří Podpiera	<i>Consumers, consumer prices and the Czech business cycle identification</i>
3/2004	Anca Pruteanu	<i>The role of banks in the Czech monetary policy transmission mechanism</i>
2/2004	Ian Babetskii	<i>EU enlargement and endogeneity of some OCA criteria: Evidence from the CEECs</i>
1/2004	Alexis Derviz Jiří Podpiera	<i>Predicting bank CAMELS and S&P ratings: The case of the Czech Republic</i>

CNB RESEARCH AND POLICY NOTES

2/2011	Adam Geršl Jakub Seidler	<i>Credit growth and capital buffers: Empirical evidence from Central and Eastern European countries</i>
1/2011	Jiří Böhm Jan Filáček Ivana Kubicová Romana Zamazalová	<i>Price-level targeting – A real alternative to inflation targeting?</i>
1/2008	Nicos Christodoulakis	<i>Ten years of EMU: Convergence, divergence and new policy priorities</i>
2/2007	Carl E. Walsh	<i>Inflation targeting and the role of real objectives</i>
1/2007	Vojtěch Benda Luboš Růžička	<i>Short-term forecasting methods based on the LEI approach: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
2/2006	Garry J. Schinasi	<i>Private finance and public policy</i>
1/2006	Ondřej Schneider	<i>The EU budget dispute – A blessing in disguise?</i>
5/2005	Jan Stráský	<i>Optimal forward-looking policy rules in the quarterly projection model of the Czech National Bank</i>

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

CNB ECONOMIC RESEARCH BULLETIN

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

Czech National Bank
Economic Research Department
Na Příkopě 28, 115 03 Praha 1
Czech Republic

phone: +420 2 244 12 321

fax: +420 2 244 14 278

<http://www.cnb.cz>

e-mail: research@cnb.cz

ISSN 1803-70; 9