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1. Use of macroprudential measures around the world
   - Based on the IMF Annual Macroprudential Policy Survey

2. New IMF research on the effectiveness of macroprudential tools
   - Based on a new integrated macroprudential database
Use of macroprudential measures around the world
Countries are using the whole range of tools....

Total number of tools: 1,560
Average number of tools: 10.2

- Broad based tools: (17%) 262
- Household sector tools: (23%) 355
- Corporate sector tools: (8%) 127
- Liquidity and FX tools: (32%) 494
- Nonbank tools: (9%) 146
- Structural tools: (11%) 176

Source: IMF Macropudential Policy Survey Database. Note: Numbers denote frequency of measures reported; percentages denote the share among total measures reported.
... often using a variety of tools for the household sector

Source: IMF Macroprudential Policy Survey Database.
Note: Numbers denote frequency of measures reported; percentages denote the share among total measures reported.
### Use of CCyB: still room for further action

- 73 jurisdictions indicated the existence of a CCyB framework, however, only relatively few countries have set a positive buffer rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Current buffer</th>
<th>Effective date</th>
<th>Pending buffer</th>
<th>Effective date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong SAR</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: ESRB, BIS, IMF Macroprudential Policy Survey.
New IMF research on the effectiveness of macroprudential policy
New IMF research on the effectiveness of macroprudential policy

Digging Deeper into the quantitative effects of macroprudential policy

- Presents a new database and digs deeper into the quantitative effects of macroprudential policies—in particular for borrower-based tools

Macroprudential policy helps limit growth-at-risk

- Gelos, Brandao Marques, Nier (forthcoming)
- Easing financial conditions can put GDP at risk; macroprudential policy can mitigate those risks while monetary policy is less useful
Digging deeper into the quantitative effects of LTV caps

**Effects of a LTV-tightening**¹
(Cumulative effects of a one percentage point tightening after four quarters)

- Real household credit growth: -0.65*** ppt
- Real private consumption growth: -0.15* ppt

**Do initial LTV limits matter?**²
(Cumulative effects of a 1-ppt LTV tightening conditioning on the initial LTV level)

- Loose LTV levels: -0.173 ppt
- Tight LTV levels: -0.082 ppt

- LTV tightening is **effective** in reducing household credit growth, and side-effects on consumption growth are limited...
- ... however, **initial LTV levels matter**...
- ... hence a **portfolio approach** is preferred where LTV limits are complemented with other measures

---

¹ Effects of a one-ppt LTV tightening where the overall tightening is less than 10 ppt—obtained by the augmented inverse propensity-score weighted estimation. ² Estimated by the fixed effects estimation with the timing assumption. "Loose LTV levels" refers to greater or equal to 100 percent and 90 percent in AEs and EMs, respectively. Source: Alam et al. (2019).
Growth at Risk—intertemporal trade-off between financial conditions and downside risk

Loose FC lead to buildup in financial vulnerabilities (Adrian and others, 2019)

Source: Adrian and others (2018)
Can macroprudential and other policies improve trade-offs in response to financial shocks?

- Tightening MPM (red line) when financial conditions loosen (blue line) mitigates negative GaR (20th percentile).
- Need to look at entire distribution of future outcomes
- Examine different policies and compare
- Macroprudential policies appear to be effective

![Marginal effect of FCI shocks on GaR (e.g., 20th percentile cumulative GDP growth)](source: Brandao-Marques, Gelos, Narita, and Nier (forthcoming)).
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