

# The Stock-Flow Approach to the Real Exchange Rate of CEE Transition Economies

Balázs Égert<sup>%,#</sup>, Amina Lahrèche-Révil<sup>&</sup>, and Kirsten Lommatzsch<sup>§</sup>

## Abstract

In this paper, we use an asset model of the real exchange rate inspired by Faruqee (1995), Aglietta et al. (1997) and Alberola et al. (1999, 2002) to investigate determinants of equilibrium exchange rates for new EU Member States and candidate countries. We complete this approach by assessing the impact of productivity gains on both the Balassa-Samuelson effect and the behaviour of the tradable real exchange rate. On the basis of four panels ((1) small, open OECD countries (2) emerging economies of Asia and the Americas (3) transition countries from Central and Eastern Europe (4) all countries put together), we show that although the B-S effect may be a common feature to all economies, the tradable price-based real appreciation is a distinct feature of transition and emerging economies. Furthermore, we propose a solution to the so-called net foreign asset puzzle according to which a decrease in net foreign assets usually leads to an appreciation of the real exchange rate of transition countries, instead of the depreciation predicted by theory. Comparing in-sample and out-of-sample estimates (in terms of the country coverage) of equilibrium exchange rates shows that these measures can yield different results for transition economies, and could therefore be considered as complementary tools in judging misalignments.

JEL: C15, E31, F31, O11, P17

Keywords: equilibrium exchange rate, real exchange rate, transition, EU enlargement, euro area, Balassa-Samuelson effect, productivity, relative prices, net foreign assets, out-of sample panel

---

<sup>%</sup> Corresponding author.

<sup>#</sup> Oesterreichische Nationalbank; MODEM, University of Paris X-Nanterre and William Davidson Institute. [Balazs.Egert@oenb.at](mailto:Balazs.Egert@oenb.at); [begert@u-paris10.fr](mailto:begert@u-paris10.fr)

<sup>&</sup> CEPII ; [lahreche@cepil.fr](mailto:lahreche@cepil.fr)

<sup>§</sup> DIW-Berlin; [klommatzsch@diw.de](mailto:klommatzsch@diw.de)

We would like to thank Jarko Fidrmuc, László Halpern, and participants of seminars held at CEPII, at MODEM, University of Paris X-Nanterre, at the European Department of the IMF, at the Bank of Slovenia and participants of the Accession Countries Conference held at the European University Institute, for helpful comments and suggestions. All remaining errors are ours.

The views expressed in the paper do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Oesterreichische Nationalbank or the European System of Central Banks (ESCB).

# 1 Introduction

Transition economies in Central and Eastern Europe have experienced a rather substantial real appreciation of their currencies, which could make meeting the nominal convergence criteria difficult. This sizeable real appreciation is often related to the Balassa-Samuelson effect of rising prices of non-tradable goods during the catch-up process (e.g. Halpern and Wyplosz 2001, Backé et al 2002), although its importance for the price level convergence of transition economies has been questioned lately (Coricelli and Jazbec, 2001; Égert 2002, Égert et al. 2003, Mihajlek and Klau 2003). Macro-economic models and reduced-form equations have also been used for assessing determinants of the real exchange rate. In addition to productivity, they consider a wide range of other determinants, such as foreign debt or net foreign assets, terms of trade, government debt and regulated prices (e.g. Csajbók 2003, Alberola 2003, Rawdanowicz 2003, Égert and Lommatzsch 2003).

A major problem for assessing the factors driving equilibrium rates for transition countries is the lack of long time series providing sufficient numbers of observation for econometric testing. Time series estimations may not be robust enough to establish reliably long-term determinants of the real exchange rate. Therefore, panel estimations have gained popularity (Kim/Korhonen 2002, Crespo-Cuaresma et al. 2003). However, a question arises as to whether it is more appropriate to make use of out-of-sample or in-sample estimations.<sup>1</sup> Maeso-Fernandez et al. (2004) argue that out-of-sample panel estimates may be superior to in-sample panel estimates for transition economies because in the presence of initial undervaluation, in-sample panels produce biased estimates. However, while such an approach attempts to correct the constant term, it cannot, by nature, account for possible *parameter* differences between transition countries and the more developed countries, e.g. in the OECD, regarding net foreign assets and productivity. Such differences are yet likely: the catch up process may, at an early stage, justify an increase in foreign liabilities because foreign savings are needed for the growth potential to materialise; rapid changes in supply capacities and technology may imply that productivity impacts on the real exchange rate through different channels than in industrialised countries operating at the technological frontier..

In this paper, we make a further step in comparing panel estimates from out-of sample forecasts and in-sample tests. As a background, we use the stock-flow approach as set out in e.g. Faruqee (1995), Aglietta et al. (1997) and Alberola et al. (1999, 2002). In this approach, the equilibrium real exchange rate is determined by the stock and flow of assets between countries. Any country has a desired stock of net foreign assets which it aims to achieve in the long run. The equilibrium real exchange rate prevails at a current account position consistent with the income flows from the desired stock of foreign assets. In view of the large current account deficits that most of the transition countries<sup>2</sup> of Central and Eastern Europe have been experiencing, the question of the impact of net foreign assets on the real exchange rate and external equilibrium is highly relevant. An increase in net foreign liabilities is often found to lead to an appreciation of the equilibrium real exchange rate of the transition countries. This is in contrast to what theory would suggest, i.e. a rise in net foreign liabilities should cause the real exchange rate to depreciate. The solution to this conundrum seems to be linked to different time horizons and the movement towards the desired level of foreign assets or liabilities.

---

<sup>1</sup> In-sample and out-of-sample estimates are defined here in terms of country coverage. Namely, out-of-sample measures of the equilibrium exchange rate for a given country are based on exchange-rate equations estimated on a sample where from this country is excluded. Conversely, in-sample measures are derived from equations estimated on a geographical sample including the country of interest.

<sup>2</sup> The term "transition economy" is used throughout the paper instead of "new EU member state" (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia) or "candidate country" (Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania) because for most of the period used for the estimations, the countries from Central and Eastern Europe can be viewed as transition economies.

Beside net foreign assets, we also consider labour productivity. The productivity variable is usually interpreted with reference to the Balassa-Samuelson (B-S) effect, which causes the real exchange rate to appreciate via an increase in the relative price of non-tradable goods. However, we also view productivity as channelling changes in the tradable price-based real exchange. This is the case in transition economies because industrial productivity gains do not only reflect the cost-competitiveness of the countries, but also quality improvements – i.e. non-price competitiveness – . Therefore, productivity improvements are expected to lead to an appreciation of the real exchange rate. Using medium-size panels for different groups of countries: (1) small, open OECD countries (2) emerging economies of Asia and the Americas (3) transition countries from Central and Eastern Europe (4) all countries put together, we show that transition and emerging market economies do experience a tradable price-based appreciation, which is not the case in the more developed OECD countries. The use of different proxies for productivity allows us to show that the CPI-to-PPI ratio so often used in the literature as a proxy for relative productivity vehicles other type of information as well, and is an imperfect substitute for the Balassa-Samuelson effect.

The paper is organised as follows: Section 2 presents the theoretical model. Section 3 describes the data and the estimation methods. Section 4 provides results for real exchange rate determination. Finally, Section 5 concludes.

## 2 Theoretical Framework

### *Real Exchange Rate Decomposition*

Decomposing the real exchange rate allows to separate competitiveness from relative price issues, as all prices need not affect the ability of a country to sell goods or services abroad.

Considering the CPI composed of tradable and non-tradable goods with  $\alpha$  and  $(1-\alpha)$  being the respective share of tradable and non-tradable goods in the CPI, the real exchange rate can be split into three components: (1) the nominal exchange rate<sup>3</sup>, (2) the ratio of foreign to domestic tradable prices, (3) and the ratio of domestic to foreign relative price of non-tradable goods as shown below<sup>4</sup>:

$$q = \underbrace{e + p^{*T} - p^T}_{\text{real exchange rate for the tradable sector}} - \left( \underbrace{(1-\alpha) \left( \frac{p^{NT} - p^T}{p^{*NT} - p^{*/T}} \right)}_{\text{ratio of the domestic to the foreign relative price of non-traded goods}} \right) \quad (1)$$

The first term represents the real exchange rate of the tradable (or open) sector. The second term compares the relative price of non-tradable to tradable-goods between the domestic and foreign economies. It accounts for the behaviour of the real exchange rate when the prices of tradable and non-tradable goods develop differently. This decomposition allows to separate the factors that influence the real exchange rate of the open sector (and hence the current account via the trade balance), from the ones that are related to the price developments in the non-tradable sector.

According to asset models of the real exchange rate<sup>5</sup>, the current account is driven in the long run by the adjustment of the net foreign assets towards their desired position. The equilibrium real exchange rate of the open sector is affected by this adjustment, and can thus deviate from the purchasing power parity (PPP). On the opposite, the relative price of non-

<sup>3</sup> The exchange rate is defined as units of domestic currency per unit of foreign currency. Thus, an increase (decrease) in the exchange rate denote a depreciation (appreciation).

<sup>4</sup> An asterisk denotes the foreign country.

<sup>5</sup> Frenkel and Mussa (1985), Faruqee (1995), Aglietta et al. (1997), Alberola et al. (1999) and Lane and Miletta (2002).

tradable goods need not affect international competitiveness, and hence the current account position and changes in net foreign assets<sup>6</sup>.

### *The Real Exchange Rate of the Open Sector*

The analysis draws on the the model developed by Alberola et al. (1999, 2002) and Alberola (2003). The equilibrium real exchange rate is defined as the real exchange rate that leads simultaneously to internal and external balances.

Internal balance is reached when the domestic goods market clears (non-inflationary level of employment, i.e. output near to its potential level). Hence, it conveys both a Balassa-Samuelson effect (the relative price of non-tradable goods increases when productivity rises in the tradable sector, because of labour mobility within the country) and a demand effect.

External balance refers to current account sustainability, which implies that, in the long run, the current account is balanced and net foreign assets have converged to their steady state. The long-run equilibrium real exchange rate secures the trade balance deficit (surplus) to correspond to the income payments received (made) by the country. In the medium term, external balance is characterised by the convergence of net foreign assets towards their desired level, i.e. current account deficits or surpluses are connected with desired capital flows. Following Frenkel and Mussa (1985), the medium-run adjustment can be defined as the convergence of net foreign assets towards their desired level and as the difference between short and long-run interest rates.

This model lead to the following testable equation, where the real effective exchange rate ( $q_t$ ) is determined jointly by net foreign asset developments ( $nfa_t$ ) and relative prices developments ( $rel_t$ )

$$q_t = f(nfa_t, rel_t)$$

In such a model, relative prices developments (CPI versus PPI) are used as a proxy for productivity developments in the tradable sector, compared to the non-tradable one. They only impact on the internal equilibrium of the economy, through market clearing in the non-tradable sector.

As to the external equilibrium, it only relies on price-competitiveness, as net foreign asset developments feed back into the real exchange rate to achieve the desired current account position. However, current account developments do not only depend on price-competitiveness, especially in emerging markets which experiment an upgrading in the quality of specialisation, but also in developed economies, where product differentiation leads the price-elasticity of demand for traded goods to decrease. This issue is explicitly taken into account in the theoretical model developed by Aglietta et al. (1997), starting from that of Faruquee (1995).

In that model, the external equilibrium depends both on the net foreign asset position and non-price competitiveness, the underlying assumption being that non-price competitiveness allows a country to sustain a more appreciated level of the real exchange rate for a given current account (and consequently NFA) position. Consistently with other theoretical models, the internal equilibrium is determined by a Balassa-Samuelson effect.

The resulting real exchange rate equation is the following:

$$q_t = f(nfa_t, npc_t, rel_t)$$

where  $npc_t$  relates to non-price competitiveness.

This model of stock-flow adjustment suggests a long-term relationship between the real exchange rate and net foreign assets on the one hand, and determinants of the trade

---

<sup>6</sup> It need not, but it can, if non-tradables are inputs for the production of tradables, and their increase implies cost pressure on the tradable goods prices.

account on the other. An increase in non-price competitiveness leads to an appreciation of the equilibrium real exchange rate. As in the Alberola model, an improvement in the net foreign asset position leads to an appreciation of the real exchange rate, because higher net foreign assets mean higher flows of income.

In both model, during the adjustment process towards equilibrium the sign is, however, not clear-cut. If the desired stock of net foreign assets is negative (because the higher expected growth or returns in the domestic economy make the use of foreign savings desirable), the economy will be moving to a desired foreign debt position, which, in turn, implies current account deficits and a real appreciation of the exchange rate. Therefore, the effect of income payments for the foreign debt (requiring a real depreciation) may dominate the exchange rate determination only at a later point when the desired level of foreign debt or negative foreign assets is achieved.

### 3 Estimation Issues

The estimation of the real exchange rate for the tradable sector should include the net foreign asset position of the country and its non-price competitiveness. The global real exchange rate is also driven by relative price differentials for the non-tradable and the tradable sector, which implies taking also account of the Balassa-Samuelson effect. Furthermore, the model considers the difference in growth rates. Empirically, however, this effect mixes with the B-S effect (increasing growth is attributable to increasing productivity, which appreciates the real exchange rate through the relative price of the non-tradable goods). Therefore, growth differences are not taken directly into account in the empirical estimates<sup>7</sup>.

In the 1997 Aglietta model, non-price competitiveness is proxied by R&D expenditure. Because of the still lower level of development of transition economies, and because of R&D being mostly produced in the origin countries of the multinational firms which have been investing in these countries, this proxy does not seem to fit well non-price competitiveness developments. This is the reason why it is preferably caught by a measure of the industrial productivity of labour. Indeed, when labour productivity gains lead to production increases with no quality improvement, the relative price of domestic tradable goods should be stable or decreasing. In addition to supply-side effects (costs should be decreasing), this is due to the fact that the price-elasticity of demand is unchanged, so that a higher production level leads to a stability (small country) or even decrease (large country) in the relative price of the tradable goods, other things being equal. On the opposite, if labour productivity is associated to quality improvements, or a better product differentiation, the relative price of tradable goods can increase, because demand becomes less price-elastic.<sup>8</sup> In the transition countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the transformation and catch-up processes have been entailing a rapid shift to a supply of goods of higher quality and technological content. While this mechanism is present in all economies, in transition economies, this process seems to be more pronounced and can even lead to real appreciation, as put forward in Égert and Lommatzsch (2003).

However, when assessing the behaviour of the “global” real exchange rate, productivity can also account for the B-S effect<sup>9</sup>, as an increase in manufacturing productivity should lead to

---

<sup>7</sup> Moreover, the growth differential is a stationary variable, which, for this reason, does not add much to a cointegration analysis.

<sup>8</sup> The new theory of international trade also accounts for such a possibility. According to Krugman (1989), growth may be associated to an increase in the variety of tradable goods produced in the domestic economy. The resulting decrease in the relative price elasticity of demand for exports allows for an appreciation of the real exchange rate of the tradable goods.

<sup>9</sup> In so doing, it is implicitly assumed that productivity in the non-tradable sector develops similarly in all countries, and that the transmission mechanism from higher productivity in the traded goods sector to higher prices of non-tradables is stable.

an appreciation of the relative price of non-tradable goods, under the assumption of no change in non-tradable productivity. To distinguish between the two channels through which productivity affects the real exchange rate, not only the CPI-based real exchange rate, but the producer price index (PPI)-deflated (as a proxy for tradable goods) real exchange rate is also regressed on productivity and net foreign assets.

### 3.1 Reduced Form Equations

The baseline scenario considers the real exchange rate deflated using the CPI on the one hand, and productivity and net foreign assets on the other, given in equation (3):

$$q^{CPI} = f(\overset{-}{prod}, \overset{+/-}{nfa}) \quad (3)$$

$q$  is the real exchange rate defined as the ratio of foreign to domestic prices:  $q = e + p^* - p$ . Therefore, an increase (decrease) denotes a real depreciation (appreciation). The effect of productivity improvements on the relative price of tradable goods is also assessed in equation (4), where the producer price index (PPI)-deflated (as a proxy for tradable goods) real exchange rate is also regressed on productivity and net foreign assets:

$$q^{PPI} = f(\overset{-}{prod}, \overset{+/-}{nfa}) \quad (4)$$

Because of comparison reasons, we also perform the estimations using the relative price ratio:

$$q^{CPI} = f(\overset{-}{rel}, \overset{+/-}{nfa}) \quad (3')$$

$$q^{PPI} = f(\overset{-}{rel}, \overset{+/-}{nfa}) \quad (4')$$

It is common practice in the literature to use the CPI-to-PPI ratio as a proxy for productivity to account for the B-S effect. There are two problems with this identification however. First, productivity gains can affect the real exchange rate, especially in transition countries via different channels (see Figure 1.). Second, the CPI-to-PPI ratio is not a proper proxy for the relative price of market non-tradables through which productivity gains feed into the real exchange rate because it also measures the impact of the following factors:

- (a) higher demand for non-tradable goods because of higher income
- (b) indirect taxes (which are included in the calculation of the CPI, but not in the calculation of the PPI, the latter referring to producer prices before adding indirect taxes);
- (c) the adjustment of regulated prices (which concerns most often non-tradables); and
- (d) more difficulties in adjustment for quality changes of non-tradables than tradables.

Moreover, the CPI ratio also includes a varying proportion of imported goods, which can affect its behaviour when the nominal exchange rate moves.


The sign of net foreign assets is ambiguous as described earlier. A decrease in net foreign assets results in an appreciation of the real exchange rate if the desired stock of net foreign assets is negative. The relationship is positive if the desired level is reached.

Finally, in a further extension, net foreign assets, relative prices and productivity are all considered in one specification to see whether the productivity variable and the relative price variable vehicle a different set of information. As long as they both enter the equation significantly, productivity in industry would describe the effect of non-price-competition on

tradables' prices, whereas the CPI-to-PPI ratio would stand both for the above-mentioned four factors and the Balassa-Samuelson effect:

$$q^{CPI} = f(\overset{-}{prod}, \overset{-}{rel}, \overset{+/-}{nfa}) \tag{5}$$

**Figure 1.** The transmission of productivity and the CPI-to-PPI ratio to the real exchange rate



### 3.2 Data Sources and Definitions

The dataset covers 35 countries, of which 15 are small, open, industrialised OECD economies<sup>10</sup>, 8 emerging market economies from Asia and the Americas<sup>11</sup>, and 11 transition economies from Central and Eastern Europe<sup>12</sup>. Cyprus is also included in the dataset. On the basis of the 35 countries, the following panels were built: (1) OECD countries, (2) emerging countries of Asia and the Americas, (3) transition economies from Central and Eastern Europe. Because we are concerned primarily with real exchange rates for the transition economies, we further divided the panel of 11 transition economies in order to account for possibly significant differences between the transition countries. For example, Bulgaria and Romania are less advanced in their reforms than the new EU member states, and together with the Baltic countries they have experienced higher real appreciation compared with the rest. Therefore, two further panels were formed: (4) CEEC5 plus the 3 Baltic countries and (5) only CEEC5. Panel (6) contains all mentioned countries. Finally, panel (7) contains all countries plus Cyprus, which was difficult to put into any of the specific panels. The period spans from 1970 to 2002 for panel (1) and Cyprus. However, for some of the countries, some of the series begin later. For panel (2), time series usually begin between 1980 and 1990 and

<sup>10</sup>Austria, Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Netherlands, Sweden, Canada, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, New Zealand, South Africa and South Korea. Although South Africa is not an OECD country, its economic structure may be considered for the most part of the sample as rather similar to that of Australia and New Zealand.

<sup>11</sup>Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey

<sup>12</sup> Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania.

end in 2002. Regarding transition economies, the datasets span from 1992/1993 to 2002.<sup>13</sup> All data are quarterly ; the definition of variables and data sources are given in the Appendix.

---

<sup>13</sup> For more details on data sources and available time periods, see Appendix 1.

**Table 1.** Overview of panels

<b>Panel 1</b>	15 OECD countries
<b>Panel 2</b>	8 emerging countries
<b>Panel 3</b>	11 CEE transition countries
<b>Panel 4</b>	8 transition countries (CEEC5+B3)
<b>Panel 5</b>	CEEC5
<b>Panel 6</b>	<i>Panel 1+ Panel 2+ Panel 3</i>
<b>Panel 7</b>	<i>Panel 6+Cyprus</i>

The real effective exchange rate is a weighted average of the real exchange rate vis-à-vis the US economy and the euro area<sup>14</sup>. Germany and France are taken as a proxy for the euro area, where the weights correspond to the relative size of French and German GDP (40 and 60 per cent, respectively). The weights allocated to the US and the euro area are given by the trade patterns of the given economy.

**Table 2.** Share of EU15 and US in AC total trade (in %), 1996-2001 average

	EU 15	US	Total
Czech Rep.	0.66	0.02	0.68
Estonia	0.63	0.04	0.67
Hungary	0.69	0.04	0.73
Latvia	0.55	0.05	0.60
Lithuania	0.47	0.02	0.49
Poland	0.68	0.02	0.70
Slovakia	0.52	0.01	0.53
Slovenia	0.70	0.02	0.72


Source: Chelem-Cepii database.

The other series are calculated as follows:

- average labour productivity in industry is computed as industrial production to employment in industry,
- the relative price of non-tradables to tradables is approximated by the CPI to PPI ratio. All variables are calculated as the domestic to foreign series ratio.
- Net foreign assets are constructed as cumulated current account deficits/surpluses expressed in terms of GDP. All variables are taken in natural logarithms and are interpolated from yearly to quarterly frequency. Net foreign assets are transformed so as to keep observations non-negative:  $\ln(1 + (NFA/GDP)/100)$ .

**Table 4.** Net foreign assets in % of GDP.

<sup>14</sup> In doing so, we do not consider the rest of the world, which implicitly suggests that real exchange rate adjustments, if any, are to be made against the euro (mostly) and the dollar (marginally). This hypothesis, although apparently restricting, matches both the increasing orientation of transition countries economies towards the euro area, and the future of EMU participation, which will leave asymmetric shocks to be adjusted through the relative prices against other EMU countries. See Bénassy-Quéré et al. (2004) for developments about the inclusion/exclusion of the rest of the world in real effective equilibrium exchange rates estimations.



### 3.3 Econometric Issues

The first step of the cointegration analysis is to ascertain that the series are non-stationary in level. For this purpose, the panel unit root test proposed by Im et al (2003) (IPS test henceforth) is used. The advantage of the IPS test is that it allows for heterogeneity in the autoregressive coefficient across the countries of the panel. Consider the following equation assuming a trend and a constant term:

$$\Delta y_{i,t} = \pi_i \cdot y_{i,t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} b_i \cdot \Delta y_{i,t-1} + \mu_i + \gamma_i \cdot t + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \quad (6)$$

The null of  $H_0 : \pi_i = 0$  for each  $i$  is tested against the alternative hypothesis of  $H_1 : \pi_i < 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . The t-bar statistics is determined as the mean of individual ADF statistics, and is then compared with a set of critical values provided in Im et al (2003).

The coefficients of the long-term relationships are derived by using (1) fixed effect OLS, (2) the mean group of individual dynamic OLS estimates, (3) mean group of individual estimates based on the error-correction specification of the ARDL process proposed by Pesaran et al. (1999), and (4) the pooled mean group estimator based on the ARDL.

The dynamic OLS can be written for each member of the panel as follows:

$$Y_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_n X_{i,t} + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=-k_1}^{k_2} \gamma_{i,j} \Delta X_{i,t-j} + \varepsilon_t \quad (8)$$

with  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  denoting respectively leads and lags for panel member  $i$ .

The error correction form of the ARDL model is given for panel member  $i$  as shown in equation (9) where the dependent variable in first differences is regressed on the lagged values of the dependent and independent variables in levels and first differences:

$$\Delta Y_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \rho(Y_{i,t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_n X_{i,t-1}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l_1} \eta_j \Delta Y_{i,t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{l_2} \gamma_{i,j} \Delta X_{i,t-j} + \varepsilon_t \quad (9)$$

where  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  are the maximum lags. The pooled mean group estimator (PMGE) is first estimated with the short-term dynamic terms restricted across the members of the panels, and then with unrestricted short-run terms across panel members. In addition, the ARDL mean group estimator is also employed.

The error correction terms obtained from the mean group and pooled mean group estimators proposed by Pesaran et al. (1999) are used as tests for cointegration. A negative and statistically significant error correction term is taken as evidence for the presence of cointegration.

## 4 Estimation Results

### 4.1 The CPI-based Real Effective Exchange Rate

The IPS panel unit root tests indicate that most series are non-stationary in level, but become stationary after differentiation. Thus, the panel cointegration techniques can be applied to the data. Equations (3) and (3') are estimated for the 7 panels described earlier.<sup>15</sup> For the panel including OECD countries, the tests are carried out for 7 periods so as to check for stability of the estimation results. The periods 1970-2002, 1975-2002, 1980-2002 and 1970-1990 yield very similar results, and therefore only those for 1975 to 2002 are reported here.

In general, there appears to be a great deal of heterogeneity across countries of the sub-panels because the fixed effect OLS and the PMGE, which impose homogeneity on the long-run coefficients, appear to be of poor quality. In a number of cases, the error correction terms for the PMGE turn out to be statistically insignificant and/or to have a positive sign, indicating the absence of an error correction mechanism towards long-run equilibrium. By contrast, the DOLS and ARDL mean group estimators seem to confirm our expectations both in terms of significance, signs and the error correction term. Given this, we will concentrate on the interpretation of the estimates obtained on the basis of the panel DOLS and MG estimators. Results for tests based on the CPI-based real exchange rate are displayed in Table 5.

Tests can establish cointegration for the specifications with the productivity series and the CPI-to-PPI price ratio. For the group of OECD countries, productivity in industry has the expected negative sign, meaning that an increase in productivity causes the real exchange rate to appreciate. Although the CPI-to-PPI ratio also has a negative sign, the size of it is considerably higher in absolute terms (-0.7 to -1.2) than that of the two productivity variables (-0.16 to -0.2). This is a first indication that the variables may convey different information.<sup>16</sup> Net foreign assets are also correctly (negatively) signed and are statistically significant except when the CPI-to-PPI ratio is used. Thus, an increase in net foreign assets leads to an appreciation of the real exchange rate. It should be noted that results obtained using DOLS

<sup>15</sup> Three lag structures are used for the mean group DOLS and ARDL. First, we impose 1 lag and 1 lead for panel DOLS and 1 lag for ARDL. Then, lags and leads are chosen on the basis of Akaike and Schwartz information criteria. As results are very similar, only the estimates based on the Schwarz information criterion are reported. Moreover, only results for the CEE11 and CEE5 are shown, as they are similar to what is obtained using different sub-partitions of the CEE data set. Complete results are displayed in Appendix 3.

<sup>16</sup> The CPI to PPI ratio should be connected to relative productivity by a multiplicative factor which accounts for the weight of the tradable sector in the economy :  $(1-\alpha)$ , where  $\alpha$  is the weight of the tradable sector. According to our estimates, the implicit weight of the tradable sector would range between 50% and 0%. The usually accepted figure is around 30%, which matches neither estimate. This is an indication that both variables convey different information. Moreover, in the emerging countries and CEE panels, the estimated parameters do not allow to infer implicit weights for the tradable sector, which is a further indication of both variables relying to different phenomena.

are in general of better quality as those based on MGE because in a number of cases, some variables are not significant using the MGE.

With regard to the group of emerging countries from Asia and South America, the two productivity variables and the CPI-to-PPI ratio bear the correct sign, i.e. an increase (decrease) leads to an appreciation (depreciation) of the real effective exchange rate. However, the absolute size of the variables is higher than for the OECD panel (1.2 to 1.5 for productivity in industry and the CPI to PPI ratio). By contrast, net foreign assets turn out insignificant in most cases, and when they are statistically significant, their sign differs.

Coming to the transition economies, we observe a high significance of the productivity variables. Similar to the OECD countries, the size of the CPI-to-PPI variable is much higher than the one of productivity in industry. Comparing the three panels (11 transition economies, CEEC5+B5, CEEC5), the elimination of Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania, and then the three Baltic countries leads to a decrease in the size of the CPI-to-PPI variable and to a rise in the size of productivity in industry. In contrast to the group of emerging countries, the net foreign assets variable is mostly significant at standard significance levels. However, the sign of this variable is always positive.

Finally, the estimation results are very similar for the last two panels. This means that the inclusion of Cyprus to the other countries does not affect the overall results. For this reason, we only report results for the panel including the OECD, emerging and transition countries and Cyprus (panel (7)). The results are something of a mixture of the three panels analysed above. The productivity variables are significant and correctly signed with a size somewhere between those obtained for the OECD panel, on the one hand, and for the emerging and transition economies, on the other hand. The net foreign assets variable turns out to be positive as in the transition countries panel. This is probably because in the emerging market panel some countries may also have recorded appreciation alongside foreign debt growth. In addition, higher net foreign assets may also be connected with depreciation, if the movements towards a higher net foreign assets position dominates the effect of subsequent income flows, which may be the case in some of the countries in the OECD panel.

## **4.2 The Sign on Net Foreign Assets for Transition Economies**

The increasing literature on equilibrium exchange rates is not conclusive regarding the sign of net foreign assets relative to the real exchange rate. For instance, Burgess et al. (2003) find a positive sign between NFA and the real exchange rate for the three Baltic states: a decrease (increase) in the NFA position causes the real exchange rate to appreciate (depreciate). Alonso-Gamo et al. (2002) and Lommatzsch and Tober (2002) come to the same conclusion for Lithuania, and for the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, respectively, as Alberola (2003) does for the case of the Czech Republic. By contrast, Hinnsar et al. (2003) find a negative sign for Estonia, and Rahn (2003) for Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia, i.e. a decrease (increase) in the NFA position causes the real exchange rate to depreciate (appreciate). Alberola (2003) comes to the same conclusion for Hungary and Poland. Csajbók (2003), Darvas (2001), Rubaszek (2003) and Bitans and Tillars (2003) confirm these findings. Using a small panel of transition countries, MacDonald and Wojcik (2002) suggest that the sign changes in function of the estimated equation.

Our results indicates that net foreign assets have a very robust positive link to the real exchange rate for transition economies, and to a lesser extent for emerging countries. In contrast with this finding is the observation that NFA bear a strong negative tie to the real exchange rate for a set of small, open OECD countries. This appears to be a major piece of evidence for the explanation provided in Égert (2003), according to which in the medium to long term, NFA may be positively linked to the real exchange rate, but the direction of this link changes in the longer run. Within the framework of the stock-flow asset model of the real exchange rate shown earlier, this can be explained by the fact that in the medium run,

transition economies are moving towards their desired stock of foreign assets because the higher growth potential cannot be financed by domestic savings only and the use of foreign savings implies the accumulation of foreign liabilities. Moreover, the opening up of capital accounts, associated to higher expected returns in the economy, leads to an increase in capital inflows which appreciates the real exchange rate. However, in the long run, the desired level of foreign assets is achieved, and payments on the existing stock of foreign liabilities would reverse the relationship: the higher the stock of foreign liabilities, the higher the need for real exchange rate depreciation to service the debt through an improved trade account, and vice versa. This is exactly what we observe for the average of the OECD countries.

**Table 5. The CPI-based REER and the fundamentals**

		OLS	DOLS_SIC	MGE_SIC	PMGE	Nb. Obs
<b>OECD</b>	Coint			-0.042***	0.003***	1554
	prod	-0.021	-0.160***	0.124		
	Nfa	-0.027***	-0.074***	-0.235***		
	Coint			-0.052***	0.000***	1590
	rel	-0.904***	-0.763***	-0.744***		
	nfa	0.030***	0.035	-0.088		
<b>Emerging countries</b>	coint			-0.033***	-0.018*	564
	prod	-0.166***	-1.217***	-1.858*	-1.040*	
	Nfa	-0.034	-0.340	0.063	-0.552***	
	Coint			-0.054***	-0.005	704
	rel	-1.672***	-1.449***	-1.479***		
	nfa	0.119***	-0.192	-0.276		
<b>CEEC11</b>	Coint			-0.148***	-0.071***	423
	prod	-0.344***	-0.437***	-0.024***	-0.673***	
	Nfa	0.742***	0.569***	0.540***	-0.141	
	Coint			-0.088***	0.043	427
	Rel	-1.809***	-1.663***	-0.510***		
	Nfa	0.493***	0.376***	0.243***		
<b>CEEC5</b>	coint			-0.197***	-0.019***	197
	prod	-0.589***	-0.736***	-0.790***	-1.506***	
	Nfa	0.256***	0.176***	0.156	-0.152	
	Coint			-0.089***	0.010	197
	Rel	-2.185***	-1.036***	-1.216***		
	Nfa	0.195***	0.398***	0.125		
<b>ALL (including Cyprus)</b>	coint			-0.073***	0.027**	2646
	prod	-0.196***	-0.498***	-0.465***		
	Nfa	0.064***	0.071***	0.080		
	Coint			-0.063***	-0.011	2826
	rel	-1.541***	-1.156***	-0.788***		
	Nfa	0.117***	0.088***	-0.027		

Notes DOLS\_SIC are the DOLS estimates obtained on the basis of the Schwarz information criterion. The same applies to the mean group estimators (MGE\_SIC). \*,\*\*\* and \*\*\* denote respectively statistical significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels. In the row "coint" under MGE\_SIC and PMGE are shown the error correction terms.

### 4.3 The PPI-based Real Effective Exchange Rate

In a second step, equations (4) and (4') are used which connect the real effective exchange rate deflated by the PPI – which proxies tradable goods prices – to productivity / the CPI-to-PPI ratio and net foreign assets. The aim of this series of estimates is to assess the impact of productivity on the real exchange rate of the open sector.

For the OECD countries, the productivity variables switch sign and become positive, but remain statistically significant. Both an increase in average labour productivity and the CPI-to-PPI ratio leads to a depreciation of the tradable price-deflated real exchange rate. Connected with the result of the test with the CPI-based real exchange rate, a possible explanation for this finding is that higher productivity in industry eventually leads to an increase in the relative price of non-tradables (e.g. via the Balassa-Samuelson effect). However, as long as this primarily implies higher growth of the entire economy and higher import demand, a depreciation in the price of tradable goods would be required to maintain external equilibrium (Lommatzsch and Tober (2004)).

In contrast to the OECD panel, for the transition and emerging countries both average productivity and the CPI-to-PPI ratio have the same effect on the real exchange rate of the open sector as for the CPI based real exchange rate: an increase (decrease) in the productivity and relative price variables leads to an appreciation (depreciation) of the tradable price-based real exchange rate. This confirms largely the hypothesis that – at least in the catching-up process – the labour productivity variable is a proxy for increasing non-price competitiveness.

The sign of net foreign assets is in all panels the same as the one determined for the CPI-based real exchange rates: leading to appreciation in the OECD countries and depreciation in the transition countries.

**Table 6.** The PPI-based REER and the fundamentals

		OLS	DOLS_SIC	MGE_SIC	PMGE	TOT Obs
<b>OECD</b>	Coint			-0.061***	0.010***	1534
	prod	0.089***	0.013***	0.023***		
	Nfa	-0.010	-0.120***	-0.194***		
	Coint			-0.053***	0.001***	1590
	Rel	0.094***	0.234***	0.012***		
	Nfa	0.027***	-0.028	-0.217*		
<b>Emerging countries</b>	Coint			-0.056***	-0.026***	564
	prod	-0.037	-1.087***	-1.271***	-0.829***	
	Nfa	0.076***	0.219*	0.784	-0.302**	
	Coint			-0.054***	-0.005	704
	rel	-0.680***	-0.452***	-0.472***		
	Nfa	0.118***	-0.193*	-0.278		
<b>CEEC11</b>	Coint			-0.150***	-0.050***	423
	prod	-0.218***	-0.319***	-0.354***	-0.888***	
	Nfa	0.569***	0.408***	0.410***	-0.312**	
	Coint			-0.104***	0.043***	427
	Rel	-0.809***	-0.662***	-0.218		
	Nfa	0.493***	0.377***	0.387***		
<b>CEEC5</b>	Coint			-0.193***	-0.038***	197
	prod	-0.397***	-0.566***	-0.591***	-0.921***	
	Nfa	0.176***	0.043***	-0.057	-0.021	
	Coint			-0.101***	0.010	197
	Rel	-1.186***	-0.035***	-0.159*		
	Nfa	0.195***	0.399***	0.087*		
<b>ALL (including Cyprus)</b>	coint			-0.087***	0.026	2626
	prod	-0.066***	-0.364***	-0.395**		
	Nfa	0.099***	0.030***	-0.223		
	Coint	0.021		-0.068***	0.011*	2826
	rel	-0.546***	-0.156***	0.024*		
	Nfa	0.114***	0.085***	0.037		

Notes as for Table 5

#### 4.4 The extended specification: productivity, relative prices and net foreign assets

As a next step, the baseline specification including the (CPI-based) real exchange rate and two explanatory variables is extended in accordance with equation (5): the real exchange rate is regressed on labour productivity, the CPI-to-PPI ratio and net foreign assets. The results are presented in Table 7. Estimates of the baseline specifications have suggested that the CPI-to-PPI ratio may be a reasonable proxy for labour productivity, as they were found significant and had the correct negative sign. However, the size of the coefficients varies considerably. In most of the extended specifications, both productivity and the CPI-to-PPI ratio enter the regression significantly. This suggests the absence of multi-collinearity between productivity and the CPI-to-PPI ratio. In the transition countries panel they enter with the same sign, whereas they have opposite signs in the OECD panel. Thus, the two variables seem to vehicle a different set of information. Productivity can stand for higher non-price competitiveness (mainly for the transition countries), but it can also reflect the need for real depreciation with higher growth to maintain external balance (as in the OECD panel, where the sign of labour productivity in industry becomes positive conditioned on the CPI-to-PPI ratio). The CPI-to-PPI ratio may stand for the B-S effect, but it may also represent the factors enumerated earlier, such as indirect taxes or regulated prices. It should be noted that net foreign assets are robust, especially for the transition economies, to the simultaneous inclusion of productivity and relative prices.

**Table 7. Extended specification, RERCPI, 1975-2002**

		OLS	DOLS_SIC	MGE_SIC	PMGE	TOT Obs
<b>OECD</b>	Coint			-0.070***	0.016***	1534
	prod	0.077***	0.016***	0.064		
	Rel	-0.969***	-0.803***	-0.610***		
	Nfa	-0.006	-0.020*	-0.124*		
<b>Emerging</b>	Coint			-0.074***	-0.040***	564
	prod	0.051	-1.168***	-1.560	-0.541***	
	Rel	-1.690***	-1.365***	-1.144***	-0.082	
	Nfa	0.154***	-0.257	-0.574	-0.255***	
<b>CEEC11</b>	Coint			-0.112***	-0.051***	423
	prod	-0.110*	-0.486***	-0.007*	-1.099***	
	Rel	-1.843***	-1.652***	-0.904	0.887*	
	Nfa	0.422***	0.190***	0.046***	-0.186	
<b>CEEC5</b>	coint			-0.173***	-0.027***	197
	prod	-0.256***	-0.454***	-0.306***	-1.341***	
	rel	-1.732***	-0.479***	-0.983***	0.181	
	Nfa	0.117***	0.226***	0.030	-0.022	
<b>ALL (including Cyprus)</b>	Coint			-0.083***	0.031	
	Prod	-0.016	-0.439***	-0.348		
	rel	-1.466***	-1.153***	-0.780***		
	Nfa	0.119***	0.007***	-0.177		

Notes as for Table 5

#### 4.5 In-Sample vs. Out-of-Sample Panel Estimates: Constant term or Parameter Values?

In a recent paper, Maeso-Fernandez et al. (2004) argue that in-sample panel estimates are biased if the real exchange rate is undervalued at the beginning of the sample period.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Maezo-Fernandez et al. (2004) regress the real exchange rate on productivity, openness and government expenditures.

Therefore, they propose to compute out-of-sample measures of the equilibrium real exchange rate for accession countries. Estimates are run on a benchmark panel, which does not include the countries which are suspected to have undervalued real exchange rates at the beginning of the period. Parameter estimates are then applied to these countries (hence, it is an out-of-sample measure of the real exchange rate).

One obvious difficulty with such an approach relates to the computation of constant terms for the missing countries, as country fixed effects are not observable for the out-of-sample countries.<sup>18</sup> There is another difficulty however, which is evidenced by the sensitiveness of parameter values to the composition of the geographical sample. Depending on the countries included in the sample, our results show that estimated coefficients can change dramatically. At least on the basis of the stock-flow approach, this result strongly questions the economic meaning of equilibrium exchange rate measures, which rest only on out-of-sample estimates. Indeed, while out-of-sample estimates mirror long-term behaviour – and can be difficult to interpret in policy terms –, in-sample estimates may reflect medium-term developments and therefore trace the equilibrium development more appropriately for policy purposes,.

Therefore, out-of-sample estimates alone do not allow to assess the degree of misalignment of a currency in a context of strong heterogeneity, because fixed-effect estimates strongly rely on the homogeneity of parameters hypothesis. When this is not the case, in-sample estimates are useful to assess whether the observed long-run misalignment is compensated by a medium-run equilibrium, or whether it is both a long-run and medium-term misalignment.

## 5 Conclusion

In this study, we used the stock-flow approach to the equilibrium exchange rate proposed by Alberola et al. (1999, 2002) to determine long-term factors driving the real exchange rate and compare results from in-sample and out-of-sample estimates. We also follow Aglietta et al. (1997) by taking into account the impact of non-price competitiveness on real equilibrium exchange rate developments. A number of conclusions arise from our empirical analysis.

Firstly, we show that the normally positive relationship between net foreign asset accumulation and real exchange rate appreciation is not a general feature of small open economies. A number of papers had already shown that a decrease in net foreign assets yields an appreciation of the real exchange rate in transition economies. Using panel cointegration techniques, and splitting our sample into smaller and more homogeneous sub-samples, we show that an improving net foreign asset position does correspond to a real exchange rate appreciation for a group of small and open OECD countries. By contrast, a decrease in net foreign assets is found to be systematically linked to a real appreciation of the exchange rate for different groups of transition economies.

We suggest that the systematically different sign of net foreign assets may be related to the time period studied, i.e. the distinction between the medium run and the long run. The 30-year period for the OECD countries may be viewed as the long term, whereas the slightly more than 10-year period for the transition economies can be considered as the medium run, i.e. convergence towards a long-term level. According to the model, in the long run, net foreign assets are assumed to have reached their desired level. Therefore, an increase in net foreign assets implies an appreciation of the real exchange rate because higher net foreign assets mean higher flows of income. However, the medium run is characterised by the adjustment of net foreign assets to their desired level. If countries desire a negative stock of

---

<sup>18</sup> Maeso-Fernandez et al. propose to estimate the missing fixed effects by using either (1) the average of constant terms of the sample, (2) the average constant of the converging euro area countries, such as Greece, Portugal and Spain, or (3) the lowest constant term of the euro area countries. Although they do not report estimated constant terms, because their estimates are based on relative price levels (and not, as in this paper, on relative price indices) the results of Maeso-Fernandez et al. cannot be, in principle, directly compared to our results.

net foreign assets (which seems to be the case in the transition economies), they run current account deficits and record a real appreciation of the exchange rate.

Secondly, the sources of CPI-based real exchange rate appreciation differ between groups of countries. In OECD countries, productivity gains feed into the real exchange rate mainly via the B-S effect. In transition economies, they also lead to an appreciation of the tradable price-deflated real exchange rate.

Thirdly, our results indicate that the CPI-to-PPI ratio is an imperfect proxy for relative prices when measuring the B-S effect because this ratio not only reflects the relative price of market-based non-tradable goods but also a number of other factors. Moreover, it is not appropriate to use the CPI-to-PPI ratio (and relative prices in general) as a proxy for relative productivity in transition economies because it cannot fully convey the effect of productivity gains to the real exchange rate, i.e. the appreciation of the real exchange rate of the open sector.

Finally, we show that sizeable differences exist between in-sample (transition economies and all countries put together) and out-of-sample (OECD countries), as regards the signs and the size of estimated coefficients. This suggests that both measures offer complementary information as far as measuring real exchange rate misalignments is concerned: equilibrium rates derived from the panel of OECD countries give an insight on the long run for the transition economies, but may be less easily interpreted for policy purposes.

## References

- Aglietta, M., C. Baulant and V. Coudert. 1997. Why the euro will be strong: an approach based on equilibrium exchange rates, *CEPII document de travail* No. 18. Paris.
- Alberola, E. 2003. Real Convergence, External Disequilibria and Equilibrium Exchange Rates in EU Acceding Countries. *Banco de España*. mimeo.
- Alberola, E., S. G. Cervero, H. Lopez and A. Ubide. 1999. Global Equilibrium Exchange Rates: Euro, Dollar, "Ins," "Outs," and Other Major Currencies in a Panel Cointegration Framework. *IMF Working Paper* No. 175.
- Alberola, E., S. G. Cervero, H. Lopez and A. Ubide. 2002. Quo vadis Euro? *The European Journal of Finance*. 8. pp. 352-370.
- Alonso-Gamo, P., S. Fabrizio, V. Kramarenko and Q. Wang. 2002. Lithuania: History and Future of the Currency Board Arrangement. *IMF Working Paper* No. 127.
- Backé, P., J. Fidrmuc, T. Reininger and F. Schardax. 2003. Price dynamics in Central and Eastern European EU Accession Countries. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade* 39(3). 42–78.
- Bitans, M. and I. Tillers. 2003. Estimates of Equilibrium Exchange Rate in Latvia. Latvijas Banka. Analysis of the Real Exchange Rate in Latvia: 1994–2001. *Bank of Latvia*. mimeo.
- Burgess, R., Fabrizio, S. and Y. Xiao. 2003. Competitiveness in the Baltics in the Run-Up to EU Accession. *IMF Country Report* No. 114.
- Bénassy-Quéré, A., Duran-Vigneron, P., Mignon, V. and A. Lahrière-Révil. 2004. Distributing Key Currency Adjustment: A G-200 Panel Cointegration Approach. *CEPII*, Mimeo.
- Clark, P. and R. MacDonald. 1998. Exchange Rates and Economic Fundamentals: A Methodological Comparison of BEERs and FEERs. *IMF Working Paper* No. 67.
- Coricelli, F. and B. Jazbec. 2001. Real Exchange Rate Dynamics in Transition Economies. CEPR Discussion Papers Series No. 2869.
- Csajbók, A. 2003. The Equilibrium Real Exchange Rate in Hungary: Results from Alternative Approaches. Paper presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Workshop on Macroeconomic Policy Research. National Bank of Hungary. October 2–3.

- Darvas, Zs. 2001. Exchange Rate Pass-Through and Real Exchange Rate in EU Candidate Countries. *Economic Research Centre of the Deutsche Bundesbank Discussion Paper No. 10*.
- Detken, C., A. Dieppe, J. Henry, C. Marin and F. Smets. 2002. Model Uncertainty and the Equilibrium Value of the Real Effective Euro Exchange Rate. *ECB Working Paper No. 160*.
- Égert, B. 2002. Investigating the Balassa-Samuelson Hypothesis in the Transition: Do We Understand What We See? A Panel Study. *Economics of Transition* 10(2). 273–309.
- Égert, B. 2003. Assessing equilibrium exchange rates in CEE acceding countries: Can We Have DEER with BEER Without FEER? A critical survey of the literature. Oesterreichische Nationalbank. *Focus on Transition* No. 2. pp. 38-106.
- Égert, B. and K. Lommatzsch. 2003. Equilibrium Exchange Rates in Acceding Countries: How Large Is Our Confidence (Interval)? Oesterreichische Nationalbank. *Focus on Transition* No. 2.
- Égert, B., T. Gruber and T. Reininger. 2003. Challenges for EU Acceding Countries' Exchange Rate Strategies after EU Accession and Asymmetric Application of the Exchange Rate Criterion. Oesterreichische Nationalbank. *Focus on Transition*. 2003 No. 2.
- Faruqee, H. 1995. Long-Run Determinants of the Real Exchange Rate: A Stock-Flow Perspective. *IMF Staff Papers*. 42(1). pp. 80-107.
- Frenkel, J.A and M. L. Mussa. 1985. Asset Markets, Exchange Rates and the Balance of Payments. In R. W. Jones and P.B. Kenen (eds). *Handbook of International Economics*. 2. North-Holland. Amsterdam. pp. 679-747.
- Halpern, L. and Ch. Wyplosz. 2001. Economic Transformation and Real Exchange Rates in the 2000s: The Balassa-Samuelson Connection. *UNO Economic Survey of Europe*. 227–239.
- Hinnosar, M., R. Juks, H. Kaadu and L. Uusküla. 2003. Estimating the Equilibrium Exchange Rate of the Estonian Kroon. *Bank of Estonia*. mimeo.
- Im, K. S., M. H. Pesaran and Y. Shin. 2003. Testing for unit roots in heterogeneous panels. *Journal of Econometrics*. 115(1). pp. 53–74.
- Krugman, P. 1989. Differences in Income Elasticities and Trends in Real Exchange Rates. *European Economic Review*. 33. pp. 1031-1054.
- Lane, Ph. And G. M. Milesi-Ferretti. 2002. External Wealth, the Trade Balance and the Real Exchange Rate. *CEPR Discussion Paper No. 3153*.
- Lommatzsch, K. and S. Tober. 2002. What Is behind the Real Appreciation of the Accession Countries' Currencies? An Investigation of the PPI-Based Real Exchange Rate. Presented at "Exchange Rate Strategies during the EU Enlargement." Budapest. 27 – 30 November.
- Lommatzsch, K. and S. Tober. 2004. The inflation target of the ECB: Does the Balassa-Samuelson effect matter? *DIW-Berlin*. mimeo.
- MacDonald, R. 1997. What Determines Real Exchange Rates? The Long and Short of It. *IMF Working Paper No. 21*.
- MacDonald, R. and C. Wójcik. 2002. Catching Up: The Role of Demand and Supply Side Effects on the Real Exchange Rate of Accession Countries. Oesterreichische Nationalbank. *Focus on Transition* No. 2. pp. 38–57.
- Maeso-Fernandez, F., Ch. Osbat and B. Schnatz. 2004. Towards the Estimation of Equilibrium Exchange Rates for CEE Acceding Countries: Methodological Issues and a Panel Cointegration Perspective. *ECB Working Paper No. 353*.
- Mihaljek, D. and M. Klau. 2003. The Balassa-Samuelson Effect in Central Europe: A Disaggregated Analysis. *BIS Working Paper 143*. Basel and *Comparative Economic Studies* (forthcoming).
- Pedroni, P. 1999. Critical Values for Cointegration Tests in Heterogeneous Panels with Multiple Regressors. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*. 61. Supplement 1. pp. 653-670.

Pesaran, M. H., Y. Shin and R. J. Smith. 2001. Bounds testing approaches to the analysis of level relationships. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*. 16(3). pp 289–326.

Rawdanowicz, Ł. W. 2003. Poland's Accession to EMU: Choosing the Exchange Rate Parity. CASE Studies&Analyses 247. December 2002, and forthcoming in: De Souza, L.V. and B. Van Aarle (eds.). *The Euro Area and the New EU Member States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rahn, J. 2003. Bilateral Equilibrium Exchange Rates of the EU Accession Countries Against the Euro. *BOFIT Discussion Paper* No. 11.

Rubaszek, M. 2003. A Model of Balance of Payments Equilibrium Exchange Rate: Application to the Zloty. *National Bank of Poland*. mimeo.

## APPENDIX 1.

### Data sources and definition

#### Real exchange rate

The real exchange rate compares domestic price indices to foreign ones, in the same currency. The bilateral real exchange rate is computed as follows:  $Q = EP^*/P$ , where E is the nominal exchange rate (source: IMF, *International Financial Statistics*, line 00rf), P and P\* are respectively the domestic and foreign price index (source: IMF, *International Financial Statistics*, line 64). The series are normalised to 1993 (1993=100)

The real exchange rate is computed in effective terms:  $REER = \alpha_{i/US}Q_{i/S} + \alpha_{i/UE}Q_{i/DM}$ ,

$$\text{where } \alpha_{i/US} = \frac{X_{i/US} + M_{i/US}}{(X_{i/US} + M_{i/US}) + (X_{i/UE} + M_{i/UE})} \text{ and } \alpha_{i/UE} = \frac{X_{i/UE} + M_{i/UE}}{(X_{i/US} + M_{i/US}) + (X_{i/UE} + M_{i/UE})}.$$

X and M are average bilateral exports and imports, taken from IMF *Direction of Trade Statistics*, and computed over 1990-2000.

#### Productivity

Industrial productivity is computed using the IFS, OECD MEI and UNIDO database, reformatted by Cepii using INDSTAT2002 ISIC REV3, a UNO database of industrial production. We use

- Industrial production
- Industry employment

Industrial productivity is computed for each country *i* of the sample as well as for the US and Germany. Relative industrial productivity is therefore the ratio of country *i*'s industrial productivity to the trade-weighted average of the US and Germany's industrial productivity

#### Net foreign assets

Net foreign assets data were computed by cumulating current account balances to NFA data (using IMF, *Balance of Payment Statistics*, line 78ald). Data are in dollars, and were normalised by national GDPs in the same currency (IMF, *International Financial Statistics*, line 99 and line 00rf).

## APPENDIX 2.

**Table 1.** Constants from the specification  $RERCPI=f(\text{PROD},\text{NFA})$ , 1975-2002

RERCPI2	prod,nfa														
	_at	_be	_nl	_fi	_gr	_ie	_pt	_es	_dk	_se	_ca	_au	_nz	_sa	_co
DOLS	-0.032	-0.018	-0.073	-0.191	0.023	0.012	-0.010	-0.009	-0.040	-0.088	-0.102	-0.303	-0.226	0.125	-0.014
DOLS_AI	-0.032	-0.018	-0.071	-0.187	0.023	0.012	-0.010	-0.003	-0.040	-0.090	-0.101	-0.309	-0.230	0.121	-0.014

C															
DOLS_SI	-0.031	-0.018	-0.070	-0.186	0.023	0.011	-0.004	-0.003	-0.043	-0.090	-0.101	-0.309	-0.237	0.121	-0.010
C															
MGE	-0.029	-0.013	-0.066	-0.158	-0.024	-0.084	0.010	-0.090	-0.035	-0.059	-0.249	-0.319	-0.125	0.213	0.039
MGE_AIC	-0.029	-0.015	-0.066	-0.158	-0.023	-0.064	-0.003	-0.109	-0.042	-0.059	-0.249	-0.319	-0.125	0.213	0.039
MGE_SIC	-0.029	-0.015	-0.066	-0.158	-0.023	-0.064	-0.003	-0.109	-0.042	-0.059	-0.249	-0.319	-0.125	0.224	0.039
	<b>_cz</b>	<b>_hu</b>	<b>_pl</b>	<b>_si</b>	<b>_sk</b>	<b>_ee</b>	<b>_lv</b>	<b>_lt</b>	<b>_cy</b>						
DOLS	-0.070	-0.047	-0.080	-0.089	-0.053	-0.209	-0.522	-0.736	-0.030						
DOLS_AI	-0.070	-0.006	-0.079	-0.089	-0.050	-0.289	-0.522	-0.736	-0.038						
C															
DOLS_SI	-0.070	-0.013	-0.079	-0.089	-0.050	-0.289	-0.522	-0.736	-0.039						
C															
MGE	-0.101	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-						
		0.048	0.072	0.098	0.081	0.992	0.927	3.529	0.127						
MGE_AIC	-0.101	-0.048	-0.090	-0.098	-0.069	-0.992	-0.927	-2.794	-0.127						
MGE_SIC	-0.101	-0.074	-0.090	-0.098	-0.069	-1.118	-0.927	-2.794	-0.127						

APPENDIX 3. Detailed estimation results

**Table 1.** The CPI-based REER and the fundamentals

	OLS	DOLS	DOLS_AI C	DOLS_SI C	MGE	MGE_AI C	MGE_SI C	PMGE	PMGE_u n	TOT Obs
<b>OECD</b>										
CoInt					-0.043***	-0.041***	-0.042***	0.003***	0.018	1554
<b>prod</b>	-0.021	-0.165***	-0.166***	-0.160***	0.083	-0.140	0.124			
<b>Nfa</b>	-0.027***	-0.076***	-0.075***	-0.074***	-0.224***	-0.236***	-0.235***			
CoInt					-0.054***	-0.051***	-0.052***	0.000***	-0.022***	1590
<b>rel</b>	-0.904***	-0.745***	-0.760***	-0.763***	-1.132***	-1.214***	-0.744***		-0.667***	
<b>nfa</b>	0.030***	0.037	0.035	0.035	-0.495	-0.513*	-0.088		-0.018	
<b>Emerging countries</b>										
coInt					-0.034***	-0.036***	-0.033***	-0.018*	-0.015	564
<b>prod</b>	-0.166***	-1.481***	-1.486***	-1.217***	-1.841***	-1.769***	-1.858*	-1.040*		
<b>Nfa</b>	-0.034	-0.359	-0.361	-0.340	-0.078	0.049	0.063	-0.552***		
CoInt					-0.054***	-0.054***	-0.054***	-0.005	-0.018***	704
<b>rel</b>	-1.672***	-1.443***	-1.450***	-1.449***	-1.479***	-1.479***	-1.479***		-1.732***	
<b>nfa</b>	0.119***	-0.205	-0.209	-0.192	-0.276	-0.276	-0.276		-0.072	
<b>CEEC11</b>										
CoInt					-0.138***	-0.148***	-0.148***	-0.071***	-0.028**	423
<b>prod</b>	-0.344***	-0.455***	-0.471***	-0.437***	-0.045*	-0.017***	-0.024***	-0.673***	-0.681**	
<b>Nfa</b>	0.742***	0.627***	0.631***	0.569***	0.343***	0.379***	0.540***	-0.141	0.114	
CoInt					-0.103***	-0.086***	-0.088***	0.043	-0.027	427
<b>Rel</b>	-1.809***	-1.479***	-1.656***	-1.663***	-1.161***	-0.476***	-0.510***			
<b>Nfa</b>	0.493***	0.437***	0.374***	0.376***	0.202***	0.294***	0.243***			
<b>CEEC8</b>										
coInt					-0.130***	-0.145***	-0.143***	-0.103***	-0.031***	308
<b>prod</b>	-0.191***	-0.417***	-0.431***	-0.430***	-0.289*	-0.183***	-0.133***	-0.668***	-0.639***	
<b>Nfa</b>	0.905***	0.535***	0.541***	0.544***	0.119*	0.158*	0.131	0.037	0.038	
CoInt					-0.101***	-0.085***	-0.088***	-0.098	-0.056***	308
<b>rel</b>	-2.279***	-2.042***	-2.009***	-2.035***	-1.676***	-1.310***	-1.355***		-1.608***	
<b>Nfa</b>	0.404***	0.274***	0.265***	0.266***	0.077*	0.174	0.104		0.158	
<b>CEEC5</b>										
coInt					-0.174***	-0.199***	-0.197***	-0.019***	-0.027**	197
<b>prod</b>	-0.589***	-0.780***	-0.736***	-0.736***	-0.760***	-0.824***	-0.790***	-1.506***	-0.732**	
<b>Nfa</b>	0.256***	0.121***	0.172***	0.176***	0.150**	0.115	0.156	-0.152	0.105	
CoInt					-0.100***	-0.086***	-0.089***	0.010	-0.014	197
<b>Rel</b>	-2.185***	-0.949***	-0.994***	-1.036***	-1.046**	-1.128***	-1.216***			
<b>Nfa</b>	0.195***	0.423***	0.397***	0.398***	0.124***	0.246*	0.125			
<b>ALL (including Cyprus)</b>										
coInt					-0.070***	-0.073***	-0.073***	0.027**		2646
<b>prod</b>	-0.196***	-0.570***	-0.573***	-0.498***	-0.394*	-0.450***	-0.465***			
<b>Nfa</b>	0.064***	0.084***	0.086***	0.071***	0.103	0.026	0.080			
CoInt					-0.068***	-0.062***	-0.063***	-0.011		2826
<b>rel</b>	-1.541***	-1.090***	-1.153***	-1.156***	-1.169***	-0.979***	-0.788***			
<b>Nfa</b>	0.117***	0.105***	0.084***	0.088***	0.215	-0.193	-0.027			

Notes: DOLS, DOLS\_AI, and DOLS\_SIC are the DOLS estimates obtained on the basis of fixed lags and leads, and the ones chosen using the Akaike and Schwarz information criterion. The same applies to the mean group estimators (MGE, MGE\_AI, MGE\_SIC). \*, \*\*, and \*\*\* denote respectively statistical significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels. In the row "coInt" under MGE, MGE\_AI, MGE\_SIC, PMGE and PMGE\_unr are shown the error correction terms.

**Table 2. The PPI-based REER and the fundamentals**

	OLS	DOLS	DOLS_AI C	DOLS_SI C	MGE	MGE_AIC	MGE_SI C	PMGE	PMGE_u n	TOT Obs
<b>OECD</b>										
Coint					-0.063***	-0.061***	-0.061***	0.010***	0.024***	1534
<b>prod</b>	0.089***	0.015***	0.021***	0.013***	0.013***	0.043***	0.023***			
<b>Nfa</b>	-0.010	-0.124***	-0.125***	-0.120***	-0.203***	-0.207***	-0.194***			
Coint					-0.054***	-0.052***	-0.053***	0.001***	0.022*	1590
<b>Rel</b>	0.094***	0.253***	0.239***	0.234***	0.057***	0.541***	0.012***			
<b>Nfa</b>	0.027***	-0.030	-0.028	-0.028	-0.226	-0.771**	-0.217*			
<b>Emerging countries</b>										
Coint					-0.056***	-0.057***	-0.056***	-0.026***	-0.026	564
<b>prod</b>	-0.037	-1.159***	-1.121***	-1.087***	-1.182***	-1.267***	-1.271***	-0.829***		
<b>Nfa</b>	0.076***	0.257**	0.239**	0.219*	0.950	0.783	0.784	-0.302**		
Coint					-0.054***	-0.054***	-0.054***	-0.005	-0.018***	704
<b>rel</b>	-0.680***	-0.446***	-0.453***	-0.452***	-0.472***	-0.472***	-0.472***		-0.736***	
<b>Nfa</b>	0.118***	-0.206	-0.210	-0.193*	-0.278	-0.278	-0.278		-0.073	
<b>CEEC11</b>										
Coint					-0.138***	-0.151***	-0.150***	-0.050***	-0.026**	423
<b>prod</b>	-0.218***	-0.350***	-0.358***	-0.319***	-0.028***	-0.373***	-0.354***	-0.888***	-0.594**	
<b>Nfa</b>	0.569***	0.456***	0.460***	0.408***	0.300***	0.258**	0.410***	-0.312**	0.140	
Coint					-0.102***	-0.102***	-0.104***	0.043***	0.027	427
<b>Rel</b>	-0.809***	-0.478***	-0.656***	-0.662***	-0.007	-0.056	-0.218			
<b>Nfa</b>	0.493***	0.438***	0.375***	0.377***	0.092***	0.180***	0.387***			
<b>CEEC8</b>										
coint					-0.133***	-0.148***	-0.146***	-0.096***	-0.039**	308
<b>prod</b>	-0.115*	-0.262***	-0.274***	-0.257***	-0.306***	-0.188***	-0.140***	-0.452***	-0.380**	
<b>Nfa</b>	0.682***	0.288***	0.294***	0.323***	0.204	0.138	0.117	0.065	0.210	
Coint					-0.102***	-0.101***	-0.104***	0.097*	-0.056	308
<b>rel</b>	-1.279***	-1.042***	-1.008***	-1.034***	-0.460***	-0.527**	-0.497**			
<b>Nfa</b>	0.405***	0.274***	0.266***	0.267***	0.069	0.053	0.061			
<b>CEEC5</b>										
Coint					-0.175***	-0.198***	-0.193***	-0.038***	-0.053***	197
<b>prod</b>	-0.397***	-0.641***	-0.599***	-0.566***	-0.555***	-0.621***	-0.591***	-0.921***	-0.487***	
<b>Nfa</b>	0.176***	0.140***	0.093***	0.043***	0.036	-0.075	-0.057	-0.021	0.126	
Coint					-0.104***	-0.096***	-0.101***	0.010	-0.014	197
<b>Rel</b>	-1.186***	-0.052***	-0.007***	-0.035***	-0.201	-0.206	-0.159*			
<b>Nfa</b>	0.195***	0.424***	0.398***	0.399***	0.088**	0.074*	0.087*			
<b>ALL (including Cyprus)</b>										
coint					-0.084***	-0.087***	-0.087***	0.026		2626
<b>prod</b>	-0.066***	-0.392***	-0.381***	-0.364***	-0.271*	-0.409***	-0.395**			
<b>Nfa</b>	0.099***	0.035***	0.039***	0.030***	-0.257	-0.169	-0.223			
Coint					-0.068***	-0.067***	-0.068***	0.011*		2826
<b>rel</b>	-0.546***	-0.090**	-0.152***	-0.156***	0.050*	0.299*	0.024*			
<b>Nfa</b>	0.114***	0.102***	0.081***	0.085***	0.134	0.340	0.037			

Note: As for Table 1

**Table 3. Extended specification, RERCPI, 1975-2002**

	OLS	DOLS	DOLS_AI C	DOLS_SI C	MGE	MGE_AIC	MGE_SI C	PMGE	PMGE_u n	TOT Obs
<b>OECD</b>										
Coint					-0.073***	-0.070***	-0.070***	0.016***	0.023*	1534
<b>prod</b>	0.077***	0.016***	0.011***	0.016***	0.105	0.103	0.064			
<b>Rel</b>	-0.969***	-0.811***	-0.811***	-0.803***	-0.501***	-0.584***	-0.610***			
<b>Nfa</b>	-0.006	-0.012	-0.019*	-0.020*	-0.184	-0.198**	-0.124*			
<b>Emerging</b>										
Coint					-0.074***	-0.074***	-0.074***	-0.040***	-0.033	564
<b>prod</b>	0.051	-1.264***	-1.197***	-1.168***	-2.864*	-1.737	-1.560	-0.541***		
<b>Rel</b>	-1.690***	-1.332***	-1.349***	-1.365***	-0.472***	-1.045***	-1.144***	-0.082		
<b>Nfa</b>	0.154***	-0.314	-0.295	-0.257	-1.298	-0.543	-0.574	-0.255***		
<b>CEEC11</b>										
Coint					-0.106***	-0.143***	-0.112***	-0.051***	-0.023***	423
<b>prod</b>	-0.110*	-0.514***	-0.488***	-0.486***	-0.124	-0.077***	-0.007*	-1.099***	-0.924***	
<b>Rel</b>	-1.843***	-1.502***	-1.657***	-1.652***	-1.241	-0.795**	-0.904	0.887*	1.117	
<b>Nfa</b>	0.422***	0.276***	0.179***	0.190***	0.192***	0.184***	0.046***	-0.186	0.173	
<b>CEEC8</b>										
coint					-0.105***	-0.149***	-0.114***	-0.102***	-0.039***	308
<b>prod</b>	-0.017	-0.494***	-0.487***	-0.484***	-0.396	-0.108***	-0.235	-0.654***	-0.614***	
<b>Rel</b>	-2.273***	-2.033***	-2.059***	-2.052***	-1.865	-0.972***	-1.400	-0.057	-0.601	
<b>nfa</b>	0.397***	0.041***	0.031***	0.016***	0.088	0.087	0.289	0.054	0.021	
<b>CEEC5</b>										
coint					-0.187***	-0.197***	-0.173***	-0.027***	-0.037***	197
<b>prod</b>	-0.256***	-0.475***	-0.459***	-0.454***	-0.248***	-0.389***	-0.306***	-1.341***	-0.579***	
<b>rel</b>	-1.732***	-0.485***	-0.491***	-0.479***	-1.100***	-0.863***	-0.983***	0.181	-1.042	
<b>Nfa</b>	0.117***	0.181***	0.202***	0.226***	0.138*	0.085*	0.030	-0.022	0.096	
<b>ALL (including Cyprus)</b>										
Coint					-0.082***	-0.093***	-0.083***	0.031	2626.000	
<b>Prod</b>	-0.016	-0.474***	-0.445***	-0.439***	-0.627	-0.437	-0.348			
<b>rel</b>	-1.466***	-1.103***	-1.154***	-1.153***	-0.686***	-0.703***	-0.780***			
<b>Nfa</b>	0.119***	0.010***	0.019***	0.007***	-0.322	0.156	-0.177			

Note: As for Table 1