

Modernizing central banks' large semi-structural projection models: the role of model-consistent expectations

Stéphane Adjemian¹, Nikola Bokan², Matthieu Darracq Pariès², Georg Müller^{*2}, and Srećko Zimic²

¹Université du Mans, Department of Economics.[†]

²European Central Bank, Directorate General Economics.[‡]

February 18, 2025

Abstract

We enrich the ECB's modelling toolkit by incorporating model-consistent expectations into the workhorse projection model, ECB-BASE. This enables the analysis of announced policy shifts and anticipation effects. We nest VAR-expectations, model-consistent expectation and several combinations of the two, termed as hybrid settings. In addition, the Dynare computational environment has been advanced in several dimensions to enable these new modelling capabilities. We then examine monetary policy implications of varying expectations formation. Simulations indicate that forward-looking expectations result in smoother output responses but front-loaded price reactions to policy shocks. By applying the model to assess recent supply shocks that have led to a surge in inflation, we find that forward-looking expectations from the private sector imply increased macroeconomic volatility, necessitating an early policy response.

Keywords: *Semi-structural model, model-consistent expectations, euro area, monetary policy*

JEL classification: C3, C5, E1, E2, E5

*Corresponding author. Email addresses:
stephane.adjemian@univ-lemans.fr (S. Adjemian),
nikola.bokan@ecb.europa.eu (N. Bokan),
matthieu.darracq-paries@ecb.europa.eu (M. Darracq Pariès),
georg.muller@ecb.europa.eu (G. Müller),
srecko.zimic@ecb.europa.eu (S. Zimic)

[†]Avenue Olivier Messiaen 72085 Le Mans cedex 9, France

[‡]Sonnemannstrasse 22, 60314 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

1 Introduction

This paper contributes by modernizing ECB’s semi-structural projection model toolkit. We study the transmission of monetary policy in the ECB-(RE)BASE model across different expectation formation alternatives. ECB-(RE)BASE is model-consistent (MCE), or rational expectations (RE), version of the ECB-BASE model, which up until now operated solely under expectations formed via Vector-Autoregressions (VAR). The underlying ECB-BASE model developed at the ECB was introduced by [Angelini et al. \(2019\)](#) as the primary semi-structural macroeconomic model for the euro area. Today, it is instrumental in informing ECB monetary policy preparation by contributing to economic projections, risk and scenario analysis, and quantitative policy evaluations. The main advantage of such models lies in the balance between the theoretically founded structure (and its imposed restrictions) and empirical validity of captured gradual transmissions. Importantly, expectations also play a critical role in determining macroeconomic dynamics in this class of models. As a functional policy analysis tool, the model features a comprehensive description of the euro area economy, incorporating a detailed demand break-down, price and wage developments, forward-looking asset pricing, financing conditions, future income projections, as well as different roles for policy interventions.

The impetus to explore alternative expectation settings arises from recent supply shocks that have increased energy, production, and consumer prices. These shocks have heightened macroeconomic volatility, underscoring the need to understand the role of expectations as long-term anchors. Induced by such developments, the monetary authorities needed to assess the implications of different degrees of forward-lookingness on macroeconomic volatility. After a prolonged period of low interest rates, the central bank’s reaction to the new environment resulted in many instances in large hiking cycle. In this respect, our work in this paper focuses on understanding the consequences of unexpected and anticipated monetary policy shocks.¹

At the same time, central bank forecasting models are under increasing scrutiny (see [Bernanke \(2024\)](#)). DSGE models typically emphasize forward-looking behavior under the rational expectations paradigm. In contrast, majority of semi-structural projection models rely predominantly

¹The accompanying working paper in [Adjemian et al. \(2024\)](#) documented systematically the implications of different expectation settings for other main shocks.

on established long-run relationships consistent with data. For pure forecasting purposes, it is often adequate to consider expectations based on historical patterns. However, for analytical purposes, exploring alternative expectation settings that account for policy shifts, evaluate announced changes, and anticipate news would be highly beneficial. We contribute to the ECB's analytical capabilities by integrating these alternative expectation settings into the main projection tool. The implementation also allows for hybrid settings, combining different expectations across various sectors or blocks of the model simultaneously.

Changing expectations from backward-dependent to forward rational expectations affects monetary policy transmission. We find that MCE leads to a dampened cyclical response because of stronger income smoothing and more gradual transition dynamics. These smoothing forces dominate any implications of the financial sector being forward-looking. We also find that there are front-loading features on prices, especially on HICP through the exchange rate effect on imported energy, but less on the GDP deflator. We show that policy announcements lead to partial anticipation of economic dynamics if credibly understood by the private sector. Additionally, we show that recent supply shocks imply more macroeconomic volatility under MCE compared to VAR expectations, highlighting the need for central banks to understand the degree of anticipation of supply pressures to achieve its stabilization objectives.

In its primary role as a forecasting and policy analysis tool, the ECB-BASE model operates under VAR expectations and is estimated accordingly. In this setup, current and past states potentially affect expectations. The VAR provides a reduced-form view of the full economic environment described by the complete macro-model and can, loosely speaking, be considered as a "limited or condensed information" expectations formation version. Other forms of restricted information sets used in the forecasting literature are adaptive learning approaches ([Slobodyan and Wouters \(2012\)](#), [Warne \(2023\)](#)).

A key challenge in swapping expectations in this class of models are the adjustment costs. They are central for the model to generate empirically plausible transition dynamics. They are modeled via the Polynomial Adjustment Costs (PAC) approach, which is an error-correction-type specification with an explicit role of forward-looking expectations. The Dynare computational environment has been extended to support the reformulation of a VAR-based to the

model-consistent expectations setup.

This paper also relates to the literature on different expectation formation and in particular in the context of semi-structural models as used in central banks. The main reference point is the work around the FRB/US model ([Brayton and Tinsley \(1996\)](#), [Brayton et al. \(1997\)](#)) which served as inspiration in the development of underlying ECB-BASE model. In their analytical work, FED staff has also occasionally compared the impulse responses the model produces under different expectation settings. [Brayton et al. \(2014\)](#) shows that VAR-based expectations can imply high inertia that differs from the inertia implied by the Taylor rule. In this case, the MCE imply a softer price response to a monetary policy rate shock than under VAR expectations.

Numerous FRB/US simulations with an emphasis on the role of expectations have been used for monetary policy analysis (e.g. [Reifschneider and Williams \(2000\)](#), [Chung et al. \(2012\)](#) among others). [Kiley and Roberts \(2017\)](#) evaluated the frequency and potential costs of Lower Bound incidences, showing that clear commitment strategies by the central bank to maintain lower interest rates until achieving the inflation objective are highly effective under MCE in the FRB/US model. [Bernanke et al. \(2019\)](#) finds that MCE can imply lower output volatility than hybrid expectations when there is a risk of hitting the Lower Bound, as private sector expectations regarding the inflation anchor help alleviate the constraint. [Tetlow \(2022\)](#) uses FRB/US to assess the cost of disinflation, showing that a persistent reduction in inflation can be achieved under MCE via a credible announcement of shifting the inflation anchor without sharply decreasing demand. Conversely, VAR expectations require a more aggressive policy adjustment, causing a more significant decline in demand to achieve the same outcome.

The remainder of our paper is structured as follows. Section 2 lays out the strategy to solve a model under rational expectations. It describes the role of expectations in ECB-(RE)BASE while broadly outlining its main features and shows the details necessary to convert BASE into a forward-looking expectation model. Section 3 examines impulse responses to monetary policy shocks, comparing different expectation modalities and discusses some key contributing factors. Section 4 examines the inflation surge across different expectation settings. Finally, section 5 concludes.

2 ECB-(RE)BASE

This section discusses the modifications to the ECB-BASE model to convert it into a model-consistent expectation variant.

Before delving into the model details, it is useful to generally recall the treatment of expectations in the solution of dynamic macro-models. Consider the following type of model:

$$\mathbb{E}_t[f(y_{t+1}, y_t, y_{t-1}, \epsilon_t)] = 0 \quad (1)$$

where y is a vector of endogenous variables, ϵ is a vector of structural shocks with $\mathbb{E}_t[\epsilon_{t+1}] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_t[\epsilon_{t+1}\epsilon'_{t+1}] = \Sigma$. Under backward expectations, the terms $\mathbb{E}_t[y_{t+1}]$ are replaced by² VAR-forecasts: $y_{t+1} = h'x_t$ where x_t is a set of explanatory variables that may include y_t and lags thereof. The solution then amounts to solve for y_t , in each period given $\underline{y_{t-1}}$ and ϵ_t . Formally, the following nonlinear problem arises:

$$f(h'x_t, y_t, y_{t-1}, \epsilon_t) = 0 \quad (2)$$

In this case, the paths for the endogenous variables are the unknown object of interest that we want to solve for. Contrary to that strategy, under rational expectations, we solve 1 for an invariant mapping between the endogenous variables and the state variables. Let this mapping be $y_t = g(y_{t-1}, \epsilon_t)$, we can then reformulate 1 as:


$$\mathbb{E}_t[f(g(g(y_{t-1}, \epsilon_t), \epsilon_{t+1}), g(y_{t-1}, \epsilon_t), y_{t-1}, \epsilon_t)] = 0 \quad (3)$$

which is typically solved by perturbation techniques around the deterministic steady state. If we consider a first-order approximation, the solution is a linear reduced form model: $y_t = Ay_{t-1} + B\epsilon_t$.

²Assuming the model exhibits linearity with respect to the forward terms, the conditional expectation can be accurately transferred under the function f . In contrast, for non-linear models, this operation results in an approximation due to Jensen's inequality. Semi-structural models are typically linear with respect to the forward variables.

Let us now recall the basics of the ECB-BASE model. Figure 1 gives a birds-eye view of the model structure. The rich structure of the model enables us to incorporate various mechanisms behind economic forces and policy channels. More specifically, the wage-price block is based on a simple auxiliary New-Keynesian model used to estimate the model’s main price and wage Phillips curves (see appendix B.4 in [Angelini et al. \(2019\)](#)).

Figure 1: Overview of the ECB-BASE model and the center-stage of expectations



Notes: Each small hexagon represents a specific model "block". The blocks gravitate towards specific long-run anchors, which discipline the model through the expectation terms. In the case of VAR expectations, a core VAR serves to pin-down the main relationships between inflation, the output gap and the interest rate which is then extended to account for other explanatory forces differing across model blocks, and at the same time ensuring a certain degree of system-wide consistency. The large light blue shaded hexagon indicates where these expectations enter. Furthermore, main adjustment dynamics governed by PAC are also subjected to the expectations. The framed light blue hexagon touches the blocks where PAC play a role. To be precise, they govern the transition dynamics of private consumption, private business and residential investment, house prices, property income and employment.

The model’s domestic demand structure features private consumption, business and housing investment and government expenditures. Global forces, captured in the foreign block, affects exports and imports. Financing conditions, as well as asset prices influence borrowing and transmit into the consumption and investment decisions.

In the wage-price block, reduced-form pricing curves assign an important role to forward looking expectations.³ Important to notice is that this auxiliary model is estimated under rational expectations as a standalone system. It is therefore straightforward to revert back to this specification when transitioning from VAR to MCE expectations.⁴ Given the prominence of the financial block in the model, in (RE)BASE, we re-specify the model’s asset pricing problem and align it to the formulations standard to the DSGE literature.⁵ To do so, it is convenient to change the logic of how bond prices and financing rates are constructed. Furthermore, we also treat the exchange rate mechanism as a financial feature. Postulating the exchange rate as a forward looking variable implies a significant departure from the empirical setup used in the original model.

An interesting specificity of the model is the prominence of multiple income sources (labour, transfer and property income) as main determinants of consumption. While the underlying theory behind the relationships entering VAR expectation and MCE version of the model is the same, the former requires significant algebraic manipulation of the equations in order to arrive at a trend-gap representation. On the other hand, the MCE version of the model eliminates the need for this trend-gap decomposition. Therefore, in order to facilitate the exposition of the changes in the model structure vs the original BASE, we do present the aforementioned changes in more detail in the following section.

We should also reiterate the significant role played by the expectations in the adjustment process of the model’s main macroeconomic variables. The adjustment to the long-run trend

³The reduced-form goods price Phillips curve is of the form $\pi_t = \{(1 - \delta_\pi)(1 - \beta_\pi)(1 - \varphi_\pi)\}^{-1}\{(1 - \delta_\pi)(1 - \beta_\pi)(1 - \varphi_\pi)\bar{\pi}_t^e + \beta_\pi \mathbb{E}_t \pi_{t+1} + \delta_\pi \pi_{t-1} + \beta_y^x mc_t + \varphi_\pi \pi_t^{oil}\} + \epsilon_t^\pi$. π_t is the core deflator inflation. mc_t are marginal costs and π_t^{oil} is imported energy price inflation. The medium-term inflation expectations $\bar{\pi}_t^e$ are imperfectly anchored and are updated based on past inflation realizations. They follow this rule throughout this paper.

⁴Given that (RE)BASE and BASE share the identical specification of the wage setting structure, we do not restate it here.

⁵House prices are modeled as in ECB-BASE. They are not per se modeled as financial assets valuations like the bond prices are, but rather are determined on simple empirical relationships based on contemporaneous information and on the medium-term inflation anchor. However, the transition dynamics of house prices to the target value follow the PAC framework.

values is a sluggish transition process arising as a consequence of the various adjustment costs featured in the model and governed at least in part by the expectations. Figure 1 illustrates the various blocks featuring expectations and their main formation mechanism. Two light blue shaded hexagonal areas overlapping each other connect the model blocks where either core VAR expectations and/or PAC-based formulations enter the model.

In the following, we describe the modifications in the model necessary to swap it into its MCE form. The order of exposition preempts the order at which we want to switch on certain features sequentially in the simulation exercises presented later.

2.1 Modified Financial Blocks

2.1.1 Bond Prices and the Long-term Interest Rate

The following assets are modeled with forward-looking expectation formation: 10-year (long-term) bonds, corporate bonds as well as equities/stocks. Short-term nominal bond price is not explicitly modeled. The policy maker steers the value of short-term bond by setting a nominal interest rate according to the Taylor rule.

The long-term interest rate in ECB-(RE)BASE is a 10-year benchmark government bond yield. Computationally, it is convenient to use infinitely lived console-style bond pricing equations, which have a tractable recursive formulation. We follow the approach of [Woodford \(2001\)](#) such that the long-term bond is modeled as a coupon-paying console.⁶ Coupon payments are expected to occur in each period, starting from $t+1$, and the duration of the bond is chosen to reflect a 10 year horizon of payments.⁷

To price the long-term bond, investors discount expected future coupon payments and add a term premium $\bar{t}p$ to the one-period-ahead pricing kernel. The bond price Q^{10Y} is given by the following recursive forward form:

$$Q_t^{10Y} = \frac{c}{(1+i_t)} + \rho \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{Q_{t+1}^{10Y}}{(1+i_t)(1+\bar{t}p)} \right] \quad (4)$$

⁶In the original ECB-BASE model, in contrast, bond values are not explicitly modeled. Instead, the risk-free interest rate according to the expectation hypothesis is formed based on a VAR forecast. A term premium is then added to reflect the duration risk.

⁷The bond pays a coupon c at $t+1$, ρc in $t+2$, $\rho^2 c$ in $t+3$, and so on.

where i_t is the short-term nominal interest rate, c is the coupon payment, calibrated to normalize a steady-state bond price \overline{Q}^{10Y} to 1, and ρ is the decaying factor of coupon payments, calibrated to match a Macaulay duration of 40 quarters. $\bar{t}p$ is the term premium associated with holding a bond for a 10 year period.⁸

The long-term interest rate i^{10Y} is then defined as the compounded yield to maturity on the console:

$$i_t^{10Y} = c/Q_t^{10Y} + \rho - 1 \quad (5)$$

Note that the rate of return on bond holding r^{10Y} is given by:

$$r_t^{10Y} = \frac{c + \rho Q_t^{10Y}}{Q_{t-1}^{10Y}} - 1 \quad (6)$$

A similar modeling strategy is adopted for the value of corporate bonds and its rate of return r_t^{CB} . It follows a specification as in equation 4, just that, additional to the term premium, a corporate bond spread above risk-free rates is then added to the discounting.

2.1.2 Equity Prices

The description of equity prices follows the Dividend Discount Model. The equity price P^{EQ} is then equal the present value of expected future dividend cash flows that are discounted with an appropriate risk factor.⁹

$$P_t^{EQ} = \mathbb{E}_t \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_S D_{t+k}}{(1 + i_t^{COE})^k} \quad (7)$$

⁸In general, the term premium can be responsive to the cycle in ECB-BASE: $tp_t = c^{tp} + \rho^{tp} tp_{t-1} + \lambda^{tp} \mathbb{E}_t[OG_{t+40}] + \epsilon_t^{tp}$. The expression $\mathbb{E}_t[OG_{t+40}]$ stands for the expected output gap position of the economy in 10 years and is replaced by a VAR forecast where the future cyclical position is projected based on current economic conditions. In order to avoid a convoluted expectation formation inside the determination of long-term interest rates, the (RE)BASE setting fixes the term premium to its baseline value $\bar{t}p = c^{tp}/(1 - \rho^{tp})$. To make comparison viable, we also fix the term premium in the backward-expectation cases for the remainder of the paper.

⁹In the original ECB-BASE, this equation is cast into a backward-looking version of the Dividend Discount Model. As in Fuller and Hsia (1984), it assumes two stages of dividend growth. There is an extraordinary growth phase characterized by g^{ST} that lasts for $2H$ years and a stable growth rate g^{LT} phase that lasts forever. Future growth of dividends are projected based on either exogenous information or they can follow rules that rely on information from the past. Keeping otherwise the notation of the main text, the backward-looking equity price can be written as $P_t^{EQ} = \frac{c_S D_t}{i_t^{COE} - g_t^{LT}} (1 + g_t^{LT} + H(g_t^{ST} - g_t^{LT}))$.

where D are dividend payments and c_S is a normalizing constant. Cost of equity i^{COE} is constructed as $i_t^{COE} = i_t + s_t^{COE}$, with the equity premium s^{COE} determined as in the original ECB-BASE.

Writing the equity price equation forward, it is cast into a form similar to the bond price equations shown above:

$$P_t^{EQ} = \frac{c_S D_t}{(1 + i_t^{COE})} + \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{P_{t+1}^{EQ}}{(1 + i_t^{COE})} \right] \quad (8)$$

Dividend payouts D to share-holders can be approximated by dividend income received by the household sector, which is endogenously determined in the model's property income block. The MCE setting therefore features a forward-looking formation of equity prices that encompass rational expectations on future dividend growth. c_S is calibrated to target a baseline dividend yield of 2.85%, consistent with the historical average of the MSCI Dividend Yield indicator.

Finally, net financial assets FW held by households are affected by changes in stock prices and gain from returns earned on long-term and corporate bonds:

$$\frac{FW_t}{FW_{t-1}} = \omega_0 + \omega_{10Y}(1 + r_t^{10Y}) + \omega_{CB}(1 + r_t^{CB}) + \omega_{EQ}(P_t^{EQ}/P_{t-1}^{EQ}) \quad (9)$$

where ω_0 , ω_{10Y} , ω_{CB} and ω_{EQ} are calibrated shares of assets not subject to revaluation, government debt securities, corporate debt securities and equities in total financial assets.

2.1.3 Exchange Rate

The nominal exchange rate is determined via an uncovered interest rate parity (UIP) condition that clears the interest rate differential with trading partners. The no-arbitrage condition is that the rate of return on domestic bonds in the domestic currency must equal the rate of return on foreign bonds whose payoff is converted into the domestic currency via the future spot exchange rate:

$$i_t^{10Y} = i_t^{10Y,F} + \mathbb{E}_t (s_{t+1} - s_t) \quad (10)$$

where s is the log of the nominal exchange rate of the domestic currency over a basket of

trade-weighted currencies, i.e. the nominal effective exchange rate. i^{10Y} and $i^{10Y,F}$ are the long-term nominal interest rates in the domestic and foreign markets (the US) respectively.

In the original model, the nominal exchange rate is governed by an empirical relationship that tracks the price and real interest rate differentials between the euro area and foreign market. In order to depart from Purchasing Power Parity and therefore to depart from a flexible price case, an explicit functional form for the change of the real exchange rate has been assumed¹⁰ and constituted the basis for the estimation. As a result, an (estimated) scaling of interest rate changes affects the determination of the exchange rate level in ECB-BASE.¹¹

To mimic this setup for the MCE version, we modify the UIP condition such that the expected change of the nominal exchange rate is a scaling of the interest rate differential:

$$\mathbb{E}_t \Delta s_{t+1} = \theta_{uip} \left(i_t^{10Y} - i_t^{10Y,F} \right) \quad (11)$$

where the scaling parameter θ_{uip} has been calibrated to match the medium-term dynamics of the exchange rate response to a monetary policy shock of the economy described by the original estimated model version.

In all applications that follow, foreign markets are assumed to be exogenous and therefore do not transmit a feedback to the euro area economy. Any exchange rate response is triggered by domestic interest rate changes. This allows to condition the euro area economy on an unchanged global environment, whose complexities to model is beyond the scope of this paper.

2.2 Modified Income

The long-term consumption growth rate, consistent with economic theory, is derived from utility maximization where households consider their lifetime income stream and the value of financial assets (housing wealth and financial wealth). The reader is referred to [Angelini et al. \(2019\)](#) for the full derivation.

The permanent income construct is used to pin-down target consumption $\log C_t^*$. The em-

¹⁰In BASE, the real exchange rate, defined as $q_t = s_t + p_t^F - p_t$, is assumed to follow: $\mathbb{E}_t (q_{t+1} - \bar{q}_{t+1}) = \theta(q_t - \bar{q}_t)$.

¹¹In BASE, the empirical relationship pins down the current period level of the nominal exchange rate directly (not in expectations). The parameter restrictions employed in the estimation implies: $s_t = p_t - p_t^F + 1/(1 - \theta) (i_t^{10Y} - \bar{\pi}_t^e - (i_t^{10Y,F} - \bar{\pi}_t^{e,F})) + \bar{q}_t$.

pirical specification of the target consumption equation, that has been estimated in the original model, is:

$$\log C_t^* = \eta_0 + \eta_T \log EY_t^T + \eta_P \log EY_t^P + \eta_D \log W_t^D + (1 - \eta_T - \eta_P - \eta_D) \log EY_t^L \quad (12)$$

where EY_t^i denotes the permanent income type $i \in \{T = \text{transfer}, P = \text{property}, L = \text{labour}\}$, W_t^D denotes observed financial and housing wealth and η_i stands for propensities to consume out of income type i .¹²

Permanent income is formally derived from the expected present discounted value of future incomes denoted as J_t .

$$J_t^i = \mathbb{E}_t \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + r + \phi_0)^{-k} Y_{t+k}^i \quad (13)$$

Expected permanent income EY_t is defined as

$$EY_t^i = (1 - \check{\beta}) J_t^i \quad (14)$$

with $\check{\beta}$ representing the discount factor and equals to $(1 + g)/(1 + \bar{r} - \bar{\pi} + \phi_0)$. $\bar{r} - \bar{\pi}$ is the baseline real interest rate, ϕ_0 is a risk-adjustment factor, and g is the growth rate of potential output.

The expected permanent income of type i can be re-written in recursive form:¹³

$$EY_t^i = (1 - \check{\beta}) Y_t^i + \check{\beta} \mathbb{E}_t(EY_{t+1}^i) \quad (15)$$

where the one-period-ahead expectation of permanent income $\mathbb{E}_t(EY_{t+1}^i)$ is evaluated as a rational expectation forward term.

¹²We assume that $\eta_T + \eta_P + \eta_D + \eta_L = 1$. Second, although aggregate property wealth can be directly obtained from the data there are numerous issues related to its measurement. Because of that we decided to follow FRB-US and postulate that the true property wealth is a weighted average of observed financial and housing wealth and the present value of property income. This results in financial and housing wealth entering the equation as observed and not as present discounted value of its future streams.

¹³This is different from the original ECB-BASE model where, in order to apply VAR-expectations, permanent income is deconstructed into trend and gap terms. The long-run trends are set according to the baseline targets they supposed to converge to. The gaps to these trends depend on VAR-forecasts about the cyclical position of the economy.

2.3 Reformulating the Adjustment Costs

An essential feature of the ECB-BASE model is the significant role played by expectations in the adjustment process and therefore the stickiness of main macroeconomic variables. The sluggish adjustment of variables to a theory-implied target are modeled through the Polynomial Adjustment Costs (PAC) approach.¹⁴ The benefit of it is that the long-term anchors of the model are consistent with economic theory, but the transition to the target is consistent with empirical relationships. The variables shift towards the long-run targets in an error-correction type setup. It further captures inertia via a lag structure as well as providing a role for expectations through a forward term.

Because in ECB-BASE, main macroeconomic interactions feature the PAC property, expectations appear in many parts of the model (recall Figure 1 for an overview). For instance, theory suggests that consumption depends (log-)linearly on permanent incomes (log C^* in the previous section is the theory-implied consumption target). However, when the model is applied to the data, there is a discrepancy between observed and theoretical consumption levels and its dynamics. The inter-temporal (forward-looking) optimization that determines the transition is modeled via the PAC approach.¹⁵

Now, let y_t be a generic variable of interest and y_t^* be its theoretical counterpart, typically derived from an optimization problem. Assume that the optimizing agents also seek to minimize a cost function of transition, denoted by Θ_t , with respect to the variable of interest y_t , while taking the target y_t^* as given.¹⁶ This cost function is designed to penalize both deviations between the actual value of the variable, y_t , and the target value, y_t^* , as well as changes in the variable itself:

$$\Theta_t = \mathbb{E}_{t-1} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \beta^i \left[(y_{t+i} - y_{t+i}^*)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^m b_k \left((1-L)^k y_{t+i} \right)^2 \right] \quad (16)$$

This cost encompasses the anticipated present value of squared deviations of the decision variable y_t from its target path y_t^* , in addition to adjustment costs associated with the growth

¹⁴For a reference and a more detailed presentation, please see [Tinsley \(2002\)](#).

¹⁵In the case of consumption, the PAC lag-structure is akin to internal habit formation in other models. The advantage of PAC, however, is that it is generic and therefore offers flexibility in modeling any macroeconomic variable via this approach.

¹⁶The optimization problem bears resemblance to that of an HP filter, yet the instrument employed is distinct.

rate and higher-order derivatives of the decision variable. Expectations are formed based on the information available up until the end of period $t - 1$.¹⁷ The decision rule derived from the minimization of Θ_t is as follows:

$$\Delta y_t = a_0(y_{t-1}^* - y_{t-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} a_k \Delta y_{t-k} + \mathbb{E}_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} d_j \Delta y_{t+j}^* \quad (17)$$

where the coefficients entering the above decision rule are nonlinear functions of the adjustment cost parameters b_k and the discount factor β . The change in the decision variable depends on deviations from the non-stationary optimal target value, its own lagged values, and the expected infinite discounted sum of future target values. The PAC approach not only introduces persistence to the variable of interest but also creates a dependency on the future values of the target. In contrast to the quadratic cost adjustment optimization problem obtained by setting the number of lags to $m = 1$ as used in Kennan (1979) and Rotemberg (1982), the PAC generalization of the adjustment cost function permits the inclusion of higher order (frictions) derivatives by setting $m \geq 2$. This will result in a decision rule incorporating an arbitrary number of lags on the endogenous variable and lead changes in the target variable. Note that it is the lagged changes that potentially improve the short-term dynamic properties of the model and its empirical fit.

For ease of exposition, now define auxiliary variable Z_t that captures the present value forward term in PAC:

$$Z_t = \mathbb{E}_{t-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} d_j \Delta y_{t+j}^* \quad (18)$$

Under MCE, the expected path of the target variable can be directly inferred from the system-wide solution of the model.¹⁸ This is contrary to the VAR-case. While the VAR, in

¹⁷Notice that when considering PAC framework, the expectations are formed by using the information available at time $t-1$ and not at t as is was the case in the previous sections. Although it might seem that the issue of including lagged vs current information when forming expectations in the PAC based model blocks might be somewhat inconsistent, there is no clear cut arguments promoting either. By the fact that all right hand side variables of (16) and subsequently of (17) are formed based on the same filtration, inconsistency is not present (Laubach and Reifschneider (2003)).

¹⁸Under VAR-based expectations in the original model, Z_t is expressed as $Z_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} d_j \iota H^{j+1} x_{t-1} = h' x_{t-1}$, where coefficient vector h' is a non-linear function of VAR matrix H , discount factor β and a_k coefficients. x are the VAR variables which are a subset of the full model variable set. ι is a selection vector that picks variables in x that are considered to be relevant for the imperfect information set under which the VAR-forecast is formed.

principle, may be considered a sufficient statistic representation of the full model, expectations are still formed with a restricted information set. In certain applications, such as the analysis of permanent policy change effects, this may result in persistent expectation errors under the VAR-setup (see, for example, [Brayton et al. \(2000\)](#)).

Now, the solution under MCE requires to rewrite the infinite sum in (18) into a recursive finite-lead representation in terms of Z_t and Δy_t^* , a discount factor β and the polynomial coefficients α_i which are recoverable from the estimated coefficients a_i ¹⁹. After some algebraic manipulations one can derive the MCE representation of the PAC expectation term:

$$Z_t = - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \beta^i Z_{t+i} + a_0 \left(\Delta y_t^* - \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \sum_{j=k}^{m-1} \alpha_{j+1} \beta^{j+1} \Delta y_{t+k}^* \right) \quad (19)$$

Note that this setup allows to retain the estimated parameters α , which have been estimated under the VAR expectation assumption. It also allows for a convenient switching between VAR-expectations and MCE depending on how Z_t is determined. Since the adjustment costs feature in many model blocks, the researcher may conveniently decide between hybrid expectation setups, where some sector adjustment can follow VAR-based expectations and others MCE.

2.4 Dynare’s computational environment for ECB-(RE)BASE

All the model’s simulations and estimates are carried out using Dynare’s new features. Dynare provides commands to define the backward auxiliary model used to form expectations, `var_model` and `trend_component_model`²⁰, by targeting a set of equations in the `model` block. Any expected variable in the model can be computed using the auxiliary model, provided that the variable to be expected is part of the auxiliary model and that the expectation operator is applied directly to the variable²¹. This is done by defining an expectation model with the `var_expectation_model` command. It refers to a previously defined auxiliary model and allows setting the anticipated variable and the expectation horizon. Then, in the `model` block we can use the `var_expectation` keyword, which must be linked to an expectation model, as a replacement for a forward variable.

¹⁹With $\alpha_{m-1} = a_{m-1}$, $\alpha_i = -\Delta a_i$ for $i = 2, \dots, m-2$ and $\alpha_1 = a_0 - a_1 - 1$.

²⁰See the reference manual, [Adjemian et al. \(2024\)](#), for a full description of these commands and those introduced below. Note that, except for the PAC equation, all the estimation routines are undocumented.

²¹The latter condition differs from what is assumed by default in Dynare, where the conditional expectation applies to the entire (non-linear) equation.

We use this approach for all expectations, including those not related to PAC equations.

Dynare also provides commands related to the target and the anticipations in the PAC equation. In the simplest situation, where the target of the PAC equation is a single non-stationary variable, y^* in equation (17), Dynare automatically identifies the target by parsing the error correction term. This is the case for all the ECB-(RE)BASE PAC equations, but composite targets are also allowed²²: the target is then a linear combination of non-stationary and stationary variables. The command `pac_model` defines the model for a PAC equation. For VAR-based expectations, the PAC model must be linked to a previously defined auxiliary model. If this reference is not given, Dynare understands that the expectations must be model consistent (MCE), as in equation (19). This command is also used to set the discount factor and, if necessary, defines the correction for growth neutrality. Once the PAC model has been defined, we can substitute the operator `pac_expectation` for Z_t in the notation above. Dynare replaces it with an auxiliary variable, whose definition can be either (19) or the VAR-forecast, depending on whether there is a link to an auxiliary model in the PAC model, and computes the necessary parameters (parameters α_k or vector h).

The PAC equations are estimated under VAR-based forecasts. The estimation of the autoregressive parameters a_k ($k = 0, \dots, m$) is not obvious since the vector h in the VAR depends nonlinearly on the autoregressive parameters. In the literature, this equation is typically estimated through iterated Ordinary Least Squares (as in FRB/US). However, Dynare also permits estimation of this equation using Nonlinear Least Squares (NLS), which is the favored approach here.

The simulation of the model uses simulation routines specialized either for backward models if all the expectations are VAR-based, or relying on the perfect foresight solvers or extended path simulation routine if some expectations are model-consistent. Note that Dynare can reduce computation time by exploiting the property that each equation of the semi-structural model is written as an endogenous variable equal to an expression.

²²See the commands `pac_target_info` and `pac_target_nonstationary` in [Adjemian et al. \(2024\)](#).

3 Monetary Policy Transmission Across Alternative Expectations

This section explores how transmission dynamics change by incorporating model-consistent expectations in the model economy. We focus on investigating the propagation of monetary policy shocks, as they are a major driver of economic variation and are of key interest for central bank’s model-based analysis.

All simulations are conducted relative to a baseline. Initially, we establish the model’s balanced-growth path (BGP) by executing a sufficiently long simulation of the respective version of the model, ensuring that the system settles at constant growth rates. Consequently, the growth rates of stationary variables become zero, while those of non-stationary variables align with their theoretical long-run growth rates. The initial simulation periods, where the system has not yet stabilized, are discarded. Thereafter, any further simulations can be performed around this stable BGP.

3.1 Alternative Expectations Settings

In the following analysis, we implement a shock of identical magnitude in the model economy while sequentially switching the expectation settings of various sectors to the MCE version. Table 1 provides an overview of the modalities we consider. Between the pure VAR expectations setting and the Full MCE, there exists a spectrum of hybrid expectation settings. In the context of examining the effects of monetary policy, these hybrids may prove useful as they reflect the degree to which certain sectors understand policy signals. For instance, [Bernanke et al. \(2019\)](#) use expectation settings where the private sector is backward-looking, serving as a stand-in for imperfect credibility of policy shifts. Conversely, simulations under the Full MCE setting, i.e. rational expectations, are related to full credibility.

First, we consider the scenario where only the financial sector is forward-looking. As argued by [Bernanke et al. \(2019\)](#), financial markets may be perceived as having greater incentives, expertise, and resources to comprehend and evaluate the implications of monetary policy. This setting is particularly relevant when policy shifts are considered temporary, requiring significant effort to discern their consequences. While households and non-financial firms may choose to fully invest resources only in the case of more permanent changes.

Then, we consider the supply-side, and therefore the nominal sphere, as forward-looking. This can be motivated by goods-producing firms possessing comparatively more means and incentives to understand policy changes than households. In this sequence, households and therefore consumers are least likely to be forward-looking. Switching income evaluations to MCE can be thought of as extending rational expectations to this sector as well. Finally, all transmission dynamics (PAC) are adjusted to be forward-looking in the Full MCE setting.

Sectors adhering to VAR expectations form future expectations based on past regularities. This may serve as a reasonable approximation of the true model during normal times, but the Full MCE is likely to yield significantly different insights when analyzing shifts during specific crises or non-linearities, such as the Lower Bound period on interest rates (Reifschneider and Roberts (2006)).

Table 1: The role of expectations in the model's blocks

	VAR expectations	Financial MCE	Financial + PCs MCE	Financial + PCs + income MCE	Full MCE
Exchange rate / UIP		✓	✓	✓	✓
Equity prices		✓	✓	✓	✓
Bond prices / interest rates		✓	✓	✓	✓
Wage setting			✓	✓	✓
Price setting ²³			✓	✓	✓
Permanent income				✓	✓
Household consumption PAC					✓
Business investment PAC					✓
Residential investment PAC					✓
Employment PAC					✓
House prices PAC					✓
Property income PAC					✓

Notes: The first column refers to model blocks where expectations play a role in the BASE model. The columns describe the expectation modalities considered when switching expectations. A check mark means that the VAR expectations / the backward rule of the equation in the BASE model is switched to its MCE version of (RE)BASE. PCs = Phillips curves.

²³The medium-term inflation target of the central bank remains imperfectly anchored throughout this paper. It is calibrated to be of low sensitivity with respect to current price inflation and therefore thus not influence simulations noticeably.

3.2 Simulations of Policy Shocks

Figure 2 presents impulse response functions for a standard monetary policy shock, sequentially swapping expectations from the VAR-based version to the Full MCE version (see the channels that are switched on in the overview Table 1). The economy responds to an unanticipated shock to the monetary policy rule of the model, such that the short-term interest rate increases by 100bps upon impact.

The ECB-BASE VAR-expectation response is depicted by the solid blue line. It's important to note that also in this backward-looking setting, the increase in the monetary policy rate has expectational features. The short-term interest rate is incorporated into the core VAR of ECB-BASE, thereby influencing all VAR-based expectations. Higher short-term interest rates permeate through the yield curve since the risk-free long-term rate depends on expected future short-term rates. Alongside an endogenous rise in spreads, this shift in interest rates elevates borrowing costs for households and firms, consequently dampening consumption expenditures as well as business and residential investment. The reduction in aggregate demand exerts downward pressure on nominal wages and prices via the Phillips curve mechanism. Additionally, monetary policy tightening leads to an appreciation of the exchange rate, and the resultant loss in export market shares further exacerbates the contractionary effect on economic activity.

Next, we switch the financial block of the model to MCE (represented by the dotted blue line). This results in a more abrupt repricing in the yield curve, which gradually unwinds, contrary to the hump-shaped response suggested by VAR-based expectations. This directly translates into a more moderate reaction in financing costs, which is a central propagation channel and results in a lesser decline in investment and consumption expenditures. Moreover, the revaluation of nominal assets is less negative, thereby exerting less downward pressure on consumption decisions compared to the VAR-based expectations case. In line with the dampened demand cycle, the GDP deflator also exhibits a more subdued response. The determination of the exchange rate changes with financial MCE causes the Euro to appreciate in a more front-loaded fashion, which directly impacts HICP inflation. This is due to an exchange rate repricing channel affecting imported energy, which will be discussed in more detail later. But overall, switching the financial sector to forward-looking has limited implications on the real side. This

is because a milder pass-through to financing rates under the financial MCE specification is offset by a stronger Euro appreciation triggering a worsening of the trade position.

We proceed by switching the price and wage Phillips curves to the MCE mode (illustrated by the yellow line). This model version is to be understood as an economy where firms are strongly forward looking, in addition to the financial sector, but households are not. The domestic price response is somewhat front-loaded compared to the VAR expectation case, albeit not amplified. Since the wage setting also becomes more front-loaded, income, and consequently, consumption dynamics experience some changes. Other real expenditures, however, do not exhibit substantial changes.

Finally, we switch the entire model into Full MCE mode (depicted by the red line). The transmission of the monetary policy shock becomes smoother than in the previous settings. A significant factor is the permanent income perception, which strongly influences consumption decisions. The household sector now anticipates the full future repercussions of the cycle. As a result, consumers tend to 'look through' the demand deterioration and its implications for their lifetime income. Consumption, and thus economic activity and other expenditures, are smoothed out compared to the more backward-looking expectation settings. Moreover, with all adjustment dynamics now operating in forward mode, transitions become more gradual, leading to considerable smoothing of both expenditure and output.

Permanent Income Smoothing

In the (RE)BASE model, model-consistent expectations do not amplify the effect of unexpected standard monetary policy shocks on output. Our next step is to disentangle the influence of income smoothing from the effect of smoother transition dynamics that are due to switching PAC expectations. This analysis is particularly useful as it highlights a unique feature of our model: unlike typical DSGE model specifications, consumption behavior is not driven by an Euler equation where the real interest rate directly steers consumption-saving decisions. Instead, our model focuses on empirical relationships concerning the propensity to consume from various sources of income and wealth.

To explore the significance of the permanent income channel on its own, Figure 3 illustrates another model version adding to the previous exercise. We begin with the hybrid setting where

the supply side has been switched to MCE. Then, represented by the green line, the permanent income perception only is changed to MCE. This is done without yet considering MCE in the PAC setting. The permanent income MCE accounts for more than half of the cyclical change in consumption when comparing the hybrid modality to the Full MCE modality. However, investment is not affected to the same extent. Since consumption is smoothed, the decreases in output and prices are lower - proportional to the share of consumption. The remaining difference compared to the Full MCE is attributed to transitioning the PAC specifications to a model-consistent expectation mode.

The Role of the Exchange Rate

The analysis thus far has been conducted by considering a response of the exchange rate to the interest rate differential between domestic and foreign (US) interest rates. The exchange rate channel is a crucial aspect of monetary policy transmission, and it merits to investigate it separately. The deflators for import and export prices are modeled based on domestic and external cost pressures, along with considering the role of price competition in international trade. Consequently, the exchange rate directly influences the prices at which euro area exports compete in third markets. Additionally, the model explicitly accounts for the price of oil and gas energy. The euro area is heavily reliant on energy imports, which are predominantly priced in USD. Therefore, the EUR/USD exchange rate impacts GDP deflator inflation by affecting the price of the inputs to production. The model also entails a link of HICP energy inflation to these international market prices when converted to domestic prices. Therefore, the model specifically accounts for the prominent role of household expenditures on petrol and heating.

Figure 4 begins with the VAR expectation case, where the financial sector is in MCE mode as a backward-looking benchmark version. It is plotted against the Full MCE case. There is no feedback of the global environment to changes in the euro area. An expansionary monetary policy in the euro area subsequently triggers an appreciation of the euro as domestic interest rates rise and opens the differential with unchanged foreign markets. The exchange rate response in the backward-version is notably more gradual, while the Full MCE case displays a more immediate loading with a stronger mean-reversion. This is a known feature in the literature, where the DSGE approach to specifying a UIP condition on expected exchange rate changes typically does

not lead to enough persistence to generate a hump-shaped response (Adolfson et al. (2008)).

Illustrated by lightly dotted lines, the figure demonstrates alternative economic responses under an unchanged exchange rate. This switches off the loss of export market shares and the deterioration in net trade. Output therefore declines by less. Additionally, it also switches off the endogenous repricing of energy imports quoted in domestic currency. In the endogenous model, an appreciation results in a real income gain because energy prices become cheaper. This channel mitigates the negative impact of production loss due to lower exports but does not fully compensate for it.

The significance of the exchange rate channel for output dynamics is slightly stronger under Full MCE. Given that HICP energy inflation is a significant contributor to total HICP inflation, the exchange rate more directly influences consumer prices, as opposed to the more gradual pass-through to producer's factory gate prices. Without the exchange rate channel, the differences in HICP dynamics across expectations are more akin to the dynamics of GDP deflator inflation. Overall, this channel somewhat obscures the heterogeneity of the importance of expectation settings for price developments.

Anticipation of News Shocks

A main capability of our forward-looking expectation model is its ability to analyze anticipated news shocks. It has been shown that these news shocks, in addition to surprise shocks, play a quantitatively significant role in business cycle fluctuations (Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (2012)). It has been demonstrated that theoretical models can be effectively augmented with news shocks to generate impulse responses that exhibit co-movements consistent with empirical data (Barsky and Sims (2011)).

In (RE)BASE, a news shock on the monetary policy rate is implemented as follows. The nominal short-term interest rate reacts as:

$$i_t = \beta_1 i_{t-1} + (1 - \beta_1)[\bar{i} + \beta_2 \hat{\pi}_t] + \beta_3 \Delta \pi_t + \beta_4 \Delta y_t + \epsilon_{0,t}^i + \epsilon_{1,t-1}^i + \dots \quad (20)$$

The first part of the equation is the model's Taylor rule, reflecting the interest rate's response to the inflation gap $\hat{\pi}$, the change in the inflation rate $\Delta \pi$, and output growth Δy_t . As the

simulations are conducted under perfect foresight, the model economy resolves under a known path of shocks $\epsilon_{k,t-k}^i$. It is important to note that this process is independent of how the private sector forms expectations. Technically, anticipated news shocks can be simulated across all different expectation settings. An economy relying on backward-looking information would not yet respond to a news shock related to the future. Under rational expectations in (RE)BASE, however, this information influences the mechanics as soon as the shock path becomes known, referred to as the date of announcement.

In the spectrum of credibility discussed above, this can be seen as two polar cases. If the model's expectations are fully VAR-based, then a future policy change cannot be credibly communicated, surprising the economy if it materializes. Conversely, Full MCE implies full anticipation under perfect foresight, connoting full credibility of central bank communication.

Figure 5 illustrates the model economy's responses to an announced increase in the short-term interest rate, 20 periods ahead. Under VAR expectations, the contractionary shock is a complete surprise in period 20. The model's response function is equivalent to shifting an unanticipated shock to period 20. Rational expectations active in the financial block then serve as another benchmark case. It reflects a scenario where only the financial sector understands the monetary policy shift while other sectors do not, emulating an imperfect credibility setup. The long-term interest rate reprices upon announcement at $t = 1$, leading to an immediate increase in firms' and households' borrowing costs. Investment and consumption, and thus GDP, begin to decrease even before the actual hike in the monetary policy rate. Similarly, the value of nominal financial assets also declines immediately, further weighing on consumption. Importantly, the exchange rate also reprices at the time of announcement, adding another layer of anticipation. The appreciation fuels the decrease in output through declining exports, though it also leads to a rapid decline in HICP energy prices, amplifying the response of total HICP.

In the Full MCE model, considering a fully credible policy announcement leads to price and wage dynamics that are somewhat front-loaded compared to the benchmark case. Notably, households' evaluation of permanent income becomes much smoother, with a significant decrease already during the anticipation phase. This results in consumption smoothing over the full cycle, with a stronger decrease upfront but more positive dynamics after the short-term interest rate

increase actually becomes apparent at $t = 20$.

Forward Guidance

In the previous exercise, the Taylor rule is active throughout, albeit only moderately leaning against the cyclical downturn during the anticipation phase. The steady interest rate policy, however, does not create a forward guidance puzzle in ECB-(RE)BASE. Many New Keynesian models face the phenomenon of generating explosive economic dynamics at a fixed interest rate for prolonged periods, an issue that has been of focal attention during times when the interest rate was at the Zero Lower Bound (see, e.g., [Cochrane \(2017\)](#)). Recently, [Maliar and Taylor \(2024\)](#) demonstrated that the puzzle arises at literally fixed rates as well as for policy rate rules that are insufficiently responsive to contain future shocks.

To systematically investigate the role of forward guidance in our model, we simulate exercises similar to those in [Christoffel et al. \(2022\)](#). The authors show that without mitigating the puzzle, a continuous peg of the interest rate for 10 periods creates explosive economic behavior in the New Area Wide model, a medium-scale DSGE model of the euro area. Figure 6 presents exercises conducted with (RE)BASE, where the central bank pegs the interest rate to a value 25bps below the baseline value for different durations. The economic dynamics shift proportionally to the length of the peg and do not become explosive. A major difference from other New Keynesian models is the absence of inter-temporal reallocation forces on consumption implied by an Euler equation. [Christoffel et al. \(2022\)](#) tame the forward guidance puzzle in the DSGE by introducing additional discounting and conditioning expectations on survey data. Both factors limit the importance of future stimulus implied by holding the policy rate fixed for an additional quarter. The parametrization of ECB-(RE)BASE, as a strongly data-conditioned forecast model, already displays relative dynamic stability without further interventions.

4 Recent Supply Shocks through the Lens of Alternative Expectations

In this section, we apply the model to a real-world analysis. Recent supply shocks have exerted extraordinary inflation pressures on the euro area economy. The resulting price movements were significant enough to provoke notable changes in the long-term inflation expectations of the pri-

vate sector. This situation created a trade-off for central banks: the desire to 'look-through' these supply shocks to avoid exacerbating the cyclical downturn with interest rate hikes, versus the necessity to re-anchor inflation expectations by demonstrating a firm commitment to combating above-target price pressures as they emerge. In terms of economic model interpretation, it has been shown that a full forward-looking setting implies an easier re-anchoring of inflation expectations (Beaudry et al. (2023)). Using (RE)BASE, we aim to explore how different expectations frameworks might lead to varying assessments of the trade-off between price stability and output that the central bank faces.

4.1 Scenario Design: Shock Calibrations

We construct a supply-shock scenario that is reminiscent of key characteristics of the recent inflation surge period. The scenario focuses solely on supply shocks. The scenario is designed as follows: we activate three types of residuals to create a supply-shock scenario. Their contributions to the price increases and resulting macroeconomic dynamics through the model (considering VAR-expectations) are documented in Figure 7.

First, we employ a stylized productivity shock that reduces potential GDP by approximately 2% from the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic. The shock aims to illustrate a contribution of the pandemic-induced supply-side pressures on prices. That may entail production and delivery bottlenecks as well as legacy effects from the lockdowns and containment policies on capacity. In order to calibrate this shock, we refer to the findings of Angelini et al. (2020), who introduced a pandemic module into ECB-BASE allowing to study the interaction of the macro-economy when individuals are exposed, infected and recovered (SIR) from the Covid-19 virus. According to this study, around 45% of the cumulative output loss during the pandemic is reflected into potential output. In our exercise, we illustratively assume a 4% decrease in the level of output persisting even after the pandemic health crisis subsides.

Secondly, the scenario incorporates energy price shocks. These shocks are modeled by adjusting the path of imported oil prices to match the observed increase in HICP energy inflation in the euro area starting as of 2021Q1.²⁴ This profile is matched until the end of our simula-

²⁴See Table 2 for an overview of the data targeted in this scenario.

tion horizon, 2023Q4. The oil price also has a path-through to the GDP deflator in the model, capturing the effects of imported carbon energy sources used as inputs to production. Since our scenario targets HICP energy prices, we effectively capture a general imported energy price increase, which was largely due to elevated gas prices during this episode. The oil price shock mainly transmits as a loss of real income, and consequently, as a loss in purchasing power, leading to decreased consumption, production, and other expenditures. The central bank adjusts interest rate policies to stabilize the gap between GDP deflator growth and the target rate.

While the productivity shock contributes to the inflation surge scenario at a limited extent, adding the energy price shock would result in an increase in GDP deflator inflation comparable to what was observed in actual data. Overall, this initial combination would account for approximately half of the HICP inflation increase above the central bank target rate noted from 2021Q3 to 2023Q4. To complete the scenario, we introduce a shock that matches the remaining GDP deflator and HICP inflation deviations in the data through markup shocks. The markup shocks directly shift the GDP deflator (changing the residual of the main Phillips curve pricing equation) and the HICP excluding energy and food inflation. These shocks further contribute to price increases, triggering additional losses in real disposable income and leading to a further decline in consumption.

4.2 Supply Shocks across Expectation Settings

in this section, we keep the sequence of shocks fixed, but re-simulate the model under backward expectation with financial sector being forward-looking and under Full MCE. Figure 8 displays the main simulations as dashed blue line and solid red lines. Each simulation displayed is created by the same combination of shock sequences constructed above. The interested reader is referred to the working paper: [Adjemian et al. \(2024\)](#) for a systematic documentation of switching the expectations for each shock separately.

We begin with a backward-expectations setting, where only the financial sector is forward looking and forms rational expectations. We assume an endogenous monetary policy where the nominal short-term interest rate starts to rise at the first signs of price increases from the pandemic leg of the scenario. The other shocks regarding energy and domestic price markups

unexpectedly impact the economy as of 2021Q3. The short-term interest rate then adjust accordingly, and spills into the yield curve. Due to anticipation in the financial sector, the long-term interest rates reflect the expected repricing of the short-term rate path at the beginning of the markup shock sequence. The private sector gradually perceives the real income loss implied by the price increase, causing the consumption path to adjust correspondingly.

When simulating the inflation surge scenario under Full MCE, the markup shocks lead to a significantly larger price increase because the Phillips curve expectations front-load the nominal implications. With endogenous monetary policy, this would necessitate a quicker and more pronounced rise in interest rates. Furthermore, households anticipate and front-load the perceived real income loss. Overall, households sharply reduce their consumption under the Full MCE setting, resulting in a more pronounced decline in GDP compared to the backward expectations scenario.

Finally, the same inflation surge scenario can also be evaluated under stronger anticipation assumptions. In the simulations represented by the dotted lines in Figure 8, we input the same sequence of shocks as previously constructed into the model but now assume that the economy fully anticipates the effects as early as Q1 2020. This illustrates a highly forward-looking extreme case where the pricing pressures are anticipated immediately following the pandemic's opening phase. Under backward expectations, there is no significant economic difference between anticipation and no anticipation. However, under Full MCE, the price shock sequences result in a more gradual inflation increase, with price growth peaking below the initial scenario's peak for Full MCE. Households' decisions are then influenced more immediately as they assess the post-pandemic inflation surge's implications for their real income early on. The central bank would also begin to tighten policy gradually, in foresight of price pressures building up in the economy.

In summary, these scenario exercises confirm that model-consistent expectations can significantly alter the cyclical properties viewed through the lens of the model, with critical implications for policy assessment. The cases presented are exemplary for some alternative economic repercussion that central bank may distill when assessing the implications of supply shocks. To make recommendations for policy, timing, anticipation, speed of adjustments to supply shocks

all matter. Our experiments are also consistent with findings in the literature that, if the monetary authority had full knowledge about the economic conditions prevailing from 2021 onward, optimal strategies may have called for anticipated hiking of interest rates in response to the increase in inflation (see [Darracq Pariès et al. \(2024\)](#)).

5 Conclusion


ECB-(RE)BASE is developed as part of the semi-structural model family around ECB-BASE/MC. It is a variant of the euro area model ECB-BASE that can be simulated under a model-consistent expectation setting. Our implementation allows for the integration of different expectation settings in different parts of the model economy. A key technical challenge of ECB-(RE)BASE regards the treatment of adjustment costs, which determine the sluggishness of macroeconomic transmissions.

We have shown that the expectation setting can significantly influence the transmission of monetary policy shocks through the model economy. MCE leads to a dampening of monetary policy transmission to the real side of the economy because the modelling of gradual adjustment forces and the prominence of expected life-time income dominates any implications of the financial sector being forward-looking. MCE also leads to a front-loading of HICP responses due to the exchange rate effect on imported energy. Policy announcements lead to partial anticipation of economic dynamics if credibly understood by the private sector.

Additionally, we have illustrated the implications of expectation settings for macroeconomic volatility through an applied experiment. The markup and negative productivity shocks that have driven up inflation in recent years result in stronger nominal amplifications when assessed through a model with model-consistent expectations compared to a backward-setting. Anticipation of shocks increases the complexity of the inflation-output trade-off because the speed and persistence of transmission to the real and to the nominal side may differ substantially.


This information is crucial for the conduct of monetary policy. If the private sector is highly forward-looking, the same sequence of shocks may trigger more pronounced inflation cycles. Consequently, monetary policy needs to respond proactively to effectively limit price pressures while minimizing negative impacts on output.

Figure 2: Monetary policy shock (100bps) - Switching expectations in sectors




Notes: Responses to an unanticipated increase in the short-term nominal interest rate by 100bps. All simulations are conditioned on the term premium and financing spreads being fixed to their baseline values. The horizontal axis shows time in quarters. The vertical axis depicts short- and long-term interest rates as annualized p.p. deviation from the baseline value. GDP deflator inflation and HICP inflation is shown in p.p. deviation from the baseline year-on-year growth rate. All other variables are in percent deviation from their baseline levels.

Figure 3: Monetary policy shock (100bps) - The role of income smoothing




Notes: Responses to an unanticipated increase in the short-term nominal interest rate by 100bps. All simulations are conditioned on the term premium and financing spreads being fixed to their baseline values. The horizontal axis shows time in quarters. The vertical axis depicts short- and long-term interest rates as annualized p.p. deviation from the baseline value. GDP deflator inflation and HICP inflation is shown in p.p. deviation from the baseline year-on-year growth rate. All other variables are in percent deviation from their baseline levels.

Figure 4: Monetary policy shock (100bps) - The role of the exchange rate channel




Notes: Responses to an unanticipated increase in the short-term nominal interest rate by 100bps. All simulations are conditioned on the term premium and financing spreads being fixed to their baseline values. The horizontal axis shows time in quarters. The vertical axis depicts short- and long-term interest rates as annualized p.p. deviation from the baseline value. GDP deflator inflation and HICP inflation is shown in p.p. deviation from the baseline year-on-year growth rate. All other variables are in percent deviation from their baseline levels.

Figure 5: Monetary policy shock (100bps) - Anticipated news shock




Notes: Responses to an announced increase in the short-term nominal interest rate by 100bps, 20 periods in the future, across expectation settings. All simulations are conditioned on the term premium and financing spreads being fixed to their baseline values. The horizontal axis shows time in quarters. The vertical axis depicts short- and long-term interest rates as annualized p.p. deviation from the baseline value. GDP deflator inflation and HICP inflation is shown in p.p. deviation from the baseline year-on-year growth rate. All other variables are in percent deviation from their baseline levels.

Figure 6: Forward Guidance - Peg of the policy rate (-25bps) for multiple periods



Notes: Responses to an anticipated and credible peg of the short-term nominal interest rate by 25bps below the baseline value for multiple periods. Expectations modality: Full MCE. All simulations are conditioned on the term premium and financing spreads being fixed to their baseline values. The horizontal axis shows time in quarters. The vertical axis depicts short- and long-term interest rates as annualized p.p. deviation from the baseline value. GDP deflator inflation and HICP inflation is shown in p.p. deviation from the baseline year-on-year growth rate. All other variables are in percent deviation from their baseline levels.

Figure 7: Construction of a supply-shock scenario - VAR expectations




Notes: Pandemic productivity shock is simulated as of 2020Q1, while the other shocks are assumed to arise as of 2021Q3. HICP, HICP energy and GDP deflator inflation is shown in p.p. deviation from the year-on-year growth in the baseline. The data is shown as deviation to a 2pp baseline growth rate. The short-term interest rate is shown as annualized p.p. deviation from the baseline value. All other variables are in percent deviation from their baseline level values.

Table 2: Data sources in the construction of the scenario

Observable	Raw metric	SDW codes	Further treatment
HICP inflation	Annual rate of change	ICP.M.U2.N.000000.4.ANR	Seasonally adjusted, quarterly average
HICP energy inflation	Annual rate of change	ICP.M.U2.N.NRGY00.4.ANR	Seasonally adjusted, quarterly average
GDP deflator inflation	Index	MNA.Q.Y.I9.W2.S1.S1.B.B1GQ.Z.Z.Z.IX.D.N	Annual rate of change

Source: SDW (ECB Statistical Data warehouse).

Figure 8: Macroeconomic dynamics in the supply shock scenario across expectation modalities



Notes: Responses to the same sequence of shocks, as constructed in Figure 7, across alternative expectation settings. In the first two simulations, the energy and domestic markup shocks are known to the economy as of 2021Q3. In the simulations labeled 'early anticipation', the energy and domestic markup shocks are anticipated as of 2020Q1 even if they materialize in 2021Q3. All simulations are conditioned on the exchange rate, the term premium and financing spreads being fixed to their baseline values. The graph depicts short- and long-term interest rates as annualized p.p. deviation from the baseline value. GDP deflator inflation and HICP inflation is shown in p.p. deviation from the baseline year-on-year growth rate. All other variables are in percent deviation from their baseline levels.

References

- Adjemian, S., N. Bokan, M. Darracq Pariès, G. Müller, and S. Zimic (2024). ECB-(RE)BASE: Heterogeneity in expectation formation and macroeconomic dynamics. Working Paper Series 2965, European Central Bank.
- Adjemian, S., M. Juillard, F. Karamé, W. Mutschler, J. Pfeifer, M. Ratto, N. Rion, and S. Villmot (2024). Dynare: Reference Manual, Version 6. Dynare Working Papers 80, CEPREMAP.
- Adolfson, M., S. Laséen, J. Lindé, and M. Villani (2008). Evaluating an estimated new keynesian small open economy model. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 32(8), 2690–2721.
- Angelini, E., N. Bokan, K. Christoffel, M. Ciccarelli, and S. Zimic (2019). Introducing ECB-BASE: The blueprint of the new ECB semi-structural model for the euro area. Working Paper Series 2315, European Central Bank.
- Angelini, E., M. Damjanović, M. Darracq Pariès, and S. Zimic (2020). ECB-BASIR: a primer on the macroeconomic implications of the covid-19 pandemic. Working Paper Series 2431, European Central Bank.
- Barsky, R. B. and E. R. Sims (2011). News shocks and business cycles. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 58(3), 273–289.
- Beaudry, P., T. J. Carter, and A. Lahiri (2023). The central bank’s dilemma: Look through supply shocks or control inflation expectations? Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bernanke, B. (2024). Forecasting for monetary policy making and communication: A review. Technical report, Bank of England.
- Bernanke, B. S., M. T. Kiley, and J. M. Roberts (2019). Monetary policy strategies for a low-rate environment. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* 109, 421–26.
- Brayton, F., M. Davis, and P. Tulip (2000). Polynomial Adjustment Costs in the FRB-US. mimeo, Federal Reserve Bank.

- Brayton, F., T. Laubach, and D. L. Reifschneider (2014). The FRB/US model: A tool for macroeconomic policy analysis. FEDS Notes 2014-04-03, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (U.S.).
- Brayton, F., E. Mauskop, D. Reifschneider, and P. Tinsley (1997). The role of expectations in the FRB/US macroeconomic model. *Federal Reserve Bulletin* 83, 227.
- Brayton, F. and P. Tinsley (1996). A Guide to FRB/US: A Macroeconomic Model of the United States. Finance and economics discussion series, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
- Christoffel, K., F. Mazelis, C. Montes-Galdón, and T. Müller (2022). Disciplining expectations and the forward guidance puzzle. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 137(C).
- Chung, H., J.-P. Laforte, D. Reifschneider, and J. C. Williams (2012). Have we underestimated the likelihood and severity of zero lower bound events? *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 44(s1), 47–82.
- Cochrane, J. H. (2017). The new-keynesian liquidity trap. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 92, 47–63.
- Darracq Pariès, M., A. Kornprobst, and R. Priftis (2024). Monetary policy strategies to navigate post-pandemic inflation: an assessment using the ECB’s New Area-Wide Model. Working Paper Series 2935, European Central Bank.
- Fuller, R. and C.-C. Hsia (1984). A simplified common stock valuation model. *Financial Analysts Journal* September.
- Kennan, J. (1979). The estimation of partial adjustment models with rational expectations. *Econometrica* 47(6), 1441–1455.
- Kiley, M. and J. Roberts (2017). Monetary policy in a low interest rate world. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 317–372.
- Laubach, T. and D. Reifschneider (2003). Household consumption and investment in the FRB/US model. Note, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

- Maliar, L. and J. B. Taylor (2024). Odyssean forward guidance in normal times. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 165, 104877.
- Reifschneider, D. and J. C. Williams (2000). Three lessons for monetary policy in a low-inflation era. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 32(4), 936–966.
- Reifschneider, D. L. and J. M. Roberts (2006). Expectations formation and the effectiveness of strategies for limiting the consequences of the zero bound. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 20(3), 314–337.
- Rotemberg, J. J. (1982). Monopolistic Price Adjustment and Aggregate Output. *The Review of Economic Studies* 49(4), 517–531.
- Schmitt-Grohé, S. and M. Uribe (2012). What’s news in business cycles. *Econometrica* 80(6), 2733–2764.
- Slobodyan, S. and R. Wouters (2012). Learning in an estimated medium-scale dsge model. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 36(1), 26–46.
- Tetlow, R. J. (2022). How Large is the Output Cost of Disinflation? Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2022-079, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (U.S.).
- Tinsley, P. A. (2002). Rational error correction. *Computational economics* 19, 197–225.
- Warne, A. (2023). DSGE model forecasting: rational expectations vs. adaptive learning. Working Paper Series 2768, European Central Bank.
- Woodford, M. (2001). Fiscal requirements for price stability. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 33(3), 669–728.