a volume index for the output of the banking industry

a pilot study for 1987-1995



introduction

- background of the project
- former method for banking
- new method for banking
- results
- (tentative) conclusions



background of the project

- US Boskin report (quality bias, services bias, substitution bias)
- Stability and Growth Pact (real GDP and excessive deficits)
- EU-Commission Decision 1998 (A, B and C methods; input methods are C methods for market services)
- turning point inflation/deflation in a number of industries?
- 'New economics'
- internal quality project of the NA department

research program EU

targets

improvement of deflating methods harmonisation of deflating methods

 task forces:
(1998) health, education, other nonmarket services
(1999) computers and software, construction, large equipment, bank and insurance services, business services

research program CBS

- bank services
- insurance services
- health
- transport
- business services
- co-operation CBS Erasmus University Rotterdam
 - consumer durables (cars)
 - trade services (margins)



former deflation method banking sector

 input method (C method): volume change output value = volume change intermediate consumption plus volume change labour costs

- main disadvantages:
 - deflation of inputs and outputs not independent of each other
 - probably an underestimation of the volume change of output and of labour productivity

volume measures bank services new deflation method banking sector (1)

 output of bank services = interest margin (FISIM) + commissions

 deflation of commissions with deflators for comparable business services (for the time being partially with wage rates)

 breakdown of FISIM according to main activities (credit granting, savings, transfers of payments) and a further breakdown in partial activities

new deflation method banking sector (2)

- selection of appropriate (available) volume indicators for each partial activity
- 'straight forward aggregate weighting' or 'influence weighting'
- sensitivity analysis of the weighting scheme in connection with 'expert guesses'



new deflation method banking sector (3)

• example

- credit granting (0.20)
 - mortgages (0.50)
 - administration running mortgages (0.70)
 - number of mortgages (f=1) and average value of mortgages (f=0.1)
- problem: weighting scheme (expert guesses)
- sensitivity analysis: weights for the main activities!
- note: commissions (5 activities)

results for labour productivity

	old	new	diff.
1988	1.2	-0.2	-1.4
1989	0.0	3.2	+3.2
1990	-0.4	-2.9	-2.5
1991	1.2	1.6	+0.4
1992	8.0	5.2	+4.4
1993	1.7	8.1	+6.4
1994	1.7	7.4	+5.7
1995	1.6	3.1	+1.5
1996	1.5	4.0	+2.5
1997	3.1	1.6	-1.5

advantages output method

- meets standards Commission Decision 1998
- efficient use of all kinds of available data on the banking sector
- plausible description of real volume changes of output, value added and labour productivity



(tentative) conclusions

- the 'new' output method is methodologically superior to the 'old' input method and meets the standards of the 1998 Commission Decision
- efficient use of all kinds of available data on the banking sector
- the results give a better reflection of the 'real' world
- the implementation of the new method can be improved, e.g. the weighting scheme (negotiations with the Dutch banking sector on accounting data)

volume measures bank services 'straight forward aggregate weighting'

$$IndVol = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w(i).IndA(i)$$

A(i) = a volume indicator which describes aspect i of a service,
w(i) = the weight of aspect i for the determination of volume changes

 $\Sigma w(i) =$

1

'influence weighting'

 $Ind Vol = \pi_{i=1}^{n} \{1 + f(i) [Ind A(i) - 1]\}$

A(i) = a volume indicator which describes aspect i of a service

f(i) = a parameter reflecting the influence of A(i) on the volume index

$$0 \leq f(i) \leq 1$$