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Abstract

This study develops and applies a macroeconomic framework to ascertain the influence of domestic disequilibria and external shocks on inflation dynamics in Uzbekistan. Using quarterly data for the period 1994:01 to 2000:03, the study estimates several “long-run” relationships for the goods, money, and foreign exchange markets of Uzbekistan, which are characterized by multiple exchange rates, import restrictions, and other domestic administrative controls. The empirical estimates, which use error correction mechanisms for different markets, show that domestic monetary and output developments, and changes in the official exchange rate vis-à-vis the parallel market rate have had a significant influence on the short-run behavior of the foreign exchange market in Uzbekistan. Furthermore, disequilibria in the product and money markets are the major forces driving short-run inflation dynamics in Uzbekistan. It should be noted that the study has been constrained by both the quantity and the quality of quarterly data available for the Uzbekistan economy.
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Market Disequilibria and Inflation in Uzbekistan, 1994-2000

This study is intended to develop and apply a macroeconomic framework to ascertain the influence of domestic disequilibria and external shocks on inflation dynamics in Uzbekistan. Using quarterly data for the period 1994:01 to 2000:03, the study estimates several “long-run” relationships for the goods, money, and foreign exchange markets of Uzbekistan, characterized by multiple exchange rates, import restrictions, and other domestic administrative controls. The empirical estimates, which use error correction mechanisms for different markets, show that domestic monetary and output developments, and changes in the relationship between the curb market and official exchange rates have a significant influence on the foreign exchange market dynamics in Uzbekistan. Furthermore, the results of the study suggest that disequilibria in the product and money markets are the major forces driving inflation dynamics in Uzbekistan. While disequilibria in the parallel market themselves do not seem to be a factor in price increases, the ratio of the curb market exchange rate to the official rate seems to exert a significant influence. One can infer that an important consideration here is the speed and the magnitude of adjustment of the official exchange rate in the face of disequilibria in the parallel market for foreign exchange.

The macroeconomic framework underlying the analysis assumes that the Uzbekistan economy is “small” relative to the rest of the world. Thus terms of trade shocks and effects of international financial flows pass through to the economy mainly via the exchange rate, especially the parallel market rate. The financial system is dominated by state-owned banks, which are operating under fixed interest rates, administratively determined exchange rates (both the official and commercial bank rates, until May 2000), and which have limited access to financial assets for investment. Given these considerations, we specify a model that attempts to capture the “long-run” behavior of the money, foreign exchange and goods markets. We then use the “long-run” equations to analyze the impact of market disequilibria on the dynamic behavior of money, exchange rate and prices.\(^2\)

\(^2\) This is the familiar small country assumption.
The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 starts with a comparative analysis of the inflation and stabilization experiences of a number of transition economies. Section 2 gives a brief description of the recent developments in Uzbekistan’s economy that provides the setting for the economic relationships considered in the study. Section 3 is devoted to the presentation of the long-run relationships for each of the markets: money market, foreign exchange market, and goods market. The time series properties of the variables used in the study are presented in section 4 followed by the empirical estimates of the equations in section 5. Section 6 contains a number of concluding remarks.

Section 1: Inflation and Stabilization in Transition Economies

A comparative study of inflation and stabilization in Eastern Europe (see, Stanley Fischer and Ratna Sahay (2000)) revealed that most countries entered the transition process with a monetary overhang and the urgent need for price liberalization. Stabilization packages were put in place in 25 countries by the year 1995. The extent of the monetary overhang and the timing (delays) of the initiation of a stabilization program had an effect on the extent of pre-stabilization inflation, which varied from 57000 percent per annum in Georgia to 26 percent in Hungary (see table 1).

It appears that inflation stabilization was one of the key successes of the transition process. At the time of liberalizing prices, countries were concerned with possibilities of inflation spirals and ever rising wage demands. In view of these concerns, most stabilization programs included tight monetary and credit policies, wage controls, and policies for non-inflationary sources of financing the budget deficits.

By the year 2001, inflation had been brought down to single digits, except in the cases of Belarus, Romania, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. An important consideration in the initial stabilization strategy was the choice of exchange rate regime. The Central and Eastern European Countries (CEE) and the Baltics chose a mix of fixed regimes (Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia) and flexible regimes (Albania, Bulgaria, FYR Macedonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, and

---

¹ For this purpose, an error correction formulation is used.
Slovenia). Apparently, countries with a currency board (i.e. Bulgaria, Estonia, and Lithuania) have had impressive inflation control performances.

Although many former Soviet Union countries (FSU) had announced their regimes as flexible, most were actually pegged to the US dollar or the Deutsche Mark after commencement of the stabilization program. Several countries introduced monetary reforms and new currencies. With the exchange rates explicitly or implicitly fixed, there was a rapid decline in inflation towards the latter part of the 1990s.

In recent times, most countries have moved to a flexible exchange rate regime. The move from pegs to more flexible regimes had been prompted, among other things, by considerations of easing the pressure on exchange rates. The case of Russia demonstrates the dangers of not exiting to a more flexible regime in time in the backdrop of unsustainable fiscal policies and high capital mobility.

Uzbekistan launched a comprehensive stabilization and structural reform program in late 1994. However, the country seems to have adopted a somewhat different approach than most FSU countries. In early 1997, the progress in liberalizing the foreign exchange and trade regime was reversed and a system of multiple exchange rates and restrictions on current account transactions was introduced with the objective of promoting import-substituting industries and conserving foreign exchange reserves. In the current study, we give explicit consideration to the exchange rate regime, the money market conditions, and the output gaps that jointly determined the inflation experience of Uzbekistan. In the following section, we begin with a brief analysis of the overall developments and policy approaches of Uzbekistan.
Section 2. Recent Developments in the Uzbekistan Economy

Since its independence in 1991, Uzbekistan, a successor state of the former Soviet Union (FSU) in Central Asia, has followed a unique path to economic transition. At the time of independence, the country’s relatively rich resource endowment, low degree of over-industrialization and trade dependence, large share of agriculture in aggregate output, and the predominance of cotton and other raw materials in exports, pointed to a relatively better transition path (in comparison with other FSU countries) to a market-based system. However, rather than emphasize economic growth, the government has sought to promote stability. This goal is pursued by subsidizing employment, controlling prices on essential items, privatizing large enterprises gradually, and attempting to attain self-sufficiency in energy and food supplies. Although no clear characterization of this strategy exists, it could be broadly considered as some form of “gradualism” to economic transition.

The transition process in Uzbekistan has so far been rather uneven (see, World Bank(1999)) and can be described as a case of stop-go on transition reforms. In this respect, beginning in early 1992, Uzbekistan has evolved through three different transition phases, which are very different from each other in terms of macroeconomic policies followed by the government, progress made in the implementation of market-oriented reforms, and stability of the macroeconomic situation. During the first phase, covering the period 1992-93, the government seemed to have followed rather loose macroeconomic policies, the implementation of market-oriented reforms was limited in scope and slow, and the macroeconomic imbalances inherited from the FSU deteriorated markedly. During the second phase, which covered the period from early 1994 to the 3rd quarter of 1996, macroeconomic performance improved considerably perhaps as a result of the tightening of financial policies and the acceleration of many market-oriented reforms. The third phase covers the period from the 4th quarter of 1996 to the present, and is characterized by occasional loosening of macroeconomic policies, a reversal of some key reforms while maintaining sustained progress in others, and the worsening of the external imbalances. The macroeconomic situation continued to be difficult during the year 2000 as a result of low gold prices, large debt service payments, and the overvalued and exchange rate system. Nevertheless, On May 1, 2000, the official and commercial
bank foreign exchange rates against the US dollar were unified at the level of the commercial bank rate, which reduced the spread between the new official rate and the curb market rate. In the year 2000, high interest payments led to a marginal deterioration in the current account of the balance of payments in spite of a marginal improvement in the trade balance. A drop in tax revenues and an increase in current expenditures led to a deterioration in the budget deficit.

Section 3. Long-run Relationships

The long-run relationships in the product, money, and foreign exchange markets are considered in the backdrop of the “gradualist” transition path followed by Uzbekistan, which has essentially remained a rather “controlled” economy.

The Money Market

The money market equation attempts to incorporate a number of important characteristics of Uzbekistan’s financial system: i.e. severely limited scope of markets, instruments confined to money, real assets, and foreign exchange, fixing of nominal interest rates under high inflation conditions, a substantial influence exerted by the parallel market exchange rate on the degree of asset substitution. The “long-run” money demand for Uzbekistan can be specified as follows:

\[ M = a \cdot y^b \cdot PAR^c \cdot P^d \]  

(1)

where: 

- \( M \) - nominal money supply
- \( y \) - real GDP
- \( PAR \) - parallel market exchange rate
- \( P \) - domestic price level.

In the empirical work of this study, the parallel market exchange rate was expressed in terms of local currency units per US dollar.
The parameters $a, b, c, d > 0$

Taking logarithms, we can write the real demand for money as\footnote{This specification assumes homogeneity between money and prices ($d=1$)}

$$m-p = a + b \cdot y - c \cdot \text{par} \quad (2)$$

Foreign Exchange Market

To develop a market-clearing model for foreign exchange, two equations relating to supply and demand are postulated. On the supply side, exports, foreign borrowing and changes in external reserves are important elements. On the demand side, the important components are imports and currency substitution. Imports depend on the level of domestic expenditures (absorption) and the real exchange rate while the demand for currency substitution can be depicted as a function of excess money supply.

Assuming that the “long-run” excess money supply is equal to zero (that is, $(M^s - M^d)=0$), the equilibrium condition for the foreign exchange market can be written as follows:

$$fex = a_1 - b_1 \cdot \text{rer} + b_2 \cdot \text{rde} \quad (3)$$

where the parameters $b_1, b_2 > 0$

$fex$ - foreign exchange supply (demand)

$rer$ - real exchange rate

$rde$ - real domestic expenditures.

In principle, this equation can be written in terms of the logarithm of the nominal exchange rate by incorporating appropriate relative price terms (as proxies for the real exchange rate). Thus, with all lower case variables in logarithms, we have:

$$\text{par} = a_2 - b_3 \cdot \text{fex} + b_4 \cdot \text{rde} + b_5 \cdot \text{pd} - b_6 \cdot \text{pm} \quad (4)$$
During the period of the current study (1994-2000), Uzbekistan maintained extensive foreign exchange and trade controls that aimed at preserving foreign exchange for servicing the country’s external debt obligations. The multiple official exchange rates (official and commercial bank rates) remained at substantially appreciated levels as a consequence of which the demand for foreign exchange at the “official” rate far exceeded the supply. The “unmet” demand for foreign exchange for both current and capital transactions was channeled to the parallel market, exerting considerable pressure on the parallel market premium. Since the public sector is officially barred from utilizing the parallel market, it is clear that the parallel market premium does not reflect the “unmet” foreign exchange demands of the public sector. The gap between the observed parallel market exchange rate and the “unrestricted” equilibrium exchange rate (which is unobserved in the present case) can be considered as a measure of the degree of restrictions on public sector import demand that is excluded from the parallel market in the current administrative set-up.

The Goods Market

Following the expectations-augmented version of the Phillips curve, inflationary expectations and the departure of output from its potential level determine the inflation rate. In this formulation, if output (demand) is higher than the potential level, inflation will tend to rise, and if actual output is below potential, inflation will tend to fall. One implication of the formulation is that in the steady state (where the output gap is zero) inflation will tend to remain constant. In addition, taking explicit note of imbalances in the money and foreign exchange markets, the basic model can be written as follows:

It is probably correct to say that the Phillips curve approach is a central element in most models of inflation (Nickell, (1988); Masson, Symansky, and Meredith (1990); Chada, Masson and Meredith (1992)).

In standard macroeconomics (for example, see Dornbusch and Fischer) the inflation rate and the level of output are determined by the interaction of aggregate demand and supply. In the long-run, i.e. in the steady state (where the growth rate of money is assumed to be constant, expectations have adjusted to actual inflation, and where output and inflation are constant, and output is at full-employment level), the inflation rate is determined only by the growth rate of money. In the real world, an economy probably never
\[ \Delta \Pi_t = a_4 + \sum_{i=0}^{\Omega} \beta_{4i} YGAP_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^{\Omega} \lambda_{4i} MGAP_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^{\Omega} \gamma_{4i} ERGAP_{t-i} + e_{4t} \]  

(5)

where \( \Pi_t = (CPI/CPI_{t,1} - 1) \) - change in the Consumer Price Index

YGAP \(_t\) = (RGDP \(_t\) - TRGDP \(_t\)) / TRGDP \(_t\)

TRGDP - Potential real GDP

RGDP - Real GDP

MGAP = (M \(_t\) - TM \(_t\)) / TM \(_t\)

MGAP – money market gap in terms of deviations from an “equilibrium” money supply(TM).

ERGAP = (ER \(_t\) - TER \(_t\)) / TER \(_t\)

ERGAP – the exchange rate gap in terms of a deviation from an “equilibrium” rate (TER).

e\(_t\) - a stochastic disturbance term.

Note that the parameters \( \beta_{1i} \) indicate the percentage change in inflation that can be attributable to a one percent change in the output gap (i.e. the semi-elasticity of inflation with respect to the output gap for various past years).

4. Characteristics of the Time Series Used

All data used in the study were assembled from various official publications. These include publications of the State Committee for Statistics, IMF (including International Financial Statistics), EBRD, UNDP, the World Bank.

The properties of the time series included in the study are investigated using the Phillips-Perron (PP) and ADF tests. Both the PP and ADF tests indicated that all the series were non-stationary in “levels” (for saving space, these results were not reported, but are available on request) irrespective of whether raw data or logarithms of the data were considered (see table 2). However, almost all the variables proved to be difference stationary, except for the quarterly series on the official exchange rate, which turned out to be stationary after the second difference.

---

reaches a steady state with internal and external shocks to both supply and demand moving it in unexpected directions. In the short-run, changes in the growth of money, government spending and/or taxes could cause changes in both aggregate demand and inflation. In the dynamic case, aggregate demand also depends on lagged output
The PP and ADF tests for the first differences of the data are reported in table 2 below.\textsuperscript{8}

5. Empirical Estimates\textsuperscript{9}

For empirical validation of the model, following the Engle-Granger (1987) two-step procedure, “long-run” behavioral equations for the money, foreign exchange, and product markets are estimated first. Cointegrating vectors identified from this process are then used to formulate error correction models (ECM) for estimating the short-run dynamics in each of the markets. Finally, the short-run adjustments in the different markets are put together to explain inflation dynamics.

Demand for Money

The results of estimation of one of several variants of the “long-run” demand for money using quarterly data for the period 1994:Q1 to 2000:Q3 are given in graph 1, which shows the actual and fitted values of the dependent variable (log of real money balances) and the distribution of the residuals. These results suggest that production has a positive effect on the demand for real balances and that the coefficient is significant at the 1 percent level when the real output variable was approximated by a Hodrick-Prescott filter. The currency substitution effect was better captured by a ratio of the curb market rate to the official exchange rate. The higher the curb market rate in relation to the official rate (that is, the higher the parallel market premium) the lower was the demand for domestic real balances, as the agents were shifting away from the relatively lower returns associated with domestic money (i.e. negative real interest rates). These results were not substantially affected by the inclusion or exclusion of dummy variables that were intended to capture seasonal factors.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{8} Unit root tests for the levels of variables have not been reported here to save space. These are available from the author.
\textsuperscript{9} The results are reported in graphical form at the end of this paper. However, the detailed results are available from the author.
\textsuperscript{10} The equation including the seasonal dummies is available from the author
Due to the lack of national accounts expenditure data on a quarterly basis for the entire period of the study, a variable for domestic demand (absorption) could not be included in the analysis. The closest proxy was conceived to be gross domestic expenditure (equivalent to GDP). While domestic demand (absorption) would be expected to exert an upward pressure on the parallel market exchange rate, GDP (or its expenditure version) could be expected to have a negative effect – a supply side effect.

The results for the estimates of equation (6) are given in graph 2, which suggest a fairly strong relationship among the parallel market exchange rate, CPI (the proxy for domestic prices), production, and foreign exchange availability. Domestic production (expenditure) seems to have had a strong negative influence on the curb market exchange rate. This suggests that domestic production of import substitutes may have dampened the demand for imports, thus reducing relatively the pressure on the curb market exchange rate. At the same time, domestic prices (as proxied by CPI) seems to have exerted a strong upward pressure on the curb market exchange rate with the current level of the CPI being highly significant in explaining the variations in the ratio of curb market to official exchange rate. Foreign exchange supply (LTFESUP) has the correct sign in the equation. However, it is not a significant variable that explains the variations in the parallel market exchange rate in relation to the official rate.

Graph 2 is also quite revealing in other ways. Periods of relative “over-valuation” seems to have been followed by “overshooting” as authorities grapple with the multiple exchange rate and import controls, and other policy reforms. Thus, the parallel market rate seems to have been “over-valued” during the period 1997:Q4 to 1999:Q2. However, with the rapid adjustment of the parallel market rate since then (and perhaps, with insufficient adjustment of the official rate), it seems to have “overshot”.
The Output Gap

Several empirical studies for developed countries have attempted to show the validity of the gap model and the magnitude of the impact of output gaps (IMF (1991), IMF (1995), Singh (1996)) on inflation. In a recent study (IMF, 1997), Coe and McDermott presented evidence of 13 developing countries that suggested that the gap model “works well in almost all Asian economies”, and that the “output gap is a significant determinant of the change in inflation in 11 of the 13 countries studied”.

The Hodrick-Prescott (1997) filter has been widely used to separate the “potential” part of GDP from the “cyclical” component. An estimate of the output gap can be obtained as the difference between the estimate of the HP trend and actual output. The results of the estimates are shown in graph 3. It appears that since 1998:Q3, actual output is well below “potential” while the opposite seems to be the case for the earlier period from 1994 to 1996. While most FSU countries experienced a significant output collapse since the breakdown of the USSR, it has been found that the output collapse in Uzbekistan was much less severe than in other FSU countries (see, Zettlemeyer (1998), and Zettlemeyer and Taube (1998)).

Dynamic Equations

Dynamic versions of each of the equations for goods, money and foreign exchange markets are formulated following the two-step procedure of Engle-Granger (1987). First, the “long-run” equations are tested for cointegration. If the variables in each of the equations are found to be cointegrated, error correction models are formulated using the respective cointegrated equations.

---

11 Several criticisms have been leveled at the HP filter method. It has been argued that the HP method removes potentially valuable information from time series data (King and Rebelo, 1993) and that it may impart spurious cyclical patterns to the data (Cogley and Nason (1995)). Another major concern is the rather arbitrary choice of smoothing parameters. However, in the absence of the information to estimate production functions, the HP filter offers a convenient (but mechanical) way to estimate “trend” output.

12 The mildness of Uzbekistan’s recession are attributed to a combination of a) a low degree of initial industrialization, b) its cotton production, and c) its self-sufficiency in energy. While evidence suggested no positive role of public investment, it was thought that a set of policies which failed in most other transition countries (i.e. supporting the industrial sector through credits and direct subsidies) was relatively successful in sustaining output during Uzbekistan’s early transition years.
Demand for Money

The long-run equation for money demand is found to be cointegrated. Table 3 reports the results of estimating the dynamic model for money demand following the Engle-Granger (1987) two step procedure. The error correction term has the right sign and is significant at the 10 percent level. In the short-run, money demand appears to be adjusting toward the long-run equilibrium in little over one quarter. The error correction mechanism in the foreign exchange market did not seem to have a significant effect on short-run money demand, except when a three-quarter lag was considered. In this case, the ECM term was significant at the 10 percent level. Neither the output gap nor any price variables were significant in the estimated equations despite carrying expected signs.

Exchange Rates

Several different estimates of the short-run parallel market foreign exchange rate were made but only one result is reported in table 4. It is clear that a relatively good fit has been obtained for the error correction model when the logarithm of the change in the ratio of the curb market rate to the official rate was considered to be the dependent variable. The estimates yielded relatively inferior results when the change in the logarithm of the curb market rate was considered the dependent variable.

The error correction term for the ratio of the parallel market to the official rate in this equation is highly significant, has the right sign, and indicates an almost full adjustment of disequilibria in the foreign exchange market (as represented by the ratio) in one quarter. Furthermore, the change in the level of the ratio itself seems to be exerting an important short-run effect. The adjustments to disequilibria in the money market during at least the preceding two quarters seem to exert a strong influence on the relationship between the curb and official market exchange rates, with the relatively stronger impact coming two quarters ahead. The disequilibria in the product market also influence the parallel market exchange rate with the relevant coefficient being significant at the 10 percent level. However, in the short-run model, the
foreign exchange supply variable is not significant, indicating factors other than the flow of foreign exchange resources probably play a more significant role in the foreign exchange market.

Inflation in the short-run

One of the intentions of the study has been to explain short-run inflationary behavior in the Uzbek economy in terms of the disequilibria in the money, foreign exchange, and product markets. With this in mind, we use the error correction terms for each of the equations in the formulation of the dynamic version of the inflation equation.

In the short-run dynamic inflation equation, except for the error correction term relating to the parallel market for foreign exchange, all other error correction terms are highly significant (see table 5). At the same time, the change in the ratio of the parallel market to the official rate has a very significant effect on the change in inflation rate. If the curb market rate increases due to disequilibria in the foreign exchange market or the authorities fail to adjust the official rate in line with those disequilibria, inflation is likely to increase substantially. Furthermore, product market disequilibria are seen to exert a strong influence on the change in inflation. The coefficients for money market adjustment as well as the change in the level of money supply are highly significant indicating the predominance of monetary phenomena in the inflation process in Uzbekistan.

6. Some Conclusions

Using quarterly data, the study has estimated several “long-run” relationships for the goods, money, and foreign exchange markets of Uzbekistan for the period 1994:01 to 2000:03, in an environment of multiple exchange rates, administrative controls, and import restrictions. It was found that the variables describing the behavior of each of the different markets were cointegrated. Using this property to incorporate the error correction mechanisms in different markets, the study developed a framework to ascertain the influence of domestic disequilibria and external shocks on inflation dynamics in Uzbekistan.
The empirical estimates show that domestic monetary and output developments, and changes in the relationship between the curb market and official exchange rates have a significant influence on the foreign exchange market dynamics in Uzbekistan. However, the contemporaneous level of foreign exchange supply does not seem to have a substantial impact on the parallel exchange rate market.

The results suggest that disequilibria in the product and money markets are the major forces driving inflation dynamics in Uzbekistan. While disequilibria in the parallel market themselves do not seem to be a factor in price increases, the ratio of the curb market to the official exchange rate seems to exert a significant influence. One can infer that an important consideration is the speed and the magnitude of adjustment of the official exchange rate in the face of disequilibria in the parallel market for foreign exchange.

The study has been rather constrained by the limited availability of quarterly data on many important variables. It had to make do with a number of proxies for the variables under focus. The study can benefit from a further investigation into improving both the quality and the quantity of data required for econometric and other investigations of the Uzbekistan economy.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stabilization Program Date</th>
<th>Pre-Program regime adopted</th>
<th>Exchange regime</th>
<th>Maximum inflation</th>
<th>Year in which inflation was highest</th>
<th>Year in which inflation fell below 50%</th>
<th>Exchange regime in 2000</th>
<th>Inflation in 1998</th>
<th>Inflation in 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania August 1992</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia December 1994</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Flexible/Fixed</td>
<td>10896</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus November 1994</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td>Flexible/Fixed</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>181.7</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria February 1991</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia October 1993</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>2585</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia September 1994</td>
<td>56476</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>7486</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary March 1990</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan January 1994</td>
<td>2315</td>
<td>Flexible/Fixed</td>
<td>2961</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic May 1993</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>Flexible/Fixed</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia June 1992</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>Flexible/Fixed</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania June 1992</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>Flexible/Fixed</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland January 1990</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania October 1993</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia April 19953</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Flexible/Fixed</td>
<td>2510</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic January 1991</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia February 1992</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan February 19953</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>7344</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan Not Started</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>9743</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine November 1994</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>Flexible/Fixed</td>
<td>10155</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Memorandum items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Year in which inflation was highest</th>
<th>Year in which inflation fell below 50%</th>
<th>Exchange regime in 2000</th>
<th>Inflation in 1998</th>
<th>Inflation in 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Transition</td>
<td>820</td>
<td></td>
<td>2764</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All CEE</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td>651</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE: Early Reformers</td>
<td>567</td>
<td></td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE: Late Reformers</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltics</td>
<td>871</td>
<td></td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td></td>
<td>4943</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

Sources: For years 1989-98, data adapted from IMF Working Paper WP/00/30 authored by Stanley Fishcher and Ratna Sahay

Other Sources: for other years, IMF, International Financial Statistics

Pre-program inflation is inflation in the 12 months previous to the month of the stabilization program

Inflation is calculated from December to December

Fixed regimes are those that have a currency board, pegged (explicitly or implicitly) at a fixed rate or have a narrow crawling band

Flexible regimes include those that are free or managed floating

Lithuania adopted a currency board in April 1994 and Bulgaria adopted one in July 1997

The Latvian currency was pegged to the SDR in February 1994

Russia announced an exchange rate corridor in July 1995. Both Latvia and Russia had flexible exchange rate regimes prior to these dates

CEE Early reformers refer to Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovak Republic and Slovenia

CEE later reformers refer to Albania, Bulgaria, Macedonia FYR and Romania.

Baltics refer to Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania

Other former Soviet Union refer to Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Russia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan
### Table 2: Unit Root Tests For First Differences of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>ADF-Test Statistic</th>
<th>Phillips-Perron Test Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LQACUR</td>
<td>-3.5219</td>
<td>-8.2687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQAOFI</td>
<td>-6.8312</td>
<td>-3.1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQBLKP</td>
<td>-4.3122</td>
<td>-5.6972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQC_P93</td>
<td>-2.7341</td>
<td>-5.3979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQNRFRD</td>
<td>-2.8680</td>
<td>-3.2815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQRPRDIN</td>
<td>-7.9336</td>
<td>-7.3586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQRM2</td>
<td>-5.2409</td>
<td>-4.0856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQRRM</td>
<td>-7.9472</td>
<td>-4.8400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QACURR</td>
<td>-3.0714</td>
<td>-3.6439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAOFIR</td>
<td>-1.2796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAOFIR*</td>
<td>-3.7626</td>
<td>-4.6643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBLKPRM</td>
<td>-3.0555</td>
<td>-3.5903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QNFRES3D</td>
<td>-2.2263</td>
<td>-2.9432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QOF_CPI93</td>
<td>-6.2136</td>
<td>-3.9662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPRDIIND</td>
<td>-7.1755</td>
<td>-6.6740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRM2</td>
<td>-2.6765</td>
<td>-2.8656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRRM</td>
<td>-4.3910</td>
<td>-3.7246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
* indicates second difference of series
Variables names beginning with L indicate logarithm of the series
Variables names beginning with Q indicate quarterly series
Variables names beginning with QA indicate quarterly averages of series
Variable names:
QACURR - quarterly average curb market exchange rate
QAOFIR - quarterly average official exchange rate
QBLKPRM - quarterly average curb market exchange rate premium
QNFRES3D - quarterly net foreign reserves in US dollars
QOF_CPI93 - quarterly official consumer price index (1993=100)
QPRDIIND - Quarterly production index
QRM2 - quarterly real broad money supply
QRRM - quarterly real reserve money
### Table 3: The Dynamic Demand for Money Equation

Dependent Variable: DLQRM2  
Method: Least Squares  
Sample(adjusted): 1996:3 2000:3  
Included observations: 17 after adjusting endpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSEQLRM2C(-1)</td>
<td>-0.7544</td>
<td>0.3577</td>
<td>-2.1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYGAP/LQPRDIN(-1)</td>
<td>0.0072</td>
<td>0.0264</td>
<td>0.2722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLNWCP93(-1)</td>
<td>-0.1417</td>
<td>0.2756</td>
<td>-0.5142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEQLCUR1(-3)</td>
<td>0.1849</td>
<td>0.1000</td>
<td>1.8485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.0247</td>
<td>0.0340</td>
<td>0.7249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD2</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
<td>0.0292</td>
<td>0.3779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD3</td>
<td>0.0207</td>
<td>0.0362</td>
<td>0.5707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD4</td>
<td>0.0631</td>
<td>0.0450</td>
<td>1.4040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared: 0.7438  
Adjusted R-squared: 0.5445  
S.E. of regression: 0.0471  
Mean dependent var: 0.0396  
S.D. dependent var: 0.0697  
Akaike info criterion: -2.9692  
Schwarz criterion: -2.5771  
Log likelihood: 33.2378  
F-statistic: 3.7319  
Prob(F-statistic): 0.0353  
Durbin-Watson stat: 2.3579

Symbols:  
DLQRM2 - change in log of quarterly broad money  
RSEQLRM2C(-1) - error correction term for money demand equation  
LYGAP/LQPRDIN(-1) - ratio of log of output gap to log of production lagged one quarter  
DLNWCP93(-1) – change in log of CPI lagged one quarter  
RSEQLCUR1(-3) - error correction term for exchange rate equation
Table 4: Equation for the Change in Ratio of Curb Market to Official Exchange Rate

Dependent Variable: DLRQCUROFI
Method: Least Squares

Sample(adjusted): 1996:2 2000:3
Included observations: 18 after adjusting endpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSEQLCUROFI2(-1)</td>
<td>-0.9933</td>
<td>0.3272</td>
<td>-3.0360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEQLRM2C(-1)</td>
<td>-0.2629</td>
<td>0.8423</td>
<td>-0.3121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEQLRM2C(-2)</td>
<td>-3.0518</td>
<td>0.8429</td>
<td>-3.6204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYGAP/LQPRDIN(-1)</td>
<td>0.1194</td>
<td>0.0657</td>
<td>1.8178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLTESUP(-1)</td>
<td>0.0940</td>
<td>0.4075</td>
<td>0.2307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLRQCUROFI(-1)</td>
<td>0.5977</td>
<td>0.2312</td>
<td>2.5848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.0068</td>
<td>0.0411</td>
<td>-0.1645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared 0.6378    Mean dependent var 0.0407
Adjusted R-squared 0.4403    S.D. dependent var 0.1973
S.E. of regression 0.1476    Akaike info criterion -0.7027
Sum squared resid 0.2398    Schwarz criterion -0.3565
Log likelihood 13.3247    F-statistic 3.2289
Durbin-Watson stat 1.9269    Prob(F-statistic) 0.0442

Symbols:
DLRQCUROFI – change in log of ratio of curb market to official exchange rate
RSEQLCUROFI2(-1) - error correction term from foreign exchange market equation
RSEQLRM2C(-1) - error correction term from demand for money equation
RSEQLRM2C(-2) - error correction term from money demand lagged 2 quarters
LYGAP/LQPRDIN(-1) - ratio of log of output gap to log of production index lagged one quarter
DLTESUP(-1) - change in log of foreign exchange supply lagged one quarter
DLRQCUROFI(-1) - change in log of ratio of curb to official exchange rate lagged one quarter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LYGAP/LQPRDIN(-1)</td>
<td>-0.0442</td>
<td>0.0159</td>
<td>-2.7841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEQLRM2C(-1)</td>
<td>1.1761</td>
<td>0.2793</td>
<td>4.2103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEQLCUROFI2(-1)</td>
<td>0.0330</td>
<td>0.0970</td>
<td>0.3398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRCUROFI</td>
<td>1.3600</td>
<td>0.3454</td>
<td>3.9371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLQRM2</td>
<td>0.8555</td>
<td>0.2467</td>
<td>3.4678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.0404</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>2.0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD2</td>
<td>0.0206</td>
<td>0.0316</td>
<td>0.6509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD3</td>
<td>-0.0040</td>
<td>0.0310</td>
<td>-0.1287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD4</td>
<td>-0.0075</td>
<td>0.0359</td>
<td>-0.2092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.8355</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-squared</td>
<td>0.7039</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. of regression</td>
<td>0.0361</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.4994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum squared resid</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.0521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>42.2447</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin-Watson stat</td>
<td>1.9873</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols:
DLNWCP93 - change in log of CPI
LYGAP/LQPRDIN(-1) - ratio of log of output gap to log of production index lagged one quarter
RSEQLRM2C(-1) - error correction term for money demand equation
RSEQLCUROFI2(-1) - error correction term for foreign exchange market equation
DRCUROFI - change in ratio of curb market to official exchange rate
DLQRM2 - change in log of quarterly broad money
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Graph 6: Dynamic Inflation Equation