



OECD Economics Department Working Papers No. 475

Recent House Price
Developments: The Role of
Fundamentals

**Nathalie Girouard,
Mike Kennedy,
Paul van den Noord,
Christophe André**

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/864035447847>

Unclassified

ECO/WKP(2006)3



Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

23-Jan-2006

English - Or. English

ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT

ECO/WKP(2006)3
Unclassified

RECENT HOUSE PRICE DEVELOPMENTS: THE ROLE OF FUNDAMENTALS

ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT WORKING PAPERS No. 475

By

Nathalie Girouard, Mike Kennedy, Paul van den Noord and Christophe André

All Economics Department Working Papers are now available through OECD's Internet Web Site at
<http://www.oecd.org.eco/>

JT00197301

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

English - Or. English

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY | 4 |
| THIS HOUSE PRICE BOOM IS DIFFERENT | 6 |
| The magnitude and duration of house price cycles..... | 6 |
| The link with the overall business cycle..... | 6 |
| HOUSE PRICES AND THEIR UNDERLYING DETERMINANTS | 9 |
| Evidence from econometric models | 10 |
| Affordability of housing | 16 |
| Asset-pricing approach..... | 19 |
| Other factors affecting house prices | 22 |
| HOUSING CYCLES AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY | 28 |
| <i>Appendix</i> | 33 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 54 |

ABSTRACT/RÉSUMÉ

Recent House Price Developments: The Role of Fundamentals

In the vast majority of OECD economies, house prices in real terms have been moving up strongly since the mid-1990s. Because of the important role housing wealth has been playing during the current upswing, this paper will look more closely at what is underlying these developments for 18 OECD countries over the period from 1970 to the present, with a view to shedding some light on whether or not prices are in line with fundamentals. The paper begins by putting the most recent housing price run-ups in the context of the experiences of the past 35 years. It then examines current valuations against a range of benchmarks. It concludes with a review of the links between a possible correction of housing prices and real activity. The main highlights from this analysis are as follows: 1) The size and duration of the current real house price increases; the degree to which they have tended to move together across countries; and the extent to which they have disconnected from the business cycle are unprecedented. 2) Overvaluation of real house prices may only apply to a relatively small number of countries. However, the extent to which these prices look to be fairly valued depends largely on longer-term interest rates remaining at or close to their current low levels. 3) If house prices were to adjust downward, the historical record suggests that the drops might be large and that the process could be protracted, given the observed stickiness of nominal house prices and the current low rates of inflation.

JEL Classification: R21, R31.

Keywords: House prices, housing markets.

Le rôle des fondamentaux dans l'évolution récente des prix des logements

Dans la grande majorité des pays de l'OCDE, les prix réels des logements se sont accrus fortement depuis le milieu des années 90. Étant donné le rôle important joué par le patrimoine immobilier dans la reprise; cette étude examinera de près les facteurs ayant contribué à cette évolution afin de mieux cerner si les prix des logements depuis 1970, pour 18 pays de l'OCDE, sont justifiés par les fondamentaux. Cette étude commence par replacer les hausses les plus récentes des prix de l'immobilier résidentiel dans le contexte des évolutions observées au cours des 35 dernières années. Elle examine ensuite les prix actuels au regard d'un certain nombre d'indicateurs. Elle s'achève enfin par une analyse des liens entre un éventuel réajustement des prix des logements et l'activité réelle. Les principaux aspects de cette analyse sont les suivants: 1) L'ampleur et la durée de l'augmentation des prix réels des logements, l'homogénéité de leur évolution dans différents pays et leur découplage par rapport au cycle économique sont sans précédent. 2) La surévaluation des prix de l'immobilier n'apparaîtrait que dans un nombre relativement restreint de pays. Cela étant, pour considérer que ces prix sont justifiés, il faut, dans une large mesure supposer que les taux d'intérêt à long terme resteront pratiquement aussi bas qu'actuellement. 3) Si les prix des logements venaient à baisser, l'expérience passée conduit à penser que les baisses pourraient être plus importantes en termes réels et qu'elles pourraient être durables, compte tenu de la rigidité observée des prix des logements en termes nominaux et de la faiblesse actuelle de l'inflation.

Classification JEL : R21, R31.

Mots clés : Prix des logements, marché immobilier.

Copyright OECD, 2006

Application for permission to reproduce or translate all, or part of, this material should be made to: Head of Publications Service, OECD, 2 rue André Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France.

RECENT HOUSE PRICE DEVELOPMENTS: THE ROLE OF FUNDAMENTALS

Nathalie Girouard, Mike Kennedy, Paul van den Noord and Christophe André¹

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

1. In the vast majority of OECD economies, house prices in real terms (the ratio of actual house prices to the CPI) have been moving up strongly since the mid-1990s (Figure 1). Real house prices of the 18 OECD countries for which there is information over the period from 1970 to the present are grouped by the extent of the increases and decreases they have experienced since the mid-1990s.² Because of the important role housing wealth has been playing during the current upswing (Catte *et al.*, 2004), this paper will look more closely at what is underlying these developments, with a view to shedding some light on whether or not prices are in line with fundamentals.

2. The paper begins by putting the most recent housing price run-ups in the context of the experiences of the past 35 years. It then examines current valuations against a range of benchmarks. It concludes with a review of the links between a possible correction of housing prices and real activity. The highlights from this analysis are as follows:





- A number of elements in the current situation are unprecedented: the size and duration of the current real house price increases; the degree to which they have tended to move together across countries; and the extent to which they have disconnected from the business cycle.
- While concerns have been expressed in several quarters about high housing prices, the evidence examined here suggests that overvaluation may only apply to a relatively small number of countries. However, the extent to which these prices look to be fairly valued depends in good part on longer-term interest rates, which exert a dominant influence on mortgage interest rates, remaining at or close to their current low levels.
- If house prices were to adjust downward, possibly in response to an increase in interest rates or for other reasons,³ the historical record suggests that the drops (in real terms) might be large and that the process could be protracted, given the observed stickiness of nominal house prices and the current low rate of inflation. This would have implications for activity and monetary policy.

1. General Economic Analysis Division of the OECD Economics Department. Contact author: Nathalie Girouard (nathalie.girouard@oecd.org). They are grateful to Sebastian Barnes, Benoît Bellone, Pietro Catte, Jean-Philippe Cotis, Boris Cournède, Romain Duval, Jorgen Elmeskov, Michael Feiner, Claude Giorno, Peter Jarrett, Vincent Koen, Paul O'Brien, Robert Price and the Economics Department country desk experts for their comments and the European Central Bank, the Bank for International Settlements and Nomisma for providing valuable data. They would like to thank Anne Eggimann and Sarah Kennedy for secretarial assistance.

2. The frequency, definitions and quality of the data vary greatly across countries. Data for Korea start only in 1986. The sources for the series used are detailed in Table A1 in the Appendix.

3. See Borio and McGuire (2004) who document a tendency for house prices to fall about a year or so after equity prices have peaked and note that once prices fall, the declines tend to take on a life of their own.

Figure 1. Real house prices have generally been rising
 Nominal price deflated by the overall consumer price index



Source: See table A1 in the Appendix for house prices. OECD Main Economic Indicators for consumer price indices.

THIS HOUSE PRICE BOOM IS DIFFERENT

The magnitude and duration of house price cycles

3. Various statistical and other criteria will be used to put the current period of real house price increases into historical perspective. Based on a procedure to date house price cycles,⁴ it appears that, to the extent that there is an “average real-house-price cycle” over the period under consideration, it has lasted about ten years. The main features of the real house price cycles are detailed in Table 1. During the expansion phase of about six years, real house prices have increased on average by around 45%. In the subsequent contraction phase, which lasts around five years, the mean fall in prices has been on the order of 25%. By implication, at least since 1970, real house prices have fluctuated around an upward trend, which is generally attributed to rising demand for housing space linked to increasing *per capita* income, growing populations, supply factors such as land scarcity and restrictiveness of zoning laws, quality improvement and comparatively low productivity growth in construction. See for example Evans and Hartwich (2005) and Helbling (2005).

4. To put the current large run-ups in these prices in perspective, the characteristics of what are considered *major* real house price cycles are calculated in Table 2. To qualify as a major cycle, the appreciation had to feature a cumulative real price increase equalling or exceeding 15%. This criterion identified 37 such episodes, corresponding to about two large upswings on average per 35 years for English-speaking and Nordic countries and to 1½ for the continental European countries.⁵ In this context, the current housing price boom differs from the average of past experiences in two important respects.

- First, the size of the real price gains during the current upturn is striking. For Australia, Denmark, France, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States, the cumulative increases recorded in the recent episode have far exceeded those of previous upturns. With the exception of Finland, real house prices in the countries experiencing gains are above their previous peaks.
- Second, its duration has surpassed that of similar past episodes of large real price increases for almost all countries. It is at least twice as long in the Netherlands, Norway, Australia, Sweden and the United States.

The link with the overall business cycle

5. Comparing an aggregate real house price index with the output gap for the OECD as a whole (Figure 2), house-price and business-cycle turning points roughly coincided from 1970 to 2000, although in some upturns prices appear to have lagged OECD-wide slack. The current house price boom, however, is strikingly out of step with the business cycle.

4. In this paper, the timing of turning points is determined using the Bry and Boschan (1971) cycle-dating procedure, described by Harding (2003). Restrictions were imposed to ensure that the periods of increases and decreases had a minimum length of six quarters so as to avoid spurious cycles. Once the turning points are known, the length of each cycle can be identified.

5. Any choice of what is “a large increase” is necessarily *ad hoc*. A similar procedure to that used here, employed by Helbling (2005), identifies booms and busts episodes when a price change exceeded 15%.

Table 1. Summary statistics on real house price cycles
1970 Q1 -2005 Q1

| | Number | Average duration (quarters) | Average price change (per cent) | Maximum duration (quarters) | Maximum price change (per cent) | Number of turns > 15% |
|--------------------|--------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Upturns | | | | | | |
| United States | 3 | 17.0 | 15.3 | 23 | 17.0 | 1 |
| Japan | 2 | 34.5 | 67.0 | 54 | 77.6 | 2 |
| Germany | 3 | 21.3 | 12.1 | 27 | 15.7 | 1 |
| France | 2 | 35.5 | 32.1 | 44 | 33.0 | 2 |
| Italy | 2 | 34.5 | 81.9 | 44 | 98.0 | 2 |
| United Kingdom | 3 | 18.3 | 64.2 | 30 | 99.6 | 3 |
| Canada | 4 | 15.5 | 31.6 | 27 | 66.5 | 2 |
| Australia | 6 | 14.3 | 31.6 | 32 | 84.7 | 3 |
| Denmark | 2 | 25.0 | 44.3 | 37 | 56.5 | 2 |
| Finland | 3 | 25.7 | 61.9 | 40 | 111.8 | 3 |
| Korea ¹ | 2 | 12.5 | 29.0 | 15 | 33.5 | 2 |
| Ireland | 2 | 29.0 | 40.8 | 46 | 53.9 | 2 |
| Netherlands | 1 | 33.0 | 98.4 | 33 | 98.4 | 1 |
| New Zealand | 4 | 15.8 | 37.3 | 22 | 62.7 | 4 |
| Norway | 2 | 14.0 | 33.7 | 16 | 56.3 | 1 |
| Spain | 3 | 15.0 | 63.6 | 23 | 134.8 | 3 |
| Sweden | 2 | 19.0 | 35.8 | 22 | 42.5 | 2 |
| Switzerland | 3 | 28.3 | 40.2 | 53 | 73.5 | 2 |
| Average | 2.7 | 22.7 | 45.6 | 32.7 | 67.6 | 2.1 |
| Downturns | | | | | | |
| United States | 3 | 14.3 | -9.9 | 21 | -13.9 | 0 |
| Japan | 1 | 15.0 | -30.5 | 15 | -30.5 | 1 |
| Germany | 2 | 16.5 | -10.7 | 25 | -15.3 | 1 |
| France | 2 | 18.5 | -18.0 | 23 | -18.1 | 2 |
| Italy | 2 | 22.0 | -30.6 | 23 | -35.3 | 2 |
| United Kingdom | 3 | 16.3 | -25.0 | 25 | -33.7 | 2 |
| Canada | 4 | 13.0 | -13.5 | 17 | -20.9 | 1 |
| Australia | 5 | 10.0 | -10.1 | 19 | -14.7 | 0 |
| Denmark | 2 | 21.5 | -36.2 | 29 | -36.8 | 2 |
| Finland | 3 | 14.0 | -28.4 | 19 | -49.7 | 2 |
| Korea ¹ | 2 | 22.5 | -26.7 | 39 | -47.5 | 1 |
| Ireland | 2 | 16.0 | -15.5 | 23 | -27.1 | 1 |
| Netherlands | 1 | 29.0 | -50.4 | 29 | -50.4 | 1 |
| New Zealand | 4 | 15.0 | -15.1 | 25 | -37.8 | 1 |
| Norway | 3 | 21.3 | -19.8 | 28 | -40.6 | 1 |
| Spain | 3 | 19.3 | -21.6 | 31 | -32.2 | 2 |
| Sweden | 3 | 22.3 | -22.7 | 26 | -37.9 | 2 |
| Switzerland | 2 | 26.5 | -34.8 | 41 | -40.7 | 2 |
| Average | 2.6 | 18.5 | -23.3 | 25.4 | -32.4 | 1.3 |

Note: The minimum length for a phase (upturn or a downturn) has been set to 6 quarters and phases continuing beyond 2005 Q1 are excluded.

1. The period covered for Korea starts in 1986 Q1.


Source: OECD calculations.

Table 2. Major real house price cycles by country

| | Upturns | Duration (quarters) | Downturns | Duration (quarters) |
|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| United States | 1982Q3-1989Q4: +17.0% | 23 | | |
| | 1995Q1-2005Q2: +52.7% | 41 | | |
| Japan | 1970Q1-1973Q4: +56.5% | 15 | 1973Q4-1977Q3: -30.5% | 15 |
| | 1977Q3-1991Q1: +77.6% | 54 | 1991Q1-2005Q1: -40.7% | 56 |
| Germany | 1976Q2-1981Q2: +15.7% | 20 | 1981Q2-1987Q3: -15.3% | 25 |
| | | | 1994Q2-2004Q4: -20.5% | 42 |
| France | 1970Q1-1981Q1: +31.2% | 44 | 1981Q1-1984Q3: -18.1% | 14 |
| | 1984Q3-1991Q2: +33.0% | 27 | 1991Q2-1997Q1: -18.0% | 23 |
| | 1997Q1-2005Q1: +74.3% | 32 | | |
| Italy | 1970Q1-1981Q1: +98.0% | 44 | 1981Q1-1986Q2: -35.3% | 21 |
| | 1986Q2-1992Q3: +65.8% | 25 | 1992Q3-1998Q2: -26.0% | 23 |
| | 1998Q2-2005Q1: +49.6% | 27 | | |
| United Kingdom | 1970Q1-1973Q3: +64.9% | 14 | 1973Q3-1977Q3: -33.7% | 16 |
| | 1977Q3-1980Q1: +28.0% | 11 | | |
| | 1982Q1-1989Q3: +99.6% | 30 | 1989Q3-1995Q4: -27.8% | 25 |
| | 1995Q4-2005Q2: +137.4% | 38 | | |
| Canada | 1970Q1-1976Q4: +46.4% | 27 | 1981Q1-1985Q1: -20.9% | 16 |
| | 1985Q1-1989Q1: +66.5% | 16 | | |
| | 1998Q3-2005Q2: +39.2% | 27 | | |
| Australia | 1970Q1-1974Q1: +36.3% | 16 | | |
| | 1987:1-1989Q1: +35.9% | 8 | | |
| | 1996Q1-2004Q1: +84.7% | 32 | | |
| Denmark | 1970Q1-1979Q2: +32.1% | 37 | 1979Q2-1982Q4: -36.8% | 14 |
| | 1982Q4-1986Q1: +56.5% | 13 | 1986Q1-1993Q2: -35.6% | 29 |
| | 1993Q2-2004Q3: +93.4% | 45 | | |
| Finland | 1970Q1-1974Q2: +23.6% | 10 | 1974Q2-1979Q1: -30.3% | 19 |
| | 1979Q1-1989Q1: +111.8% | 40 | 1989Q1-1993Q2: -49.7% | 17 |
| | 1993Q2-2000Q1: +50.3% | 27 | | |
| | 2001Q3-2005Q2: +23.6% | 15 | | |
| Ireland | 1970Q1-1981Q3: +53.9% | 46 | 1981Q3-1987Q2: -27.1% | 23 |
| | 1987Q2-1990Q2: +27.7% | 12 | | |
| | 1992Q3-2005Q1: +242.7% | 50 | | |
| Korea ¹ | 1987Q3-1991Q2: +33.5% | 15 | 1991Q2-2001Q1: -47.5% | 39 |
| | 2001Q1-2003Q3: +24.5% | 10 | | |
| Netherlands | 1970Q1-1978Q2: +98.4% | 33 | 1978Q2-1985Q3: -50.4% | 29 |
| | 1985Q3-2005Q1: +183.1% | 78 | | |
| New Zealand | 1970Q1-1974Q3: +62.7% | 18 | 1974Q3-1980Q4: -37.8 | 25 |
| | 1980Q4-1984Q2: +32.5% | 14 | | |
| | 1986Q4-1989Q1: +15.1% | 9 | | |
| | 1992Q1-1997Q3: +38.9% | 22 | | |
| | 2000Q4-2005Q1: +56.0% | 17 | | |
| Norway | 1983Q4-1986Q4: +56.3% | 12 | 1986Q4-1993Q1: -40.6% | 25 |
| | 1993Q1-2005Q2: +136.3% | 49 | | |
| Spain | 1970Q1-1974Q3: +27.5% | 14 | | |
| | 1976Q2-1978Q2: +28.6% | 8 | 1978Q2-1986Q1: -32.2% | 31 |
| | 1986Q1-1991Q4: +134.8% | 23 | 1991Q4-1996Q4: -18.3% | 20 |
| | 1996Q4-2004Q4: +114.2% | 32 | | |
| Sweden | 1974Q1-1979Q3: +29.2% | 22 | 1979Q3-1986Q1: -37.9% | 26 |
| | 1986Q1-1990Q1: +42.5% | 16 | 1990Q1-1996Q2: -28.2% | 25 |
| | 1996Q2-2005Q2: +80.1% | 36 | | |
| Switzerland | 1970Q1-1973Q3: +37.7% | 14 | 1973Q3-1976Q3: -29.0% | 12 |
| | 1976Q3-1989Q4: +73.5% | 53 | 1989Q4-2000Q1: -40.7% | 41 |

1. The period covered for Korea starts in 1986 Q1.

Source: OECD calculations.

Figure 2. OECD Real house prices and the business cycle

6. The current upswing is also more generalised across OECD countries than in the past.⁶ In particular, a historically high number of countries have been experiencing fairly large increases in house prices since the mid-1990s (Figure 3). A large price increase is defined as twice the mean annual change (which amounts to 5%) over a five-year period, for a total of a 25% increase.⁷ A combination of generalised low interest rates across OECD economies, coupled with the development of new and innovative financial products, have no doubt played an important role.

7. Of the 37 large upturn phases between 1970 and the mid-1990s, 24 ended in downturns in which anywhere from one third to well over 100% of the previous gains in real terms were wiped out. This in turn had negative implications for activity, particularly consumption.


HOUSE PRICES AND THEIR UNDERLYING DETERMINANTS

8. Unique and dramatic house price increases are not necessarily evidence of overvaluation. To address this issue, it is necessary to relate these prices to their putative underlying determinants. To this end, evidence from econometric models, affordability indicators and asset-pricing approaches, respectively, is examined below, supplemented by a qualitative discussion of other factors affecting house prices.

6. Otrok and Terrones (2005) argue that global factors, including low real interest rates and global business cycles, are important determinants of house price cycles.

7. Other criteria, for instance price changes of at least one standard deviation from the mean, show a similar pattern. See for example, Ahearne *et al.* (2005).

Figure 3. Cross-country coincidence of real house price increases
 Number of countries (out of 17) with over 25% increase in real prices over the previous five years



Source: See table A1 in the Appendix.

Evidence from econometric models

9. Econometric models can be used to compute the “fundamental” price, as determined by demand (derived on the basis of factors such as real disposable income, real interest rates and demographic developments) and supply (derived from factors influencing the available housing stock). Typically, the specification of these models is a long-run (co-integration) relationship between the house price and these determinants, which is then embedded in an error-correction mechanism. The interpretation of the co-integrating relationship provides an estimate of “equilibrium” or long-term house prices, against which current prices can be evaluated.

10. The literature reviewed for this study was confined to recent research detailed in Table 3. It suggests that prices are broadly in line with what were identified as their main determinants in Denmark, Finland, France, the United States and Norway. The findings are mixed for the Netherlands. However, they uniformly point to overvaluation in the United Kingdom, Ireland and Spain.

11. The results from any econometric study, however, can be subject to a number of valid criticisms. For example, it cannot be excluded that the estimated relationship is unstable, possibly because the price elasticities of supply and demand vary over time, due for instance to changes in regulatory conditions, demographic developments and taxes that cannot be adequately taken into account. For example, Gallin (2003) and Gurkaynak (2005) stressed several drawbacks from using an econometric approach for such purposes. Ongoing structural changes in some economies also may not be captured correctly by such methods. Given the margin of uncertainty, this evidence needs to be complemented by other approaches.

Table 3. Review of recent empirical studies on house price determination

| Country and authors | Methodology | Elasticity of real house prices relative to housing stock supply | Elasticity of real house prices relative to real disposable income | Elasticity of real house prices relative to real interest rate | Other variables | Estimated overvaluation | Comments |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| United States Meen (2002) | ECM, 1981Q3-1998Q2 | -7.9 | 2.7 | -1.3 | Real wealth = 0.7 | | High growth in real house prices is not attributable to weak supply response. If the housing stock variable is removed, the income elasticity is biased downward. |
| Schnure (2005) | Panel estimation for regional house prices, short-run specification, 1978-2004 | | 0.2 to 0.3, short-run impact | -0.6 to -1.7, short-run impact | Unemployment = -0.9 to -1.2, labor force = 0.4 to 1.8, short-run impact | No evidence of overvaluation | Increased sensitivity to interest rates since 1990 due to liberalisation of mortgage lending access and higher securitisation. No. obs.:531 to 946. |
| McCarthy and Peach (2004) | Demand and supply equations, Johansen ML estimation, 1981Q1-2003Q3 | -3.2 | 3.2 | | | No overvaluation since the mid-1990s. | OFHEO and constant quality new home price index give the same conclusions. |
| Japan Nagahata <i>et al.</i> (2004) | Panel cointegration analysis for 47 prefectures, 1976-2001 | | 0.2 to 0.5 | -0.6 to -4.5 | Price expectations = 0.8 to 0.9 | Land prices in Tokyo have bottomed out around 2002 but not in other areas. | Non-performing loan ratios have a significant explanatory power in the short-run. |

Table 3. Review of recent empirical studies on house price determination (continued)

| Country | Model | Elasticity of real house prices relative to housing stock supply | Elasticity of real house prices relative to real disposable income | Elasticity of real house prices relative to real interest rate | Other Elasticities | Estimated overvaluation | Notes |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| Euro area | | | | | | | |
| Annett (2005) | ECM for eight countries | | 0.7, variable in log differences | -0.01 to -0.02, variables in log differences | Real credit = 0.2 or real money = 0.1, variables in log differences | | Real credit and money are important determinants of long-run trends. |
| Annett (2005) | Panel regressions for sub-groups of countries based on common institutional characteristics, short-to medium run equations | | 0.1 to 1.4, short-run impact | -0.01 to -0.03, short-run impact | Real credit = 0.1 to 0.2, real money = 0.4 to 0.6 short-run impact. | | Institutional factors help to explain the relationship between credit and house prices. |
| France | | | | | | | |
| Bessone <i>et al.</i> (2005) | Demand and supply equations, Johansen ML estimation, 1986-2004 | -3.6 | 8.3 | | | No evidence of overvaluation in 2004. | House prices for Paris only. |
| United Kingdom | | | | | | | |
| Meen (2002) | ECM, 1969Q3-1996Q1 | -1.9 | 2.5 | -3.5 | Real wealth = 0.4 | | High growth in real house prices is in part attributable to weak supply response. If the housing stock variable is removed, the income elasticity is biased downward. |

Table 3. Review of recent empirical studies on house price determination (continued)

| Country | Model | Elasticity of real house prices relative to housing stock supply | Elasticity of real house prices relative to real disposable income | Elasticity of real house prices relative to real interest rate | Other Elasticities | Estimated overvaluation | Notes |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| United Kingdom (continued) | | | | | | | |
| Hunt and Badia (2005) | ECM, 1972Q4-2004Q4 | | 1.9 in 1999Q4 and 1.5 in 2004Q4 | -6.0 in 99Q4 | | 34% in 1999Q4 and 60% in 2004Q2 | Improvements in monetary and fiscal policy frameworks have raised sustainable prices beyond what these linear estimation technique can capture, suggesting there is little overvaluation. |
| Australia | | | | | | | |
| Abelson <i>et al.</i> (2005) | ECM, 1975Q1-2003Q1 | -3.6 | 1.7 | -5.4 | CPI = 0.8, unemployment = -0.2, stock index = -0.1 | | The CPI captures the after-tax investment advantages (expected capital gains and tax benefits) |
| Denmark | | | | | | | |
| Wagner (2005) | ECM, 1984Q4-2005Q1 | -2.9 | 2.9 | -7.7 | Demography = 2.9 | 9/10 of the increase since 1993 is explained by fundamentals. | Scarcity of land in the Copenhagen area, temporary effect from the introduction of interest only mortgage loans could also account for the rise in house prices. |
| Finland | | | | | | | |
| Oikarinen (2005) | ECM, 1975Q1-2005Q2 | | 0.8 to 1.3 | -2.2 to -7.5 | Construction costs = 1.1 to 2.3 | No overvaluation in recent years. | Helsinki Metropolitan Area only. Uses a trend variable to capture financial liberalisation. |

Table 3. Review of recent empirical studies on house price determination (continued)

| Country | Model | Elasticity of real house prices relative to housing stock supply | Elasticity of real house prices relative to real disposable income | Elasticity of real house prices relative to real interest rate | Other Elasticities | Estimated overvaluation | Notes |
|---------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Ireland | | | | | | | |
| OECD Economic Survey (2006) | ECM, 1977Q1-2004Q4 for new and existing houses | -2.0 for new houses, -0.007 for existing houses (time trend relative to pop. 25-44) | 1.8 for new and existing houses | -1.9 for new and existing houses | | 20% since end 2004 for new houses and 10% for existing houses. | The sharp increase in the price of existing house relative to new houses since the mid-1990s may reflect in part relative supply constraints |
| McQuinn (2004) | 3 equations system: inverted demand, supply and housing stock 1980Q1-2002Q4 | -0.5 | 0.1 to 0.2 | -0.005 | Net migration = 0.02, mortgages approved = 1.0 | Little deviation from the fundamental price in recent years. | Short-run income elasticities are high in both equations. Land costs are an important factor in the recent rise in new house prices. |
| Netherlands | | | | | | | |
| OECD Economic Survey (2004) | ECM, 1970-2002 | -0.5 | 1.9 | -7.1 | | . | High growth in real house prices is mainly attributable to weak supply response. |
| Verbruggen <i>et al.</i> (2005) | ECM, 1980-2003 | -1.4 | 1.3 | -5.9 | | 10% in 2003 | |
| Hofman (2005) | ECM, 1974Q1-2003Q3 | | 1.5 | -9.42 | | No deviation from fundamentals in 2004 | Van Rooij (1999) also failed to find any long-run effects of housing supply. |
| Norway | | | | | | | |
| Jacobsen (2005) | ECM, 1990Q1-2004Q1 | -1.7 | 1.7 | -3.2 | Unemployment = 0.5 | No overvaluation in recent years. | If housing stock is excluded, income elasticity drops to 1.2. |

Table 3. Review of recent empirical studies on house price determination (continued)

| Country | Model | Elasticity of real house prices relative to housing stock supply | Elasticity of real house prices relative to real disposable income | Elasticity of real house prices relative to real interest rate | Other Elasticities | Estimated overvaluation | Notes |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Spain OECD Economic Survey (2004b) Ayuso <i>et al.</i> (2003) and Banca de Espana (2004) | ECM, 1989-2003 1978-2002 | -6.9 to -8.1 | 3.3 to 4.1 2.8 | -4.5 (in nominal terms) if the elasticity of income is 1 otherwise insignificant | Population total = 12 to 16.9 Stock market return = -0.3 | 8% to 17% in mid-2002, 14% to 19% in 2003 and 24% to 31% in 2004. | High growth in real house prices is not attributable to weak supply response. |
| Group of countries Sutton (2002) | VAR model for the US, Australia, Canada, UK, the Netherlands and Ireland, 1970s-2002Q1 | | | Short rates = -0.5 to 1.5, weaker for long-rates, with lowest estimates for the US and the UK and largest for the Netherlands. | GNP = 1 to 4 after 3 years, largest in Ireland. Share prices = 1 to 5 after 3 years, largest in the UK | Overvaluation in all countries except Canada over 1995Q1 to 2002Q2, largest in Ireland. | |
| Tsatsaronis and Zhu (2004) | VAR model for 17 countries, grouped on their mortgage finance structures, 1970-2003 | | Account for less than 10% of total variation in house prices after 5 years | Account for than 11% of total variation in house prices after 5 years | Inflation account for 50% of total variation in house prices after 5 years, while bank credit and term spread account each for around 10% | | Mortgage market structures matter for the importance of inflation sensitivity to interest rates and the strength of the bank credit channel. |
| Terrones and Otrok (2004) | Dynamic panel regressions for 18 countries, 1970-2003 | | 1.1 | -1.0 | Population growth = 0.3, housing affordability = -0.1, lagged dependent variable = 0.5 | Between 1997 to 2003, overvaluation by 10% to 20% in Australia, Ireland, Spain and the United Kingdom, by 10% or less in Sweden and the United States | The growth rate of real house prices is very persistent, shows long-run reversion to fundamentals and dependence on economic fundamentals. No. observations = 524. |

Affordability of housing

12. One summary measure commonly used to assess housing market conditions is the price-to-income ratio, a gauge of whether or not housing is within reach of the average buyer. If this ratio rises above its long-term average, it could be an indication that prices were overvalued. In that case, prospective buyers would find purchasing a home difficult, which in turn should reduce demand and lead to downward pressure on house prices. Figure 4 shows the ratio of nominal house price to *per capita* disposable income (as well as the ratio of prices to rents, to be discussed next). For almost all the countries shown, the price-to-income ratios in 2005 are substantially above their long-term averages. In the countries with the largest house price increases (Ireland, the Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom) as well as in Australia and New Zealand, these ratios exceed their long-term averages by 40% or more. In Canada, Denmark, France and the United States, the run-up has been more moderate but these values still represent historical peaks. The main exception is the sub-group of countries recording declining or more recently stable house prices (Japan, Germany, Korea and Switzerland) and Finland, where price-to-income ratios are below average values.

13. The ratio of prices to household disposable income by itself, however, is not a sufficient metric to evaluate housing affordability. Indeed, house prices do not appear to be linked to income by a stable long-run relationship (Table A2), possibly because the cost of carrying a mortgage has varied over time. In fact, aggregate disposable income is likely not the appropriate denominator. It is an average measure that covers the whole population, whereas house prices are determined in a market where specific groups of sellers and buyers have different and likely higher incomes than the population mean.


14. In Table 4, an indicator of households' mortgage interest payments is constructed based on actual mortgage debt and a typical published mortgage interest rate. These rough-and-ready measures suggest that while mortgage debt burdens have been rising, the ability to service that debt has either been relatively stable or has improved slightly in Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom since the early 1990s. Similarly benign trends have been reported in the literature for several countries.⁸ The main exceptions are Australia,⁹ the Netherlands¹⁰ and New Zealand where the proportion

8. Debelle (2004) for instance notes that there is no clear upward trend in the interest service ratio for eight countries. Central bank studies for France and the Nordic countries indicate falling household interest burdens in recent years (Bank of Finland, 2004, Danmarks Nationalbank, 2005, Norges Bank, 2005, Riksbank, 2004 and Wilhelm, 2005). Similarly, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (2005) reports a falling interest burden, and OECD (2005a) a stable interest burden for the United Kingdom.

9. The Reserve Bank of Australia also reports a rising mortgage-servicing ratio. The large increases in household debt are mostly due to a halving of the mortgage rate and the inflation rate from the 1980s to the 1990s. Other factors that have allowed households and investors to maintain higher levels of debt for longer periods than previously are innovative products following financial deregulation and increased competition among providers of credit (Macfarlane, 2003). See also Australian Bureau of Statistics (2004) and Federal Reserve Bank of Australia (2004).


10. Dutch households have strong incentives to maintain mortgages at high levels given the extremely favourable tax treatment of debt-financed owner-occupied housing. Ter Rele and van Steen (2001) have estimated that the subsidy to housing costs for owner-occupiers rises steeply with income for mortgage financing. Mortgage financing combined with a capital insurance policy is subsidised even more. With such a combination, principal repayments are paid into the insurance policy rather than deducted from the outstanding mortgage. This enables the borrower to maximise mortgage interest deductions by not paying off the debt while at the same time accumulating capital in the insurance policy to pay off the debt when the mortgage term expires. See OECD (2004) for more details.

Figure 4. Price-to-income and price-to-rent ratios
 Sample average = 100




Source: See table A1 in the Appendix for house prices, OECD Economic Outlook 78 database for income and OECD Main Economic Indicators for rents.

Figure 4. Price-to-income and price-to-rent ratios (cont.)
 Sample average = 100



Source: See table A1 in the Appendix for house prices, OECD Economic Outlook 78 database for income and OECD Main Economic Indicators for rents.

Figure 4. Price-to-income and price-to-rent ratios (cont.)
Sample average = 100



of household income required to pay the interest on mortgages has been trending upward, reflecting the increased size of mortgages.

15. Perhaps not surprisingly, taking into account the debt-servicing ratio leads to a different assessment of current house prices than do developments in the affordability ratio itself. The general increase in indebtedness, due in part to deregulation in the mortgage markets (see below), has been mostly offset by the decline in borrowing rates and on average, households do not seem to devote a greater share of their income to debt service than in the recent past.

Asset-pricing approach

16. Another summary measure used to get an indication of over or undervaluation is the price-to-rent ratio (the nominal house price index divided by the rent component of the consumer price index). This measure, which is akin to a price-to-dividend ratio in the stock market, could be interpreted as the cost of owning versus renting a house. When house prices are too high relative to rents, potential buyers find it more advantageous to rent, which should in turn exert downward pressure on house prices. During the recent upswing, this ratio has generally outstripped the affordability measure, hitting historical peaks in several countries (see Figure 4 above).¹¹ In Ireland and Spain, two countries experiencing very sharp increases in real house prices, the 2005 level of this ratio is more than 100% above its long-term average. In the other countries reporting high real house price increases and in those experiencing more moderate gains, the ratio is 25% to 50% above its long-term average. Where real house prices have been stable or falling, the price-to-rent ratio lies below its long-run average.

11. Similar results are obtained by Ayuso and Restoy (2003) for Spain, Barham (2004) for Ireland, Weeken (2004) for the United Kingdom and Gallin (2004), Himmelberg *et al.* (2005) and Quigley and Raphael (2004) for the United States.

Table 4. Households mortgage debt and interest burden

| | Mortgage debt | | | Interest payments | | | Variable interest rates |
|----------------|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------|------|-------------------------|
| | % of household disposable income | | | | | | % of all loans |
| | 1992 | 2000 | 2003 | 1992 | 2000 | 2003 | 2002 |
| United States | 58.7 | 65.0 | 77.8 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 4.5 | 33 ¹ |
| Japan | 41.6 | 54.8 | 58.4 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 1.4 | .. |
| Germany | 59.3 | 84.4 | 83.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 72 ² |
| France | 28.5 | 35.0 | 39.5 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 20 |
| Italy | 8.4 | 15.1 | 19.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 56 |
| Canada | 61.9 | 68.0 | 77.1 | 5.9 | 5.7 | 4.9 | 25 ¹ |
| United Kingdom | 79.4 | 83.1 | 104.6 | 4.4 ³ | 3.7 | 3.0 | 72 |
| Australia | 52.8 | 83.2 | 119.5 | 4.8 | 6.4 | 7.9 | 73 ¹ |
| Denmark | 118.6 | 171.2 | 188.4 | 10.6 | 9.9 | 8.3 | 15 ² |
| Finland | 56.7 | 65.3 | 71.0 | 7.1 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 97 |
| Ireland | 31.6 | 60.2 | 92.3 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 70 ² |
| Netherlands | 77.6 | 156.9 | 207.7 | 5.0 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 15 |
| New Zealand | 67.0 | 104.8 | 129.0 | 6.9 | 9.3 | 9.4 | .. |
| Spain | 22.8 | 47.8 | 67.4 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 75 |
| Sweden | 98.0 | 94.4 | 97.5 | 5.0 ⁴ | 4.2 | 3.3 | 38 ² |

Note: Interest payments are approximated using mortgage debt, mortgage interest rates and typical loan-to-value ratio.

1. 2004-05.

2. 2003.

3. 1993.

4. 1996.

Source: European Central Bank, European Mortgage Federation, Eurostat, US Federal Reserve, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (CIBC), Clayton Research / Ipsos Reid, Mortgage Choice (Australia), Reserve Bank of New Zealand and Bank of Japan.

17. Like the affordability ratio, this indicator cannot be taken at face value.¹² It has to be assessed against the evolution of the user cost of home ownership, which takes account of the financial returns associated with owner-occupied housing, as well as differences in risk, tax benefits, property taxes, depreciation and maintenance costs, and any anticipated capital gains from owning the house (Box 1). Equilibrium in the housing market occurs when the expected annual cost of owning a house equals that of renting, while overvaluation is characterised by an actual price-to-rent ratio greater than that calculated with the user cost, suggesting that it is cheaper to rent.

12. Statistical evidence reported in Table A2 of the Appendix also shows that house price-to-rent ratios, like the affordability measures, are not stationary.

Box 1. The user cost of housing

The user cost of housing is calculated following a method proposed by Poterba (1992). In particular:

$$\text{User cost of housing} = P(i^a + \tau + f - \pi) \quad (1)$$

The first component within the bracket, the after-tax nominal mortgage interest rate i^a , is the cost of foregone interest that the homeowner could have earned on an alternative investment. It is adjusted to include the offsetting benefit given by the tax deduction or credit of mortgage interest in countries where this applies (Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States). This calculation takes into account deduction ceilings or credits and the tax base against which the deduction is applied.¹ τ is the property tax rate on owner-occupied houses, f is the recurring holding costs consisting of depreciation, maintenance and the risk premium on residential property, and π , the expected capital gains (or loss). P is the house price index.

In equilibrium, the expected cost of owning a house should equal the cost of renting and this implies that the user cost can be expressed as:

$$R = P(i^a + \tau + f - \pi) \quad (2)$$

and by rearranging Equation 2,

$$\frac{P}{R} = \frac{1}{i^a + \tau + f - \pi} \quad (3)$$

Equation 3 provides a relationship between the actual price-to-rent ratio and such features of the user cost as interest rates, depreciation, taxes, etc.

Nominal mortgage interest rates are taken from national sources. Property tax rates are taken from European Central Bank (2003), International Bureau of Fiscal Documentation (1999) and Nagahata *et al.* (2005). The parameter value for f is constant at 4% and the estimation of π as a moving average of consumer price inflation following the method outlined by Poterba (1992).

1. See van den Noord (2005) for further details on the methodology and Cournède (2005) for an application to the euro area.

18. Figure 5 compares the actual price-to-rent ratio with that based on the user cost of housing over the past ten years. For all countries, the two measures have been set equal to 100 in the most recent year when the actual price-to-rent ratio crossed its 35-year average, which by construction means that the long-run average coincides with fundamentals.¹³ The difference between the two series may be considered as an

13. This crude measure of equilibrium partly adjusts for the series' non-stationarity. Another approach would have been to benchmark the series to a point when actual rents were equal to the user cost; however, the user cost series go back only to 1995. This procedure does not work well for Germany because of the significant trend decline in the price-to-rent ratio starting in the early 1980s. For Germany, the two series were therefore arbitrarily set equal to each other in 2000. Choosing an earlier date would imply a larger degree of undervaluation.

approximate indicator of overvaluation, albeit with qualifications. In particular, this measure, based on a long-run concept (the desired price-to-rent ratio), ignores expected shorter-run movements in the variables that make up the user cost, which could potentially narrow the gap between the two series.¹⁴ It also assumes that there is a high degree of arbitrage between the rental and ownership markets. One way to interpret the extent of putative overvaluation is to calculate the difference between the user cost implied by the observed price-to-rent ratio and the one that would align it to its estimated level, based on the fundamentals listed in Box 1 (Figure 5 and Table 5 and Table A3 for the detailed methodology). This difference is expressed in terms of percentage points. In interpreting this information, it is important to note that the results are sensitive to the existing level of interest rates, the choice of a base year, the choice of the house price series used and the assumed level of expected house price inflation. Finally, in some cases the series for house prices do not take account of quality improvements while the series for rents does.

- In the countries with high real house price gains (the United Kingdom, Ireland, the Netherlands and Spain) and in Australia (where very high real prices have more recently been edging down) and in Norway, actual price-to-rent ratios remain noticeably above their “fundamental” levels in 2004, suggesting overvaluation.
- In France, Canada, Denmark and Sweden, actual and “fundamental” ratios have moved in tandem until 2003, but have tended to move apart slightly since. On this score, overvaluation is not very significant in New Zealand.
- In Finland and Italy, the desired price-to-rent ratio has exceeded its actual level in recent years. In the United States, the “fundamental” price-to-rent ratio was above its actual level until 2000, the benchmark year. Since then, the series have moved together and the gap between them has been negligible. On this measure, there does not appear to be much of a case for overvaluation, at least at the national level.
- At the other end of the spectrum, undervaluation (indicated by a “fundamental” price-to-rent ratio above the actual value) has increased in Japan (since 1997), Germany (since 2000) and, to a lesser extent, in Switzerland. In Germany and Japan, this reflects previous building excesses.


Other factors affecting house prices

19. House prices can also be affected by other features that are particular to this market. Of note are restrictions on the availability of land for residential housing development that can constrain the responsiveness of supply. These would include tough zoning rules, cumbersome building regulations, slow administrative procedures, all of which would restrict the amount of developable land. However, while the price of housing may be affected, measures like the price-to-rent ratio would not necessarily be, since such factors would presumably raise both prices and rents.

20. In the United Kingdom, complex and inefficient local zoning regulations and a slow authorisation process are among the reasons for the rigidity of housing supply, underlying both the trend rise of house prices and their high variability (OECD, 2004a and 2005a and Barker, 2004). In Ireland and the

14. Short-run dynamics in housing markets can have powerful effects on house prices. Ortalo-Magné and Rady (2005) for example, using a life-cycle model, show that changes in income of credit-constrained homeowners can lead to sharp price movements, especially when homeowners are moving up the property ladder. So can inter-generational transfers of housing wealth.


Figure 5. Price-to-rent ratios: actual and fundamental
 Long-term average = 100¹



1. For each country, actual and fundamental price-to-rent ratios have been set equal to 100 in the most recent year in which the actual price-to-rent ratio was close to its 35-year average. This procedure does not work well for Germany because of the significant trend decline in the price-to-rent ratio starting in the early 1980s. Consequently, the two series have been arbitrarily set equal to each other in 2000. Choosing an earlier date does not change the results, qualitatively, although the implied degree of undervaluation would be larger.

Source: See table A3 in the Appendix.


Figure 5. Price-to-rent ratios: actual and fundamental (cont.)
 Long-term average = 100¹



1. For each country, actual and fundamental price-to-rent ratios have been set equal to 100 in the most recent year in which the actual price-to-rent ratio was close to its 35-year average.

Source: See table A3 in the Appendix.

Figure 5. Price-to-rent ratios: actual and fundamental (cont.)
 Long-term average = 100 ¹



1. For each country, actual and fundamental price-to-rent ratios have been set equal to 100 in the most recent year in which the actual price-to-rent ratio was close to its 35-year average.
 Source: See table A3 in the Appendix.

Netherlands similar factors affect house price dynamics (OECD, 2004 and 2006). In Korea, government limitations on urban land supply (Restricted Development Zone) have been important causes of the rapid rise in housing prices (Gallent and Kim, 2000, Hannah *et al.*, 1993 and OECD, 2005). Heavy land-use regulations in some US metropolitan areas have been associated with considerably lower levels of new housing construction which have restricted housing supply and thus increased house prices in the regulated municipalities as well as in neighbouring towns (Box 2).

Table 5. Sensitivity of fundamental price-to-rent ratios to a change in the housing user cost


| | Estimated over-valuation in 2004 | Change in user cost | Mortgage rate in 2004 |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| | Per cent | Percentage point | Per cent |
| United States | 1.8 | -0.2 | 5.8 |
| Japan | -20.5 | 1.2 | 2.4 |
| Germany | -25.8 | 3.3 | 5.7 |
| France | 9.3 | -0.8 | 5.0 |
| Italy | -10.9 | 0.7 | 4.6 |
| United Kingdom | 32.8 | -2.8 | 6.1 |
| Canada | 13.0 | -1.0 | 6.2 |
| Australia | 51.8 | -2.6 | 7.1 |
| Denmark | 13.1 | -3.1 | 5.2 |
| Finland | -15.6 | 0.9 | 3.4 |
| Ireland | 15.4 | -0.4 | 3.5 |
| Netherlands | 20.4 | -1.9 | 5.1 |
| New Zealand | 7.6 | -0.7 | 8.0 |
| Norway | 18.2 | -1.3 | 4.7 |
| Spain | 14.0 | -0.6 | 3.6 |
| Sweden | 8.0 | -0.7 | 5.3 |
| Switzerland | -9.7 | 1.1 | 3.2 |

Source: European Central Bank, Statistics Canada and national central banks.

Box 2. Regional housing markets in the United States

Several studies on the US regional housing markets have found that the low supply elasticity of housing units is an important factor behind the recent larger price increases in some urban markets.¹ In particular, house prices are much higher than construction costs throughout parts of the Northeast and the West coast. The studies suggest that recent regional patterns of house price expansion do not just reflect faster growing income and population, but also other factors including building regulations on the size and characteristics of houses. They also report that US homebuilders have faced increasing difficulty in obtaining regulatory approval for the construction of new homes in some states, notably California, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey and in Washington, D.C. An additional factor has been the increased ability of established residents to block new projects.

The effects of these developments have pushed up prices, in several cases by more than rents and this is an indicator of house price overheating in local US housing markets. These show that while some markets behave as the national market, other markets – such as California and Texas – have returns that are much higher or lower respectively than the national average. The local markets where price-to-rent ratios have reached historical peaks are also the ones where the supply constraint on new construction appears to be most binding, making prices there more volatile. They include the San Francisco, Boston and Los Angeles areas.




Source: Office of Federal Housing Oversight for house prices and Bureau of Labor statistics for rents.

1. Gleaser and Gyourko (2003), Glaeser *et al.* (2005), Krainer and Wei (2004), Gyourko, Mayer and Sinai (2004), Capozza *et al.* (2002), McCarthy and Peach (2004) and Mayer and Somerville (2000).

21. Demographic developments, over and above their influence through real disposable incomes can also raise housing demand, thereby increasing price levels.¹⁵ In particular, high rates of net migration, declines in the average size of households and increases in population shares of cohorts of individuals in their thirties will boost housing demand by increasing the share of the population of household formation age. In several countries (including Ireland, Spain, Australia, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Norway) the high shares of such households in the total population since the mid-1990s have been associated with large increases in real house prices (Figure 6). By contrast, in Germany and Japan, house price declines are associated with a low share of such households in the overall population. As above, these factors should affect both prices and rents, provided that there were no distortions in the rental markets.

**Figure 6. Population and house prices
1995-2004**



Note: Korea is an outlier and therefore has not been included into the estimation of the trendline.

Source: See table A1 in the Appendix for house prices, United Nations for population.

22. Other factors, however, may just raise the price of housing. Buy-to-let markets, which have grown substantially over the past several years in the countries for which data are available (United States, United Kingdom, Australia and Ireland), are one example. Lower interest rates have increased the return on rental property for investors, enhancing the attractiveness of, and demand for, housing as an investment. Fiscal incentives in some countries have also played a role by providing favourable conditions for those choosing to invest in housing. These markets are, however, dominated by small, first-time investors and their effect on the housing market is not well understood. See for example Scanlon and Whitehead (2005) for a description of the profile and intentions of buy-to-let investors in the United Kingdom.

- In Ireland, the buy-to-let market, while still representing a small share of private rental dwellings in the overall housing stock, at about 8%, has been growing. New buy-to-let mortgages constituted 20% of all mortgage transactions in 2004 and 30% of the second-hand dwellings sold during the first half of 2004 (Koeva and Moreno, 2004).

15. Several studies have looked at the impact of demographic trends on the demand for housing. See Cerny *et al.* (2005) for the United Kingdom; FitzGerald (2005) for Ireland; Kohler and Rossiter (2005) for Australia; and Krainer (2005) and Martin (2005) for the United States.

- In the United States, the proportion of sales attributable to such investors has been rising quickly starting in the late 1990s, reaching around 15% of all home purchases in 2004, much higher than the normal 5%. Such buyers are estimated to be about equally concentrated in fast-growing as well as less-active markets (Morgan Stanley, 2005).
- In the United Kingdom, buy-to-let mortgages have grown substantially since they were introduced in the late 1990s, from about 3% of total mortgage lending in 1999 to around 7% in 2004. The levelling-off in this ratio since mid-2004 has coincided with slowing house price appreciation.
- In Australia, the proportion of such investors doubled from around 15% of total mortgage lending in 1992 to about 30% at the end of 2003 and is high in some regional markets (42% in New South Wales and 35% in Victoria), fuelling concerns about such high levels of property investment and exposure to a significant downturn in the market.

23. A particularly important factor has been financial deregulation in mortgage markets, which has significantly reduced borrowing constraints on households. This process started in the 1980s and saw rapid growth of mortgage credit, starting in the second half of that decade, in several countries. Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the Nordic countries, the United Kingdom and the United States all experienced a sharp rise of mortgage lending and large run-ups in house prices in the late 1980s (Girouard and Blöndal, 2001 and Ortalo-Magné and Rady, 1999). More recent changes in mortgage markets including lending innovations, the adoption of new technologies and the growing use of payment reduction features in mortgages have offered households greater choices and lowered borrowing costs (Table 6). In several countries, variable rate loans have become more accessible in recent years.¹⁶ Some of these instruments offer options allowing households to convert their debt to a fixed rate, thus providing them with a degree of protection against rising rates. In Denmark, the Netherlands and the United States, interest-only mortgage loans have become increasingly available. In Australia, increased competition among credit providers has contributed to the doubling of the number of products provided by lenders. Most other mortgage innovations have taken the form of lengthening terms.

HOUSING CYCLES AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

24. While other housing-market specific factors have had an influence, interest rate developments are likely to play a key role. If these rates were to rise sharply over the coming period – a possibility that is currently treated as a risk in the OECD’s projections – house prices would come under downward pressure.¹⁷ In that event, the shape and duration of any subsequent downward adjustments is likely to be conditioned by the current low level of inflation. Based on the historical record, declines in real house prices, when they have followed large run-ups, have taken place more slowly (quickly) if increases in the overall price level are small (large). This is illustrated by the negative cross-country correlation observed between the level of inflation and the duration of the house-price-contraction phases, suggesting that it can be quite protracted at very low inflation rates (Figure 7, upper panel). There is also a tendency for real

16. For example, in the United States, the share of adjustable rate mortgages rose from about 15% in 2000-03 to around 33% in 2004-05 according to the Federal Housing Finance Board Monthly Interest Rate Survey.

17. Getting a handle on how much downward pressure would be exerted on house prices from an interest rate increase in isolation is difficult. Based on asset-price models, for example, the effect would be large but such calculations only suggest what would happen to the desired price. In practice, the actual adjustment path would depend also on other factors – demographics, regulation, the share of variable rate mortgages, the ability of households to change their mortgages, tax deductibility and the overall economic situation.

Table 6. **Recent mortgage product innovations in selected countries**



| | |
|----------------|---|
| United States | Interest-only loans; Flexible mortgages with variable repayments. |
| Germany | New Pfandbriefe Law abolishing penalties for early mortgage pay-offs |
| France | Variable payment mortgages; Lengthening mortgage terms. |
| United Kingdom | Flexible mortgages; Offset mortgages (savings and mortgage held in same/linked accounts, with savings offset against mortgage balance); Base rate trackers. |
| Canada | Shorter-term mortgages, initial fixed-rate period shortened from five years to one year; Skip-a-payment, early mortgage renewal and flexible payment schedules. |
| Australia | Flexible mortgages with variable repayments; Split-purpose loans (splits loan into two sub-accounts, giving tax advantages); Deposit bonds (insurance company guarantees payment of deposit at settlement); Non-conforming loans; Redraw facilities and offset accounts; New providers including mortgage originators and brokers. |
| Denmark | "Interest-adjusted" loans: interest rate set at regular intervals by sale of bonds; Capped-rate loans; BoligXloans: interest adjusted every six months with reference to ten-day average of CIBOR; Interest-only loans. |
| Finland | Lengthening mortgage terms; Introduction of state guarantee for mortgages. |
| Ireland | Lengthening mortgage terms. |
| Netherlands | Savings or equity mortgages: part of payment covers interest, part goes into fixed interest savings account or equity account (confers tax advantages); Interest-only mortgages. |

Source: Scanlon and Whitehead (2004) and Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (2005).

prices to fall less at low inflation (Figure 7, lower panel). This feature of the adjustment process stems from the fact that nominal house prices have tended to exhibit downward stickiness. Indeed, housing markets are not as liquid as other asset markets, due to high search and transactions costs as well as the heterogeneous nature of the product. In addition, when overall conditions weaken, owners of existing homes tend to withdraw from the market rather than suffer a capital loss, while builders will not develop new properties.

25. The main channels through which housing cycles affect activity are wealth effects, residential construction and the financial sector. The feed-through from house prices to private consumption occurs either via saving responses to households' perceived wealth or via collateral effects on household borrowing (Catte *et al.*, 2004). In a number of countries (Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States) changes in housing wealth have a significant effect on consumption,

Figure 7. Inflation and real house price adjustment




Source: See table A1 in the Appendix for house prices. OECD Economic Outlook 78 database for inflation.

exceeding the effect of changes in financial wealth, in part because financial markets provide easy access to mortgage financing and to financial products that facilitate house equity withdrawal. By contrast, in France, Germany, Italy, Japan and Spain, the housing wealth effect appears to be smaller or insignificant. The strength of the aggregate wealth effect also depends on several other factors including homeownership rates, transaction costs, and housing taxes and subsidies.

26. House prices also have important effects on private residential investment. Changes in the profitability of housing investment affect the construction sector as well as employment and demand in property-related sectors. Figure 8 relates housing investment to its profitability and shows a small but significant positive relationship over the 1995 to 2004 period for most countries. These results suggest that additional factors are important in determining construction activity. Specifically, supply constraints in the form of planning restrictions, the availability of land or the competitive conditions in the construction sector may have played a role in restraining the growth of housing investment.

Figure 8. Housing investment and the Q ratio
1995-2004



Note: The Q ratio is defined as nominal house prices divided by the housing investment deflator.

Source: See table A1 in the Appendix for house prices, OECD Economic Outlook 78 database for housing investment.

27. Sharp downward corrections in asset markets, including in housing markets, can impact the banking sector, which in turn may adversely affect public finances and macroeconomic stability at large (Eschenbach and Schuknecht, 2000 and Girouard and Price 2004). If financial intermediaries misjudge risks, the potential for credit and asset booms to derail and turn into busts is increased. In this context, the pro-cyclicality of bank provisioning is a concern. Banks may be reluctant to make adequate provision for their loan losses when housing markets are buoyant, and supervisors may be reluctant to suggest it without solid evidence (Dobson and Hufbauer, 2001). Hence, when a large shock occurs, banks may find themselves with inadequate cushions to absorb the loss, which could affect credit availability.

28. The range of views on how the monetary authorities should respond to asset price developments, including house prices, is broad. Some advocate central banks responding to house (or other asset) prices only to the extent that they contain information about future output growth and inflation, and, if

desired, using alternative policy instruments (taxes and regulations) to stabilise housing cycles (Bernanke, 2002).¹⁸ Others advocate that central banks should “lean against the wind” by having a tighter stance than would otherwise be warranted by overall demand conditions in the face of abnormally rapid increases in real house prices, particularly as there might be risks to financial stability (European Central Bank 2005 and Issing 2003).

29. The reaction of central bankers to house price inflation also depends on the treatment of housing costs in the inflation measure being targeted. Rents actually paid by tenants are included in the inflation measures of all countries. However, current practices vary both in the inclusion of owner-occupier's imputed rents and in the method used to calculate imputed rents. In Australia, Canada, New Zealand and Sweden, the imputed rents are calculated using some measure of house prices. In Japan and the United States, imputed rents are based on actual rents. In the Euro area and the United Kingdom, the implicit rents paid by homeowners are excluded. More generally, in the event of a downturn, the extent to which policy has to respond depends importantly on the size of the shock and the ability of the economy to absorb it.¹⁹

18. Under this view, the costs of intervention in the face of rapidly increasing real house prices is judged to outweigh the benefits, in good part because the lags in the transmission mechanism are long and variable. In this regard, a pre-emptive hike in interest rates (over and above what is judged necessary for overall price stability purposes), may well be counterproductive (*i.e.* the effects would kick in when the housing market has already peaked). Moreover, a tighter policy to prick a housing bubble (if one could safely be identified) is also considered potentially damaging for other sectors.

19. In the United States, for example, one estimate is that a reversion to the long-run price-to-rent ratio would represent a shock that is about half the size of the US stock market decline in 2000-02, and would likely be easily absorbed (Yellen, 2005). Economies that tend to be resilient to shocks are those that have flexible labour and product markets and well-functioning financial systems. These typically have potential growth rates that are higher than the average of OECD economies.

Appendix

Table A1. Definition and source for house prices

| | House price definition | Seasonal adjustment | Source |
|----------------|---|---------------------|---|
| United States | Nationwide single family house price index | No | OFHEO, 1975Q1-2005Q2 |
| Japan | Nationwide urban land price index | No | Japan Real Estate Institute, 1990S1-2005S1 |
| Germany | Index for total Germany, total resales | -- | Bundesbank, 1994-2004 |
| France | Indice de prix des logements anciens, France | No | INSEE, 1996Q1-2005Q1 |
| Italy | Media 13 area urbane numeri indice dei prezzi medi di abitazioni, usate | No | Nomisma, 1991S1-2005S1 |
| United Kingdom | Mix-adjusted house price index | No | ODPM, 1968Q2-2005Q2 |
| Canada | Multiple listing series, average price in Canadian dollars | Yes | Ministry of Finance, 1980Q1-2005Q2 |
| Australia | Index of a weighted average of 8 capital cities | No | Australia Bureau of Statistics, 1986Q2-2005Q2 |
| Denmark | Index of one-family house sold | No | Statistics Denmark, 1971Q1-2004Q3 |
| Spain | Precio medio del m ² de la vivienda, mas de un año de antigüedad | No | Banco de Espana, 1987Q1-2004Q4 |
| Finland | Housing prices in metropolitan area, debt free, price per m ² | No | Bank of Finalnd, 2000Q1-2005Q2 |
| Ireland | Second hand houses | Yes | Irish Department of Environment 1980Q1-2005Q1 |
| Korea | Nationwide house price index | No | Kookmin Bank, January 86-May 2005 |
| Netherlands | Existing dwellings | No | Nederlandsche Bank, January 76-May 2005 |
| Norway | Nationwide index for dwellings | Yes | Statistics Norway, Table 03860, 1992Q1-2005Q2 |
| New Zealand | Quotable value index for dwellings (new and existing) | No | Reserve Bank, 1979Q4-2005Q1 |
| Sweden | One and two dwelling buildings | No | Statistics Sweden, 1986Q1-2005Q2 |
| Switzerland | Single-family home | No | Swiss National Bank, 1970Q1-2005Q2 |

Note: Quarterly and/or annual data provided by the Bank for International Settlements (based on national sources) have been used in the countries for which the sample period (1970Q1 – 2005Q2) was incomplete.

Source: OECD compilation.

Table A2. Stationarity test for price-to-income and price-to-rent ratios

Augmented Dickey-Fuller unit root test

| | Price-to-income ratio | | Price-to-rent ratio | |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| | 1970Q1 - 2004Q4 | 1970Q1 - 2000Q4 | 1970Q1 - 2004Q4 | 1970Q1 - 2000Q4 |
| United States | -1.15 | -0.98 | -0.92 | -2.37 |
| Japan | -1.34 | -2.03 | -2.05 | -2.58 |
| Germany | -1.04 | -1.31 | -0.23 | -0.61 |
| France | -1.71 | -1.85 | -1.33 | -2.89** |
| Italy | -2.37 | -2.13 | .. | .. |
| United Kingdom | -2.43 | -3.51*** | -1.53 | -3.15** |
| Canada | -1.36 | -1.58 | 0.14 | -1.58 |
| Australia | 1.47 | -1.76 | -0.49 | -1.82 |
| Denmark | -1.91 | -1.94 | -1.68 | -2.08 |
| Finland | -3.20 ** | -2.97** | -1.53 | -2.13 |
| Ireland | -0.03 | -2.82* | 0.73 | -1.14 |
| Netherlands | -1.97 | -2.29 | -2.09 | -2.74* |
| New Zealand | -2.25 | -1.81 | -1.12 | -3.61*** |
| Norway | -0.39 | -2.18 | -1.41 | -1.89 |
| Spain | -0.18 | -1.55 | -0.13 | -1.36 |
| Sweden | -2.08 | -1.93 | -2.17 | -2.91** |
| Switzerland | -1.60 | -1.46 | -2.64 * | -2.70* |
| Korea | -0.97 | -0.65 | -3.32** | -1.91 |

Note: *, ** and *** indicate the stationarity at the 10%, 5% and 1% level respectively. The lag structures for the ADF equations are chosen using the Schwarz Information Criterion. The critical values are from MacKinnon (1996). For Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Korea and Norway, the sample is shorter due to data availability.

Source: OECD calculation.

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios

| Definitions and sources | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| ECB mortgage rate | Annualised agreed rate (AAR) / Narrowly defined effective rate (NDER), Credit and other institutions (MFI except MMFs and central banks) reporting sector - Loans for house purchasing, Over 5 years maturity, Total amount, Outstanding amount business coverage, Euro, Households & individual enterprises (S.14 & S.15) sector. |
| Property tax rate rates | International Bureau of Fiscal Documentation (1999), Nagahata et al. (2004), Fraser institute and OECD estimates. |
| Recurrent holding costs | Constant at 4% for all countries. |
| House price indices | See Appendix table A1. |
| Average house prices | European Mortgage Federation (2004), ERA immobilier (2005), national sources and OECD estimates. |
| After-tax mortgage rate formula | See Van den Noord (2005). |

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | United States | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| House price index (2000=100) | 71.8 | 72.7 | 74.3 | 75.6 | 77.0 | 79.1 | 81.9 | 84.8 | 89.1 | 93.6 | 100.0 | 107.9 | 134.1 | 158.8 | 186.6 |
| Average house price (P) | 100,209 | 101,444 | 103,721 | 105,519 | 107,510 | 110,426 | 114,330 | 118,338 | 124,411 | 130,621 | 139,621 | 150,687 | 187,247 | 221,773 | 260,552 |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 10.1% | 9.2% | 8.4% | 7.3% | 8.4% | 8.0% | 7.8% | 7.6% | 6.9% | 7.4% | 8.1% | 7.0% | 6.5% | 5.8% | 5.8% |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 6.1% | 5.5% | 5.0% | 4.4% | 5.0% | 4.8% | 4.7% | 4.6% | 4.2% | 4.5% | 4.8% | 4.2% | 3.9% | 3.5% | 3.5% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.5% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 4.0% | 4.4% | 4.3% | 4.1% | 3.6% | 3.1% | 2.9% | 2.7% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 2.3% | 2.4% | 2.5% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio | 11.6 | 13.1 | 13.8 | 14.7 | 12.7 | 12.3 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.2 | 11.6 | 11.3 | 12.2 | 12.3 | 13.3 | 13.4 |
| Index (2000=100) | 102.9 | 116.2 | 122.6 | 130.1 | 112.7 | 108.8 | 106.6 | 106.4 | 107.8 | 103.1 | 100.0 | 107.7 | 109.1 | 117.5 | 118.8 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio | 99.3 | 96.1 | 95.1 | 93.9 | 92.8 | 92.3 | 92.6 | 93.0 | 94.6 | 96.6 | 100.0 | 104.0 | 107.2 | 112.0 | 121.0 |

After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i - 0.4 \text{ Min}(i, 1000000 \cdot i/P)$

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | Japan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 7.6% | 7.5% | 6.1% | 5.1% | 4.2% | 3.3% | 2.6% | 2.6% | 2.6% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.4% |
| Bank of Japan - Floating interest rates - Mortgages | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 7.6% | 7.5% | 6.1% | 5.1% | 4.2% | 3.3% | 2.6% | 2.6% | 2.6% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.4% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 1.2% | 1.8% | 2.2% | 2.3% | 2.0% | 1.4% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.6% | 0.4% | 0.2% | 0.1% | -0.4% | -0.6% | -0.6% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + \pi)$ | 8.3 | 8.8 | 10.4 | 11.7 | 12.7 | 13.0 | 13.1 | 13.1 | 13.0 | 12.9 | 12.7 | 12.5 | 11.8 | 11.5 | 11.6 |
| Index (1997=100) | 63.0 | 66.7 | 79.2 | 89.4 | 96.4 | 99.4 | 100.1 | 100.0 | 98.8 | 98.6 | 96.8 | 94.9 | 89.5 | 87.7 | 88.3 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (1997=100) | 131.3 | 132.8 | 123.8 | 115.5 | 110.2 | 106.4 | 102.9 | 100.0 | 97.8 | 94.8 | 91.0 | 87.1 | 83.2 | 78.7 | 74.1 |

After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i$

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | Germany | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| Bundesbank, total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| House price index (2000=100) | 82.6 | 86.7 | 92.8 | 97.9 | 102.0 | 103.0 | 102.0 | 100.0 | 99.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 97.0 | 95.0 |
| Germany, total | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| resales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average house price (P) | 98,808 | 103,690 | 111,016 | 117,114 | 122,000 | 123,229 | 122,035 | 119,645 | 118,443 | 119,638 | 119,640 | 119,642 | 117,252 | 116,054 | 113,661 |
| Euros | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 11.0% | 11.0% | 10.6% | 8.8% | 8.8% | 8.7% | 7.7% | 7.1% | 6.6% | 6.4% | 7.6% | 6.9% | 6.8% | 5.9% | 5.7% |
| ECB ¹ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i ^a) | 10.3% | 10.4% | 10.0% | 8.3% | 8.4% | 8.3% | 7.2% | 6.7% | 6.3% | 6.0% | 7.2% | 6.6% | 6.4% | 5.6% | 5.4% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) | 1.4% | 2.1% | 3.1% | 3.7% | 3.7% | 3.5% | 3.1% | 2.5% | 1.8% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.4% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.5% |
| (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + f - \pi)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Index (2000=100) | 7.2 | 7.5 | 8.4 | 10.5 | 10.4 | 10.3 | 10.9 | 10.8 | 10.5 | 10.3 | 9.1 | 9.8 | 9.9 | 10.8 | 11.3 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (2000=100) | 78.7 | 82.6 | 91.9 | 114.5 | 113.4 | 112.5 | 119.7 | 118.0 | 114.6 | 112.5 | 100.0 | 107.4 | 107.9 | 117.9 | 123.4 |
| 127.4 126.2 122.4 117.1 115.8 112.4 107.9 103.3 101.1 101.1 101.1 100.0 99.4 95.7 93.7 91.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calculation of after-tax mortgage rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i ^c | 9.6% | 9.7% | 9.4% | 7.6% | 7.7% | 7.6% | 6.6% | 6.0% | 5.5% | 5.2% | 6.5% | 5.8% | 5.6% | 4.7% | 4.5% |
| 10-year government bond rate (r) | 8.7% | 8.5% | 7.9% | 6.5% | 6.9% | 6.9% | 6.2% | 5.7% | 4.6% | 4.5% | 5.3% | 4.8% | 4.8% | 4.1% | 4.0% |

After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i^c + (i - i^c) e^{-\delta t}$, where $i^c = i - 0.53 \text{ Min}(0.05, 2556/P)$

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | France | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| Mortgage rate (i) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 12.7% | 11.8% | 11.7% | 10.9% | 9.1% | 9.3% | 8.8% | 7.8% | 6.8% | 6.0% | 6.7% | 6.7% | 6.0% | 5.5% | 5.0% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 12.7% | 11.8% | 11.7% | 10.9% | 9.1% | 9.3% | 8.8% | 7.8% | 6.8% | 6.0% | 6.7% | 6.7% | 6.0% | 5.5% | 5.0% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.7% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3.1% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 2.9% | 2.5% | 2.2% | 2.0% | 1.7% | 1.5% | 1.2% | 1.2% | 1.1% | 1.3% | 1.6% | 1.9% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + f \cdot \pi)$ Index (2000=100) | 6.5 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.3 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 9.6 | 9.0 | 8.9 | 9.6 | 10.4 | 11.3 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (2000=100) | 113.2 | 111.6 | 104.0 | 98.8 | 95.9 | 90.9 | 88.5 | 87.3 | 87.2 | 91.8 | 100.0 | 107.4 | 113.5 | 123.3 | 138.0 |

After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i$

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | Italy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| Nomisma - Media 13 aree urbane, Numeri indice dei prezzi medi di abitazioni, Usate Euros | 79.5 | 89.2 | 94.7 | 94.9 | 92.2 | 92.9 | 89.8 | 85.7 | 87.5 | 92.4 | 100.0 | 108.2 | 118.6 | 130.8 | 143.7 |
| Average house price (P) | 67,079 | 75,213 | 79,869 | 80,046 | 77,763 | 78,360 | 75,777 | 72,279 | 73,788 | 77,901 | 84,341 | 91,257 | 100,000 | 110,278 | 121,230 |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 10.2% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 11.3% | 11.1% | 12.8% | 9.1% | 7.2% | 5.5% | 6.1% | 6.5% | 5.3% | 5.0% | 4.6% | 4.6% |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 9.2% | 9.1% | 9.1% | 10.4% | 10.2% | 11.9% | 8.2% | 6.2% | 4.6% | 5.2% | 5.7% | 4.5% | 4.3% | 4.0% | 4.1% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 5.7% | 5.8% | 5.9% | 5.8% | 5.3% | 5.1% | 4.6% | 4.0% | 3.5% | 3.0% | 2.4% | 2.2% | 2.3% | 2.4% | 2.5% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + f - \pi)$ Index (1996=100) | 13.3 | 13.6 | 13.7 | 11.5 | 11.3 | 9.2 | 13.2 | 16.0 | 19.6 | 16.0 | 13.8 | 15.8 | 16.6 | 18.0 | 18.1 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (1996=100) | 100.6 | 103.0 | 103.8 | 87.1 | 85.0 | 69.7 | 100.0 | 120.7 | 147.8 | 121.1 | 104.3 | 119.0 | 125.2 | 135.9 | 136.5 |
| After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i - \text{Min} (0.19 i, 687/P)$ | | | | | | | 100.0 | 89.4 | 86.8 | 88.7 | 93.7 | 99.1 | 106.2 | 113.9 | 121.8 |

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | United Kingdom | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| House price index (2000=100) | 64.9 | 64.0 | 61.5 | 60.4 | 62.0 | 62.4 | 64.7 | 70.4 | 78.4 | 87.0 | 100.0 | 108.1 | 125.5 | 145.3 | 162.5 |
| Average house price (P) | 72,641 | 71,606 | 68,759 | 67,576 | 69,366 | 69,830 | 72,381 | 78,733 | 87,751 | 97,294 | 111,829 | 120,939 | 140,408 | 162,499 | 181,762 |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 11.9% | 10.2% | 9.1% | 7.5% | 8.2% | 8.2% | 7.2% | 7.8% | 8.6% | 6.9% | 7.6% | 6.8% | 5.7% | 5.5% | 6.1% |
| ODPM Mix-adjusted house price index Bank of England End month weighted average interest rate, standard variable mortgage, Banks & Building Societies IUMTLMV from 1995 on. From 1990 to 1994, OECD estimates. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 10.7% | 9.2% | 8.2% | 6.7% | 7.4% | 7.4% | 6.5% | 7.0% | 7.8% | 6.2% | 6.8% | 6.1% | 5.1% | 4.9% | 5.5% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 6.0% | 6.4% | 6.4% | 5.7% | 4.6% | 3.4% | 2.7% | 2.6% | 3.0% | 2.8% | 2.7% | 2.6% | 2.3% | 2.2% | 2.5% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio Index (2000=100) | 8.5 | 10.3 | 11.3 | 12.4 | 10.3 | 9.1 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 9.6 | 9.0 | 9.5 | 10.2 | 10.3 | 9.9 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (2000=100) | 94.5 | 114.1 | 125.8 | 137.8 | 113.9 | 100.8 | 103.4 | 97.5 | 94.2 | 106.4 | 100.0 | 105.2 | 113.1 | 113.9 | 110.1 |
| | 90.8 | 87.2 | 84.2 | 88.2 | 86.3 | 79.4 | 82.9 | 83.9 | 84.4 | 97.3 | 100.0 | 108.2 | 129.3 | 144.6 | 146.3 |

After-tax mortgage rate: i^a = i - Min (0.10 i, 30000/P)

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Canada | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CANSIM, Table 176-0043: Financial market statistics, last Wednesday unless otherwise stated; | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 13.4% | 11.1% | 9.5% | 8.8% | 9.5% | 9.2% | 7.9% | 7.1% | 6.9% | 7.6% | 8.4% | 7.4% | 7.0% | 6.4% | 6.2% |
| Canada; Chartered bank - conventional mortgage: 5 year (Percent) [B14051] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 13.4% | 11.1% | 9.5% | 8.8% | 9.5% | 9.2% | 7.9% | 7.1% | 6.9% | 7.6% | 8.4% | 7.4% | 7.0% | 6.4% | 6.2% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.5% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 6.5% | 5.9% | 6.0% | 6.0% | 5.6% | 5.2% | 4.7% | 3.9% | 3.4% | 2.9% | 2.6% | 2.6% | 2.9% | 3.2% | 3.3% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + \pi)$ | 8.1 | 9.3 | 11.1 | 12.1 | 10.6 | 10.5 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 9.8 | 8.9 | 9.7 | 10.4 | 11.5 | 11.9 |
| Index (1991=100) | 86.6 | 100.0 | 119.5 | 129.4 | 113.4 | 112.9 | 122.7 | 123.6 | 118.1 | 105.2 | 95.5 | 104.3 | 111.9 | 123.1 | 127.5 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (1991=100) | 100.4 | 100.0 | 101.3 | 104.7 | 109.7 | 102.5 | 102.5 | 106.5 | 105.3 | 108.4 | 109.6 | 112.0 | 122.7 | 132.8 | 144.1 |
| After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | Australia | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| Reserve Bank of | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 16.4% | 13.4% | 10.6% | 9.4% | 9.1% | 10.5% | 9.7% | 7.2% | 6.7% | 6.6% | 7.7% | 6.8% | 6.4% | 6.6% | 7.1% |
| Australia -Housing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| loans Variable | 16.4% | 13.4% | 10.6% | 9.4% | 9.1% | 10.5% | 9.7% | 7.2% | 6.7% | 6.6% | 7.7% | 6.8% | 6.4% | 6.6% | 7.1% |
| Banks Standard | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 7.9% | 6.8% | 5.3% | 4.2% | 3.0% | 2.5% | 2.4% | 2.2% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 1.9% | 2.3% | 2.8% | 3.2% | 3.4% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio 1/(i^a+τ+f-π) | 8.0 | 9.4 | 10.7 | 10.8 | 10.0 | 8.3 | 8.8 | 11.2 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 10.2 | 11.7 | 13.3 | 13.5 | 13.1 |
| Index (1997=100) | 71.8 | 83.7 | 95.7 | 96.5 | 88.8 | 74.4 | 78.7 | 100.0 | 103.4 | 103.7 | 91.2 | 104.3 | 118.6 | 120.7 | 116.6 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (1997=100) | 96.8 | 96.1 | 96.8 | 98.8 | 101.6 | 101.2 | 99.0 | 100.0 | 104.2 | 108.8 | 114.3 | 123.3 | 142.1 | 164.7 | 176.9 |

After-tax mortgage rate: i^a = i

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Denmark | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Statistik Denmark, main indicators (monthly), residential property prices - index nsa, cash price of one-family houses sold. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| House price index (2000=100) | 54.8 | 55.6 | 54.7 | 54.2 | 60.7 | 65.4 | 72.4 | 80.7 | 88.0 | 93.9 | 100.0 | 105.8 | 109.7 | 115.3 | 128.1 |
| Average house price (P) | 74,070 | 75,031 | 73,833 | 73,169 | 82,047 | 88,293 | 97,797 | 109,008 | 118,835 | 126,848 | 135,077 | 142,926 | 148,200 | 155,758 | 173,047 |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 12.6% | 10.8% | 9.7% | 8.2% | 8.0% | 8.2% | 7.6% | 6.7% | 5.8% | 6.1% | 6.6% | 6.0% | 5.8% | 5.3% | 5.2% |
| Bank of Denmark | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 8.5% | 7.4% | 6.7% | 5.8% | 5.7% | 5.8% | 5.4% | 4.9% | 4.3% | 4.5% | 4.8% | 4.5% | 4.3% | 4.0% | 4.0% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 3.9% | 3.7% | 3.3% | 2.6% | 2.1% | 2.0% | 1.9% | 1.9% | 2.1% | 2.2% | 2.3% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.5% | 2.2% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + f - \pi)$ | 10.4 | 11.4 | 11.8 | 12.2 | 11.6 | 11.3 | 11.7 | 12.6 | 13.7 | 13.6 | 13.3 | 14.1 | 14.4 | 15.2 | 14.8 |
| Index (1997=100) | 83.1 | 90.9 | 94.3 | 97.2 | 92.5 | 89.9 | 93.3 | 100.0 | 109.2 | 108.0 | 105.9 | 112.1 | 114.8 | 121.0 | 117.4 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (1997=100) | 82.4 | 80.0 | 76.2 | 73.4 | 80.0 | 84.3 | 92.1 | 100.0 | 106.9 | 111.2 | 115.3 | 118.8 | 120.0 | 122.9 | 132.8 |

After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i - 0.385 \text{ Min}(i - 0.02, 2150000/P)$

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | Finland | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| Bank of Finland - Housing prices in metropolitan area, debt-free price per m ² | 96 | 82 | 68 | 62 | 66 | 64 | 67 | 79 | 87 | 95 | 100 | 99 | 107 | 113 | 122 |
| Average house price (P) | 77,838 | 67,024 | 55,579 | 50,745 | 53,741 | 51,785 | 54,633 | 64,185 | 70,749 | 77,079 | 81,491 | 80,835 | 86,855 | 92,403 | 99,149 |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 13.8% | 13.9% | 14.1% | 11.1% | 9.2% | 9.2% | 7.3% | 6.5% | 6.3% | 5.4% | 6.6% | 6.3% | 5.4% | 4.0% | 3.4% |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i ^a) | 12.5% | 12.4% | 12.3% | 9.1% | 7.3% | 7.2% | 5.4% | 5.0% | 4.9% | 4.1% | 5.4% | 5.1% | 4.2% | 2.9% | 2.4% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 5.0% | 5.3% | 5.0% | 4.4% | 3.3% | 2.3% | 1.5% | 1.2% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.5% | 1.9% | 2.0% | 1.8% | 1.7% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + f \cdot \pi)$ Index (1997=100) | 8.5 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 11.3 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 12.3 | 12.5 | 12.4 | 13.8 | 12.4 | 13.5 | 15.5 | 19.2 | 20.2 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (1997=100) | 67.9 | 70.1 | 69.3 | 90.1 | 98.0 | 87.1 | 98.3 | 100.0 | 99.0 | 109.8 | 98.7 | 107.9 | 123.7 | 152.9 | 161.2 |
| | 122.0 | 103.2 | 85.5 | 81.7 | 87.4 | 82.7 | 87.0 | 100.0 | 107.8 | 116.0 | 115.8 | 110.9 | 119.7 | 128.0 | 136.1 |

After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i - 0.3 \text{ Min}(i, 3364/P)$

1. See Definitions and sources.

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Ireland | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| House price index (2000=100) | 33 | 34 | 34 | 35 | 37 | 39 | 45 | 54 | 71 | 86 | 100 | 108 | 120 | 139 | 155 |
| Irish Department of the Environment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average house price (P) | 62,453 | 63,896 | 65,409 | 66,731 | 69,900 | 74,281 | 85,424 | 102,520 | 134,268 | 163,699 | 190,388 | 206,012 | 228,000 | 264,124 | 294,724 |
| Euros | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 12.1% | 11.6% | 12.2% | 9.8% | 7.4% | 7.9% | 7.0% | 7.4% | 7.4% | 5.2% | 5.4% | 5.8% | 4.8% | 4.0% | 3.5% |
| ECB ¹ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 10.0% | 9.5% | 10.2% | 7.9% | 5.9% | 6.2% | 5.6% | 6.2% | 6.4% | 4.4% | 4.8% | 5.2% | 4.3% | 3.5% | 3.1% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) | 3.3% | 3.2% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 2.7% | 2.5% | 2.2% | 1.9% | 2.1% | 2.0% | 2.6% | 3.2% | 3.8% | 4.0% | 4.2% |
| (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + f - \pi)$ | 9.4 | 9.7 | 9.1 | 11.3 | 13.9 | 13.0 | 13.6 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 15.5 | 16.2 | 16.7 | 22.6 | 29.1 | 34.2 |
| Index (1996=100) | 69.2 | 71.3 | 67.0 | 83.5 | 102.5 | 95.6 | 100.0 | 89.3 | 88.9 | 114.6 | 119.5 | 123.2 | 166.4 | 214.6 | 251.9 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio | 79.2 | 77.5 | 73.8 | 78.9 | 86.5 | 86.9 | 100.0 | 114.1 | 145.0 | 204.5 | 215.8 | 199.2 | 222.1 | 268.0 | 290.8 |
| (1996=100) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calculation of after-tax mortgage rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i ^c | 9.7% | 9.2% | 9.9% | 7.5% | 5.6% | 6.0% | 5.4% | 5.9% | 6.2% | 4.3% | 4.6% | 5.1% | 4.2% | 3.4% | 3.0% |
| i ^d | 10.2% | 9.7% | 10.3% | 8.0% | 6.0% | 6.4% | 5.7% | 6.2% | 6.5% | 4.4% | 4.8% | 5.2% | 4.3% | 3.5% | 3.1% |
| 10-year government bond rate (r) | 10.3% | 9.4% | 9.3% | 7.6% | 8.0% | 8.2% | 7.2% | 6.3% | 4.7% | 4.8% | 5.5% | 5.0% | 5.0% | 4.1% | 4.1% |

After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i^c + (i^d - i^c) e^{-5r}$, $i^c = i - 0.24 \text{ Min}(i, 6.349\%)$, $i^d = i - 0.8 \times 0.24 \text{ Min}(i, 6.349\%)$

1. See Definitions and sources.

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | Netherlands | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| Nederlandsche bank, unpublished. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| House price index (2000=100) | 39.1 | 40.1 | 43.5 | 47.1 | 51.8 | 54.5 | 59.7 | 65.8 | 72.1 | 83.3 | 100.0 | 109.7 | 116.6 | 119.5 | 124.2 |
| Residential property prices. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average house price (P) | 74,812 | 76,746 | 83,172 | 90,022 | 99,062 | 104,343 | 114,170 | 125,915 | 137,950 | 159,273 | 191,304 | 209,887 | 223,000 | 228,692 | 237,684 |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 10.2% | 10.4% | 9.9% | 8.2% | 8.2% | 8.1% | 7.0% | 6.7% | 6.2% | 5.9% | 7.0% | 6.4% | 6.3% | 5.5% | 5.1% |
| ECB ¹ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i[*]) | 4.8% | 4.9% | 4.7% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 3.5% | 3.4% | 3.2% | 3.1% | 3.6% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 2.9% | 2.8% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 0.7% | 1.3% | 2.1% | 2.5% | 2.8% | 2.7% | 2.5% | 2.3% | 2.2% | 2.1% | 2.1% | 2.6% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.6% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^* + \tau + f - \pi)$ | 11.9 | 12.7 | 14.5 | 17.2 | 18.3 | 18.0 | 18.7 | 18.4 | 18.7 | 18.7 | 17.5 | 19.8 | 21.0 | 22.7 | 22.4 |
| Index (1998=100) | 63.9 | 68.2 | 77.8 | 92.0 | 97.8 | 96.4 | 100.4 | 98.5 | 100.0 | 100.1 | 93.9 | 106.1 | 112.5 | 121.5 | 120.1 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio | 77.4 | 76.2 | 78.4 | 80.5 | 84.4 | 84.6 | 88.9 | 94.5 | 100.0 | 112.0 | 130.9 | 139.5 | 144.1 | 143.3 | 144.5 |

After-tax mortgage rate: ^{1a} $i = i - 0.6 (i - 0.0125)$

1. See Definitions and sources.

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Norway | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Norges Bank - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 13.2% | 12.8% | 12.5% | 11.5% | 8.7% | 7.8% | 7.0% | 6.3% | 7.0% | 7.0% | 7.2% | 7.5% | 7.7% | 6.3% | 4.7% |
| Mortgage companies rates (households) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 9.5% | 9.2% | 9.0% | 8.3% | 6.2% | 5.6% | 5.0% | 4.5% | 5.0% | 5.0% | 5.2% | 5.4% | 5.5% | 4.5% | 3.4% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 6.3% | 5.5% | 4.2% | 3.3% | 2.7% | 2.4% | 1.9% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.2% | 2.3% | 2.7% | 2.4% | 2.4% | 2.1% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + f - \pi)$ | 12.6 | 11.9 | 10.5 | 10.4 | 12.1 | 12.6 | 12.9 | 13.8 | 12.9 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 13.4 | 12.8 | 14.7 | 16.6 |
| Index (1997=100) | 91.1 | 85.9 | 76.0 | 75.2 | 87.8 | 91.3 | 92.9 | 100.0 | 93.3 | 95.8 | 95.7 | 96.9 | 92.5 | 106.2 | 119.8 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (1997=100) | 90.2 | 80.7 | 74.2 | 72.9 | 81.4 | 85.3 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 108.6 | 116.9 | 129.9 | 133.5 | 134.2 | 131.4 | 141.5 |

After-tax mortgage rate: i^a = i - 0.28 i

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| New Zealand | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mortgage rate (i) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reserve bank of New Zealand - Variable first mortgage housing rates | 15.1% | 12.6% | 9.8% | 8.7% | 8.4% | 10.8% | 10.9% | 9.8% | 9.4% | 6.6% | 8.4% | 7.6% | 7.6% | 7.4% | 8.0% |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 15.1% | 12.6% | 9.8% | 8.7% | 8.4% | 10.8% | 10.9% | 9.8% | 9.4% | 6.6% | 8.4% | 7.6% | 7.6% | 7.4% | 8.0% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 9.4% | 7.3% | 4.4% | 3.3% | 2.6% | 2.1% | 2.0% | 2.1% | 2.1% | 1.7% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 1.9% | 2.4% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + f - \pi)$ | 10.4 | 10.7 | 10.6 | 10.7 | 10.2 | 7.9 | 7.8 | 8.5 | 8.8 | 11.2 | 9.2 | 9.9 | 10.3 | 10.5 | 10.4 |
| Index (1995=100) | 131.9 | 136.2 | 134.6 | 135.8 | 129.1 | 100.0 | 98.8 | 108.1 | 111.7 | 142.7 | 116.6 | 125.7 | 130.4 | 133.9 | 131.9 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (1995=100) | 95.0 | 90.5 | 91.3 | 91.7 | 97.4 | 100.0 | 105.2 | 108.3 | 104.0 | 106.8 | 104.0 | 106.6 | 113.3 | 128.3 | 141.9 |

After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i$

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| Spain | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Banco de España - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| House price index (2000=100) | 62.0 | 70.6 | 70.2 | 70.0 | 71.0 | 72.5 | 73.9 | 75.3 | 79.1 | 87.4 | 100.0 | 115.6 | 134.1 | 158.8 | 186.6 |
| Precio medio del m2 de la vivienda libre, más de un año de antigüedad | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average house price (P) | 44,387 | 50,558 | 50,220 | 50,082 | 50,846 | 51,879 | 52,915 | 53,889 | 56,633 | 62,564 | 71,591 | 82,733 | 96,000 | 113,701 | 133,583 |
| Euros | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 17.0% | 16.7% | 15.7% | 14.6% | 11.1% | 11.8% | 10.2% | 7.6% | 6.3% | 5.3% | 6.3% | 6.4% | 5.4% | 4.3% | 3.6% |
| ECB ¹ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 13.3% | 13.1% | 12.3% | 11.5% | 8.7% | 9.3% | 8.0% | 6.0% | 5.0% | 4.2% | 5.0% | 5.1% | 4.3% | 3.4% | 2.8% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% | 0.62% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 6.5% | 5.9% | 6.0% | 6.0% | 5.6% | 5.2% | 4.7% | 3.9% | 3.4% | 2.9% | 2.6% | 2.6% | 2.9% | 3.2% | 3.3% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + f \cdot \pi)$ | 8.7 | 8.5 | 9.2 | 9.9 | 12.9 | 11.5 | 12.6 | 14.9 | 16.0 | 16.7 | 14.3 | 14.2 | 16.8 | 20.7 | 24.3 |
| Index (1997=100) | 58.8 | 57.1 | 62.1 | 66.4 | 86.8 | 77.1 | 84.4 | 100.0 | 107.7 | 112.6 | 96.0 | 95.4 | 113.0 | 139.0 | 163.3 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (1997=100) | 134.9 | 141.0 | 129.3 | 118.1 | 113.6 | 109.8 | 104.2 | 100.0 | 100.2 | 106.9 | 117.9 | 130.7 | 145.3 | 165.0 | 186.2 |
| Calculation of after-tax mortgage rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i _c | 12.3% | 12.0% | 11.3% | 10.5% | 8.0% | 8.5% | 7.3% | 5.5% | 4.5% | 3.8% | 4.6% | 4.6% | 3.9% | 3.1% | 2.6% |
| i _d | 13.6% | 13.4% | 12.5% | 11.7% | 8.9% | 9.5% | 8.2% | 6.1% | 5.0% | 4.3% | 5.1% | 5.1% | 4.3% | 3.4% | 2.8% |
| 10-year government bond rate (r) | 14.6% | 12.8% | 11.7% | 10.2% | 10.0% | 11.3% | 8.7% | 6.4% | 4.8% | 4.7% | 5.5% | 5.1% | 5.0% | 4.1% | 4.1% |

After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i^c + (i^d - i^c) e^{-2\tau}$, where $i^c = i - 0.28i$ and $i^d = i - 0.20i$

1. See Definitions and sources.

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Sweden | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Swedish Central | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 13.4% | 10.9% | 10.2% | 8.7% | 9.7% | 10.4% | 8.2% | 7.3% | 6.3% | 7.2% | 7.0% | 6.6% | 6.5% | 5.6% | 5.3% |
| Bank - new loans >5 years, households | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 10.6% | 8.6% | 8.1% | 6.9% | 7.7% | 8.3% | 6.5% | 5.8% | 5.0% | 5.7% | 5.5% | 5.2% | 5.2% | 4.4% | 4.2% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 1.3% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 6.2% | 7.3% | 6.9% | 6.7% | 5.8% | 4.2% | 2.4% | 2.1% | 1.1% | 0.8% | 0.5% | 0.8% | 1.1% | 1.6% | 1.6% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + f + \pi)$ | 10.4 | 15.0 | 15.4 | 18.1 | 14.0 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 11.2 | 10.9 | 9.8 | 9.6 | 10.4 | 10.7 | 12.3 | 12.6 |
| Index (1999=100) | 106.0 | 153.7 | 157.7 | 184.7 | 143.0 | 109.7 | 109.6 | 114.0 | 111.4 | 100.0 | 98.5 | 106.0 | 109.6 | 125.4 | 128.4 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (1999=100) | 116.8 | 104.1 | 87.2 | 73.4 | 75.5 | 74.0 | 73.8 | 80.1 | 90.1 | 100.0 | 110.7 | 116.9 | 121.4 | 128.3 | 140.8 |

After-tax mortgage rate: $i^a = i - 0.21 i$

Table A3. Calculation of fundamental price-to-rent ratios (continued)

| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Switzerland | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mortgage rate (i) | 6.3% | 6.8% | 6.9% | 6.6% | 5.6% | 5.5% | 5.1% | 4.6% | 4.1% | 3.9% | 4.2% | 4.4% | 4.0% | 3.4% | 3.2% |
| Swiss National Bank - First mortgages | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After income tax mortgage rate (i^a) | 5.5% | 6.0% | 6.1% | 5.9% | 5.0% | 4.9% | 4.5% | 4.1% | 3.7% | 3.5% | 3.7% | 3.9% | 3.6% | 3.0% | 2.8% |
| Property tax rate (τ) | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% |
| Expected house price inflation rate (π) (Last 5 years moving average of CPI) | 2.5% | 3.6% | 4.1% | 4.4% | 3.9% | 3.2% | 2.2% | 1.5% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0.7% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 0.9% | 0.9% |
| Fundamental price-to-rent ratio $1/(i^a + \tau + f - \pi)$ | 10.0 | 10.5 | 11.1 | 11.8 | 12.4 | 11.5 | 10.7 | 10.4 | 10.1 | 10.3 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 10.2 | 11.0 | 11.2 |
| Index (1993=100) | 84.9 | 89.7 | 94.1 | 100.0 | 105.5 | 97.6 | 91.2 | 88.6 | 86.2 | 87.9 | 85.3 | 84.4 | 87.2 | 93.5 | 95.7 |
| Actual price-to-rent ratio (1993=100) | 138.7 | 124.0 | 110.9 | 100.0 | 99.3 | 94.4 | 87.7 | 83.8 | 83.2 | 82.6 | 82.2 | 81.5 | 83.8 | 85.5 | 86.4 |

After-tax mortgage rate: i^a = i - 0.115 i

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abelson, P., R. Joyeux, G. Milunovich and D. Chung (2005), "Explaining house prices in Australia: 1970-2003", *Economic Record*, Vol. 81.
- Ahearne, A., J. Ammer, B. Doyle, L. Kole and R. Martin (2005), "House prices and monetary policy: A cross-country study", *International Finance Discussion papers*, No. 841, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
- Annett, A. (2005), "Euro area policies: Selected issues", *IMF Country Report*, No. 05/266.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2004), "The impact of rising house prices on the WA economy", *Western Australian Statistical Indicators*, December Quarter.
- Ayuso, J., J. Martinez, L. Maza and F. Restoy (2003), "House prices in Spain", *Economic Bulletin*, Banco de Espana, October.
- Banco de Espana (2004), "Annual Report".
- Bank of Finland (2004), "Financial Stability, Special issue", *Bank of Finland Bulletin*.
- Barker, K. (2004), *Review of Housing Supply*, Final Report, HM Treasury.
- Barham, G. (2004), "The effects of taxation policy on the cost of capital in housing – a historical perspective (1976 to 2003)", Financial Stability Report of Ireland.
- Bernanke, B. (2002), "Asset-price bubbles and monetary policy", Remarks before the New York Chapter of the National Association for Business Economics, 15 October, New York.
- Bessone, A.-J., B. Heitz and J. Boissinot (2005), "Marché immobilier: voit-on une bulle?", *Note de Conjoncture*, INSEE, mars.
- Borio, C. and P. McGuire (2004), "Twin peaks in equity and housing prices?", *BIS Quarterly Review*, March.
- Bry, G. and C. Boschan (1971), *Cyclical Analysis of Time Series: Selected Procedures and Computer Programs*, NBER, New York.
- Capozza, D., P. Hendershott, C. Mack and C. Mayer (2002), "Determinants of real house prices dynamics", *NBER Working Paper Series*, No. 9262.
- Catte, P., N. Girouard, R. Price and C. André (2004), "Housing markets, wealth and the business cycle", *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 394.
- Cerny, A., D. Miles and L. Schmidt (2005), "The impact of changing demographics and pensions on the demand for housing and financial assets", *CEPR Discussion paper series*, No. 5143.

- Cournède, B. (2005), “Housing prices and inflation in the euro area”, *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 450.
- Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (2005), “Household credit analysis”, *World Markets, Economics and Strategy*, 13 June, Toronto.
- Clayton Research/Ipsos-Reid (2005), *The FIRM residential mortgage survey*, Canada.
- Danmarks Nationalbank (2005), *Financial Stability Report*.
- Debelle, G. (2004), “Macroeconomic implications of rising household debt”, *BIS Working Papers No. 153*, June.
- Dobson, W. and G. Hufbauer (2001), *World Capital Markets – Challenges for the G10*, Institute for International Economics, Washington DC.
- Era Immobilier (2005), « Le marché européen de la transaction immobilière », Enquête 2005, Contact Presse Infinities Communication.
- Eschenbach, F. and L. Schuknecht (2002), “The fiscal costs of financial instability revisited”, *ECB Working Papers*, No. 191.
- European Central Bank (2003), *Monthly Bulletin*, October.
- European Central Bank (2005), “Asset price bubbles and monetary policy”, *Monthly Bulletin*, April.
- European Mortgage Federation (2004), *Hypostat 2003 European Housing Finance Review*, Brussels.
- Evans, A. and O. Hartwich (2005), “Bigger, better, faster, more: Why some countries plan better than others”, Policy Exchange, Localis, London.
- Federal Reserve Bank of Australia (2004), *Statement on Monetary Policy*, February.
- FitzGerald, J. (2005), “The Irish housing stock: growth in number of vacant dwellings”, Special Article in ESRI, *Quarterly Economic Commentary*, Dublin, Spring.
- Gallent, N. and K. Kim (2001), “Land zoning and local discretion in the Korean planning system”, *Land Use Policy*, Vol. 18, Issue 3.
- Gallin, J. (2003), “The long-run relationship between house prices and incomes: evidence from local housing markets”, *Finance and Economics Discussion Series*, No. 2003-17, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
- Gallin, J. (2004), “The long-run relationship between house prices and rents”, *Finance and Economics Discussion Series*, No. 2004-50, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
- Girouard, N. and S. Blöndal (2001), “House prices and economic activity”, *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 279.
- Girouard, N. and R. Price (2004), “Asset price cycles, “one-off” factors and structural budget balances”, *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 391.

- Glaeser, E. and J. Gyourko (2003), "The impact of building restrictions on housing affordability", *Federal Reserve Bank of New York Economic Policy Review*, June.
- Glaeser, E., J. Gyourko and R. Saks (2005), "Why have housing prices gone up?", *Harvard Institute of Economic Research Discussion Paper*, No. 2061.
- Gurkaynak, R. (2005), "Econometric tests of asset price bubbles: taking stock", *Finance and Economics Discussion Series*, No. 2005-04, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
- Gyourko, J., C. Mayer and T. Sinai (2004), "Superstar cities", *Wharton Working Paper*, July.
- Hannah, L., K-H. Kim and E. Mills (1993), "Land use controls and housing prices in Korea", *Urban Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 1.
- Harding, D. (2003), "Towards an econometric foundation for turning point based analysis of dynamic processes", Paper presented at the 2003 Australian Meeting of the Econometric Society.
- Helbling, T. (2005), *Housing Price Bubbles – A Tale based on Housing Price Booms and Busts*, BIS Papers, No. 21, Real Estate indicators and Financial Stability.
- Himmelberg, C., C. Meyer and T. Sinai (2005), "Assessing high house prices: Bubbles, fundamentals, and misperceptions", *Staff Report* No. 218, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, September.
- Hofman, D. (2005), "Kingdom of the Netherlands-Netherlands: Selected issues", *IMF Country Report*, No. 05/225.
- Hunt, B. and M. Badia (2005), "United Kingdom: Selected issues", *IMF Country Report*, No. 05/81.
- International Bureau of Fiscal Documentation (1999), *European Tax Handbook 1999*, Amsterdam.
- Issing, O. (2003), "Monetary and financial stability: Is there a trade-off?", Address at the Conference on "Monetary stability, Financial Stability and the Business Cycle", Bank for International Settlements, Basle.
- Jacobsen, D. and B. Naug (2005), "What drives house prices?", *Norges Bank Economic Bulletin*, No. 05 Q1.
- Koeva, P. and M. Moreno (2004), "Ireland: selected issues", *IMF Country Report*, No. 04/349.
- Kohler, M. and A. Rossiter (2005), "Property owners in Australia: a snapshot", *Research Discussion Paper*, No. 2005-03, Economic Research Department, Reserve Bank of Australia.
- Krainer, J. (2005), "Housing markets and demographics", *FRBSF Economic Letter*, No. 2005-21, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.
- Krainer, J. and C. Wei (2004), "House prices and fundamental values", *FRBSF Economic Letter*, No. 2004-27, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.
- Macfarlane, I. (2003), "Do Australian households borrow too much?", *Reserve Bank of Australia Bulletin*, April.

- Martin, R.F. (2005), “The baby-boom: Predictability in house prices and interest rates”, *International Finance Discussion Papers*, No. 2005-847, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
- Mayer, C. and C. Somerville (2000), “Land use regulation and new construction”, *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, Vol. 30, Issue 6.
- McCarthy, J. and R. Peach (2004), “Are home prices the next bubble?”, *Federal Reserve Bank of New York Economic Policy Review*, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, December.
- Meen, G. (2002), “The time-series behaviour of house prices: A transatlantic divide”, *Journal of Housing Economics*, No. 11.
- McQuinn, K. (2004), “A model of the Irish housing sector”, *Central Bank of Ireland Technical paper*, 1/RT/04.
- Morgan Stanley (2005), “Housing bubble metrics”, *US Economics*, 27 May.
- Nagahata, T., Y. Saita, T. Sekine and T. Tachibana (2004), “Equilibrium land prices of Japanese prefectures: A panel cointegration analysis”, *Bank of Japan Working Paper Series*, No. 04-E-9.
- Norges Bank (2005), *Financial Stability*, 1/2005.
- OECD (2004), *Economic Survey of the Netherlands*, Paris.
- OECD (2004a), *Economic Survey of the United Kingdom*, Paris.
- OECD (2004b), *Economic Survey of Spain*, Paris.
- OECD (2005), *Economic Survey of Korea*, Paris.
- OECD (2005a), *Economic Survey of the United Kingdom*, Paris.
- OECD (2006), *Economic Survey of Ireland*, Paris, forthcoming.
- Oikarinen, E (2005), “Is housing overvalued in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area”, *Keskusteluaiheita Discussion papers*, No. 992, The Research Institute of the Finnish Economy.
- Otrock, C. and M. Terrones (2005), *House Prices, Interest Rates and Macroeconomic Fluctuations*, IMF and University of Virginia, *mimeo*.
- Ortalo-Magné, F. and S. Rady (1999), “Boom in, bust out: Young households and the housing price cycle”, *European Economic Review*, No. 43.
- Ortalo-Magné, F. and S. Rady (1999), “Housing market dynamics: On the contribution of income shocks and credit constraints”, *University of Munich, Department of Economics Discussion paper*, No. 2005-01 .
- Poterba, J. (1992), “Taxation and housing: Old questions, new answers”, *American Economic Review*, Vol. 82, No. 2.
- Quigley, J. and S. Raphael (2004), “Is housing unaffordable? Why isn't it more affordable?”, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 18, No. 1.

- Rele H. ter and G. van Steen (2001), "Housing subsidisation in the Netherlands: measuring its distortions and distributional effects", *CPB Discussion Paper*, No. 2.
- Reserve Bank of Australia (2004), *Statement on monetary policy*, February.
- Riksbank (2004), "Household indebtedness in an international perspective", *Financial Stability Report*, No. 1.
- Scanlon, K. and C. Whitehead (2004), "International trends in housing tenure and mortgage finance", Council of Mortgage lenders Research, November.
- Scanlon, K. and C. Whitehead (2005), "The profile and intentions of buy-to-let investors", Council of Mortgage lenders Research, March.
- Schnure, C. (2005), "United States: Selected issues", *IMF Country Report*, No. 05/258.
- Sutton, G. (2002), "Explaining changes in house prices", *BIS Quarterly Review*, September.
- Terrones, M. and C. Otrok (2004), "The global house price boom", *IMF World Economic Outlook*, September.
- Tsatsaronis, K. and H. Zhu (2004), "What drives housing price dynamics: Cross country evidence", *BIS Quarterly Review*, Bank for International Settlements, March.
- Van den Noord, P. (2005), "Tax incentives and house prices in the euro area: Theory and evidence", *Economie Internationale*, No. 101.
- Verbruggen, J., H. Kranendonk, M. van Leuvensteijn and M. Toet (2005), "Welke factoren bepalen de ontwikkeling van de huizenprijs in Nederland?", *CPB Document*, No. 81, April.
- Wagner, R. (2005), "En model for de danske ejerboligpriser", *Økonomi – og Erhvervsministeriets arbejdsrapport*, No. 1.
- Weeken, O. (2004), "Asset pricing and the housing market", *Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin*, Spring.
- Wilhelm, F. (2005), "L'évolution actuelle du crédit à l'habitat en France est-elle soutenable?", *Bulletin de la Banque de France*, No. 140.
- Yellen, J. (2005), *Housing bubbles and monetary policy*, Presentation to the fourth annual Haas Gala, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, 21 October.

WORKING PAPERS

The full series of Economics Department Working Papers can be consulted at www.oecd.org/eco/Working_Papers/

- 474. *Reforming federal fiscal relations in Austria*
(January 2006) Andrés Fuentes, Eckhard Wurzel and Andreas Wörgötter
- 473. *Product market competition and economic performance in France*
Concurrence sur les marchés de produits et performance économique en France
(January 2006) Jens Høj and Michael Wise
- 472. *Product market reforms and employment in OECD countries*
(December 2005) Giuseppe Nicoletti and Stefano Scarpetta
- 471. *Fast-falling barriers and growing concentration: the emergence of a private economy in China*
(December 2005) Sean Dougherty and Richard Herd
- 470. *Sustaining high growth through innovation: reforming the R&D and education systems in Korea*
(December 2005) Yongchun Baek and Randall Jones
- 469. *The labour market in Korea: enhancing flexibility and raising participation*
(December 2005) Randall Jones
- 468. *Getting the most out of public-sector decentralization in Korea*
(December 2005) Randall Jones and Tadashi Yokoyama
- 467. *Coping with the inevitable adjustment in the US current account*
(December 2005) Peter Jarrett
- 466. *Is there a case for sophisticated balanced-budget rules?*
(December 2005) Antonio Fatás
- 465. *Fiscal rules for sub-central governments design and impact*
(December 2005) Douglas Sutherland, Robert Price and Isabelle Joumard
- 464. *Assessing the robustness of demographic projections in OECD countries*
(December 2005) Frédéric Gonand
- 463. *The Benefits of Liberalising Product Markets and Reducing Barriers to International Trade and Investment in the OECD*
(December 2005)
- 462. *Fiscal relations across levels of government in the United States*
(November 2005) Thomas Laubach
- 461. *Assessing the value of indicators of underlying inflation for monetary policy*
(November 2005) Pietro Catte and Torsten Sløk.
- 460. *Regulation and economic performance: product market reforms and productivity in the OECD*
(November 2005) Giuseppe Nicoletti and Stefano Scarpetta.
- 459. *Innovation in the Business Sector*
(November 2005) Florence Jaumotte and Nigel Pain

458. *From Innovation Development to Implementation: Evidence from the Community Innovation Survey*
(November 2005) Florence Jaumotte and Nigel Pain
457. *From Ideas to Development: the Determination of R&D and Patenting*
(November 2005) Florence Jaumotte and Nigel Pain
456. *An Overview of Public Policies to Support Innovation*
(November 2005) Florence Jaumotte and Nigel Pain
455. *Strengthening Regulation in Chile: The Case of Network Industries*
(November 2005) Alexander Galetovic and Luiz de Mello
454. *Fostering Innovation in Chile*
(November 2005) José-Miguel Benavente, Luiz de Mello and Nanno Mulder
453. *Getting the most out of public sector decentralisation in Mexico*
(October 2005) Isabelle Joumard
452. *Raising Greece's Potential Output Growth*
(October 2005) Vassiliki Koutsogeorgopoulou and Helmut Ziegelschmidt
451. *Product Market Competition and Economic Performance in Australia*
(October 2005) Helmut Ziegelschmidt, Vassiliki Koutsogeorgopoulou, Simen Bjornerud and Michael Wise
450. *House Prices and Inflation in the Euro Area*
(October 2005) Boris Cournède
449. *The EU's Single Market: At Your Service?*
(October 2005) Line Vogt
448. *Slovakia's introduction of a flat tax as part of wider economic reforms*
(October 2005) Anne-Marie Brook and Willi Leibfritz
447. *The Education Challenge in Mexico: Delivering Good Quality Education to All*
(October 2005) Stéphanie Guichard
446. *In Search of Efficiency: Improving Health Care in Hungary*
(October 2005) Alessandro Goglio
445. *Hungarian Innovation Policy: What's the Best Way Forward?*
(October 2005) Philip Hemmings
444. *The Challenges of EMU Accession Faced by Catch-Up Countries: A Slovak Republic Case Study*
(September 2005) Anne-Marie Brook
443. *Getting better value for money from Sweden's healthcare system*
(September 2005) David Rae
442. *How to reduce sickness absences in Sweden: lessons from international experience*
(September 2005) David Rae
441. *The Labour Market Impact of Rapid Ageing of Government Employees:
Some Illustrative Scenarios*
(September 2005) Jens Høj and Sylvie Toly
440. *The New OECD International Trade Model*
(August 2005) Nigel Pain, Annabelle Mourougane, Franck Sédillot and Laurence Le Foulser