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## Introduction

- Some recent literature on BigData and Nowcasting after COVID.
- The role of Big Data from Financial Transactions including:
- Consumer-to-Individual Transactions to mimic Consumption
- Consumer-to-Individual + Firm-To-Firm Transactions to mimic Investment.
- Horse Racing: Out-of-Sample Test for Big Data information in Nowcasting
- Standard Linear Models (DFM, BVAR)
- Machine Learning: Linear and Non-Linear Models using Bridge Equations (Linear, Random Forest \& Gradient Boost)
- Results


## Recent Literature Spurred by Covid Crisis

- Developing of higher frequency (Weekly/Daily) Economic Activity Now-casting Models by Central Banks).
- FED Weekly Economic Index (Lewis \& Stock, 2020)
- BundesBank Weekly Activity Index (Eraslan \& Gozt,2020)
- Central Bank of Portugal Daily GDP (Lourenco \& Rua, 2020)
- Developing New Big Data Indicators: (Banking Transactions, Mobility...)
- Financial Transactions
- Alternative Sources for US. Cards PoS: Chetty et Al (2020).
- Developed and EM countries. Cards PoS: Carvalho et al (2020).
- Consumption including Cards \& Other Transfers (Carvalho et al, 2021 Forthcoming).
- Other
- Mobility indicators and others (Woloszko,2020)...


## Financial Transactions Big Data: Garanti-BBVA Database

## " <br> 270 Mill <br> Card transactions


cardholders


659 Mill transactions

Table 1 Investment Firms Statistics: Garanti BBVA vs Central Bank of Turkey (CBRT) \& Turkstats Survey

|  | Garanti BBVA |  |  | CBRT-Turkstat |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Tot. | Machinery | Constr. | Tot. | Machinery | Constr. |
| Transactions(000s) | 24.6 | 22.3 | 2.3 |  |  |  |
| Amount(US Bn) | 308 | 280 | 28 | 440 | 257 | 183 |
| Firms(000s) | 179.7 | 156.5 | 23.2 | 730.2 | 614.4 | 115.8 |
| Firms(\% CBRT) | 24.6 | 25.5 | 19.8 |  |  |  |

Source: Garanti Bank and CBRT- Turkstat Survey.

## Big Data Indicators: Consumption \& Investment in Real Time...

Big Data Consumption \& Investment vs National Accounts
(1Q-2015 to 2Q-2021, \% YoY)
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## ...and High Definition: By Assets or Goods \& Provinces

Figure 3 Big Data Investment Sectoral HeatMap
(\% YoY Light Colours stand for positive growth rates and Dark Colours for negative rates)


[^1]Figure 4 Big Data Regional Investment Maps (\% YoY Light Colours stand for positive growth rates and Dark Colours for negative rates)


Source: Own Elaboration.

## Methodology: Big Data information in a Horse Race of Models

- A Horse Race including Bridge Linear (OLS) and Non-Linear Bridge equation models (Random Forest (RF) \& Gradient Boost (GB)), Dynamic Factor Models (DFM), and Bayesian Vector Autoregressive models (BVAR) to nowcast GDP YoY growth rates.
- While DFM can deal with the missing data at the start of the dataset, we need to have a balanced dataset to estimate Bridge Equation models and BVAR.
- As our dataset is highly unbalanced, we follow Stekhoven and Bühlmann (2012) to fill out the missing data at the beginning of the dataset.


## Data included in the Model

Table 2: Detail of Variables Included in the Nowcasting Models

| Variable | Type | Frequency | StartDate | Transformation | Release Lags (M) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GDP | Hard | Quarterly | 2003 | YoY Growth | $2-3$ |
| Industrial Production | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 2 |
| Auto Imports | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 2 |
| Auto Sales | Hard | Monthly | 2003 | YoY Growth | 2 |
| Auto Exports | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 2 |
| Non Metallic Minerals | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 2 |
| Electricity Production | Hard | Daily | 2003 | YoY Growth | 0 |
| Number of Employed | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 3 |
| NUmber of Unemployed | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 3 |
| PMI | Soft | Monthly | 2006 | Level | 1 |
| Real Sector Confidence | Soft | Monthly | 2003 | Level | 0 |
| Loans (Credit) | Hard | Weekly | 2006 | Ann 13-week Growth | 1 |
| Big Data Consumption | Hard | Daily | 2015 | YoY Growth | 0 |
| Big Data Investment | Hard | Daily | 2015 | YoY Growth | 0 |
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## Data included in the Model Prevalence could penalize Big Data

Table 2: Detail of Variables Included in the Nowcasting Models

| Variable | Type | Frequency | StartDate | Transformation | Release Lags (M) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GDP | Hard | Quarterly | 2003 | YoY Growth | $2-3$ |
| Industrial Production | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 2 |
| Auto Imports | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 2 |
| Auto Sales | Hard | Monthly | 2003 | YoY Growth | 2 |
| Auto Exports | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 2 |
| Non Metallic Minerals | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 2 |
| Electricity Production | Hard | Daily | 2003 | YoY Growth | 0 |
| Number of Employed | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 3 |
| NUmber of Unemployed | Hard | Monthly | 2006 | YoY Growth | 3 |
| PMI | Soft | Monthly | 2006 | Level | 1 |
| Real Sector Confidence | Soft | Monthly | 2003 | Level | 0 |
| Loans (Credit) | Hard | Weekly | 2006 | Ann 13-week Growth | 1 |
| Big Data Consumption | Hard | Daily | 2015 | YoY Growth | 0 |
| Big Data Investment | Hard | Daily | 2015 | YoY Growth | 0 |
| Source: Own Elaboration |  |  |  |  |  |

Big Data Information only present from 2015
( $30 \%$ of the Sample) therefore results could be subject to prevalence (i. e Penalizing the Big Data Info)

## The Models: Linear \& Non-Linear Bridge Equations

- We use Bridge Equations to convert:
- A Monthly Vector: $x_{t_{m}}=\left(x_{1, t_{m}}, x_{2, t_{m}}, \ldots, x_{n, t_{m}}\right)^{\prime}, t_{m}=1,2, \ldots, T_{m}$ of $n$ (std) variables
- In Quarterly ones: $x_{t_{q}}=\left(x_{1, t_{q}}, x_{2, t_{q}}, \ldots, x_{n, t_{q}}\right)^{\prime}, t_{q}=1,2, \ldots, T_{q}$, by taking simple averages of $x_{t_{m}}$. Missing data for the reference quarter(s) will be filled by an $\operatorname{AR}(p)$ model ( $p$ chosen according to AIC)
- The functional form between the Output $y_{t_{q}}$ and Input $x_{t_{q}}$ is given by $g()$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{t_{q}}=g\left(x_{t_{q}}\right)+\varepsilon_{t_{q}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

- In our case $g()$ can take linear (OLS) or nonlinear functional forms as Random Forests (RF) \& Gradient Boost decision trees (GBM).


## The Models: Dynamic Factor Model (DFM)

- We model the DFM with idiosyncratic components $\epsilon_{i, t}$ as:

$$
\begin{align*}
& x_{t_{m}}=\Lambda f_{t_{m}}+\epsilon_{t_{m}}  \tag{2}\\
& \epsilon_{t_{m}}=\alpha \epsilon_{t_{m}-1}+v_{t_{m}} ; \quad v_{t_{m}} \sim \text { i.i.d. } \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma^{2}\right) \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

- The unobserved common factors vector $f_{t}$ evolves as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{t_{m}}=\varphi(L) f_{t_{m}-1}+\eta_{t_{m}} ; \quad \eta_{t_{m}} \sim \text { i.i.d. } \mathcal{N}(0, R), \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

- We transform to quarterly GDP growth rates by:

$$
\begin{align*}
& y_{t_{m}}^{Q}=\bar{\Lambda}_{Q}\left[f_{t}^{\prime} f_{t-1}^{\prime} f_{t-2}^{\prime}\right]+\bar{\epsilon}_{t_{m}}^{Q}  \tag{5}\\
& \bar{\epsilon}_{t_{m}}^{Q}=\alpha^{Q} \bar{\epsilon}_{t_{m}-1}^{Q}+\bar{v}_{t_{m}}^{Q} ; \quad \bar{v}_{t_{m}}^{Q} \sim i . i . d . \mathcal{N}\left(0, \bar{\sigma}^{2}\right), \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

## The Models: BVAR

- Define $y_{t_{m}}^{Q}$ as the monthly GDP growth rates (partially observed in the third month of the quarter \& linked to its unobserved monthly counterpart as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{t_{m}}^{Q}=\frac{1}{3}\left(x_{t_{m}}^{Q}+x_{t_{m}-1}^{Q}+x_{t_{m}-2}^{Q}\right) . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

- We assume $x_{t_{m}}^{Q M}$ follow a $\operatorname{VAR}(\mathrm{p})$ process as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{t_{m}}=\varphi(L) x_{t_{m}-1}+u_{t_{m}} ; \quad u_{t_{m}} \sim \text { i.i.d. } \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma), \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

- The BVAR's state-space transition and measurement equation evolves as:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
z_{t_{m}}=\pi+\Pi z_{t_{m}-1}+\zeta_{t_{m}} ; \quad \zeta_{t_{m}} \sim \text { i.i.d. } \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega) ; \\
X_{t_{m}}=M_{t} \alpha z_{t_{m}} \tag{10}
\end{array}
$$

## Results: Nowcasting Models Mean Absolute Errors (MAE)

$$
\operatorname{MAE}^{(i)}=(1 / n) \sum_{t_{q}=2016 Q 1}^{2020 Q 3}\left|y_{t_{q}}-\hat{y}_{t_{q}}^{(i)}\right| ; \quad i=1,2, \ldots, 5 .
$$

Table 3 MAEs of the models for successive nowcasting horizons between 2006Q1 and 2020Q3

|  | AR | DFM | BVAR | LM | RF | GBM |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st Nowcast | 3.71 | 1.92 | 1.77 | 3.46 | 2.60 | 3.13 |
| 2nd Nowcast | 3.71 | 1.85 | 2.29 | 3.07 | 2.32 | 2.55 |
| 3rd Nowcast | 3.80 | 1.72 | 1.52 | 1.70 | 1.53 | 1.71 |
| 4th Nowcast | 3.80 | 1.58 | 1.45 | 1.42 | 1.74 | 1.83 |
| 5th Nowcast | 3.80 | 1.38 | 1.64 | 1.46 | 1.65 | 1.49 |

Abbreviations: AR, the benchmark autoregressive model; DFM, the dynamic factor model; BVAR, the Bayesian vector autoregressive model; LM, the linear bridge equation model; RF, the random forest based bridge equation model; GBM, the gradient tree boosted bridge equation model.

## Results: Alternative Nowcasting Models vs Official Data

Figure: Alternative Nowcasting Models vs Official: Linear vs Non-Linear (2016Q1 to 2020Q3)


## Results: Combination vs Individual Nowcasting Models

## Figure: MAE for Alternative Models (2018Q1 to 2020Q3)

Table 4 MAEs of nowcasting combinations for successive nowcasting horizons between 2008Q2 and 2020Q3

|  | Averaging Models* |  |  |  | **Individual Nowcasting Models |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Simple | Median | RPW | Rank | DFM | BVAR | LM | RF | GBM |
| 1st Nowcast | 2.67 | 3.29 | 2.53 | 2.30 | 2.01 | 2.16 | 4.37 | 3.18 | 4.20 |
| 2nd Nowcast | 2.03 | 2.40 | 1.95 | 1.89 | 2.09 | 2.65 | 3.40 | 2.20 | 2.69 |
| 3rd Nowcast | 1.39 | 1.65 | 1.32 | 1.34 | 1.92 | 1.95 | 1.99 | 1.80 | 1.68 |
| 4th Nowcast | 1.44 | 1.43 | 1.44 | 1.45 | 1.59 | 1.57 | 1.22 | 2.06 | 1.88 |
| 5th Nowcast | 1.36 | 1.43 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.48 | 1.82 | 1.44 | 1.77 | 1.75 |

*Averaging Models: Simple Averaging (Simple), Median (Median), Relative Performance Weight (RPW), Rank based Weight (Rank)
**Individual Models: Dynamic Factor Model (DFM), Bayesian VAR (BVAR), Bridge Linear (LM), Bridge Random Forest (RF), Bridge Gradient Boost Model (GBM)
Source: Own Elaboration

## BigData \& Nowcasting: Pre-selection of Variables (Lasso)

Figure: MAE for Models with Pre-Selection of Variables (2016Q1 to 2020Q3)

|  | AR | DFM | BVAR | LM | RF | GBM |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st Nowcast | 3.71 | 2.52 | 2.17 | 3.24 | 2.81 | 3.47 |
| 2nd Nowcast | 3.71 | 2.15 | 1.45 | 2.63 | 2.07 | 2.57 |
| 3rd Nowcast | 3.80 | 1.72 | 1.64 | 1.36 | 1.48 | 1.62 |
| 4th Nowcast | 3.80 | 1.73 | 1.38 | 1.28 | 1.73 | 1.76 |
| 5th Nowcast | 3.80 | 1.64 | 1.36 | 1.08 | 1.56 | 1.56 |

First Step: We first select variables at any moment of time by using a linear regression with L 1 regularization as known as Lasso regression and restricti variables at to use only the variables selected b by Lasso (significant non zero coefficient). Second Step: We use the variables wselected by Lasso in the main nowcasting models.
Source: Own Elaboration

## BigData \& Nowcasting:Variable Selection (Linear\&Non-Linear)

Table 7: Selection Ration by Linear Model (Lasso) (\% Periods variables chosen by Linear Model (Lasso)]

| Name | Selection Ratio |
| :--- | :---: |
| IP | $100.0 \%$ |
| Car Imports | $0.0 \%$ |
| Ind. Production Non-Metallic Minerals | $98.3 \%$ |
| Car Total Sales | $1.7 \%$ |
| Electricity Demand | $48.3 \%$ |
| Number of Employed | $8.3 \%$ |
| Number of Unemployed | $15.0 \%$ |
| Car Exports | $0.0 \%$ |
| PMI | $98.3 \%$ |
| Total Loans 13week | $83.3 \%$ |
| Real Sector Confidence Index | $100.0 \%$ |
| Big Data Consumption | $55.0 \%$ |
| Big Data Investment | $68.3 \%$ |

Table C1: Selection Ration by Non-Linear Model (RF) (\% mean decrease in MSE calculated from out-of-bag sample in Random Forest Model)

| Name | Selection Ratio |
| :--- | :---: |
| IP | $17.4 \%$ |
| Car Imports | $-0.2 \%$ |
| Ind. Production Non-Metallic Minerals | $11.2 \%$ |
| Car Total Sales | $-0.5 \%$ |
| Electricity Demand | $2.6 \%$ |
| Number of Employed | $3.2 \%$ |
| Number of Unemployed | $6.3 \%$ |
| Car Exports | $5.8 \%$ |
| PMI | $5.1 \%$ |
| Total Loans 13week | $4.3 \%$ |
| Real Sector Confidence Index | $4.3 \%$ |
| Big Data Consumption | $5.1 \%$ |
| Big Data Investment | $9.8 \%$ |

Fgure 6 Big Data Investment and Consumption variables selection by Lasso Regression


## BigData Contribution to Nowcasting: Models \& Periods

## Mean Absolute Error Difference (MAED): Traditional Information vs Big Data

$$
\operatorname{MAED}^{(i)}=\operatorname{MAE}^{(i)}-\operatorname{MAE}_{R D}^{(i)} ; \quad i=1,2, \ldots, 5
$$

RD: Models without Big data

Table 8 MAEDs of the models for successive nowcasting horizons between 2006Q1 and 2020Q3

|  | Linear Models |  |  | Non-Linear Models |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DFM | BVAR | LM | RF | GBM |
| 1st Nowcast | 0.09 | 0.57 | 0.39 | 0.51 | 0.28 |
| 2nd Nowcast | 0.09 | -0.60 | 0.26 | 0.22 | 0.03 |
| 3rd Nowcast | 0.07 | -0.13 | 0.01 | 0.12 | -0.04 |
| 4th Nowcast | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.02 | -0.29 |
| 5 th Nowcast | 0.05 | -0.01 | 0.06 | -0.20 | 0.01 |
| Abbreviations: toregressive mo based bridge | I, th LM, |  | del; <br> ation <br> t | B RF, <br> $d$ brid | vector <br> dom <br> tion m |
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## BigData Contribution to Nowcasting: Time Advantage

Table A. 1 Announcement days and delays of the monthly variables

| Name | Announcement Lag in <br> Months | Announcement <br> Day |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Industrial Production (IP) | 2 | 13 |
| Car Imports | 2 | 15 |
| IP Non Metallic Minerals | 2 | 13 |
| Car Sales | 2 | 15 |
| Electricity Demand | 0 | 30 |
| Number of Employed | 3 | 12 |
| Number of Unemployed | 3 | 12 |
| Car Exports | 2 | 15 |
| Manufacturing PMI | 1 | 1 |
| Total Loans 13week | 1 | 10 |
| Real Sector Confidence Index | 0 | 26 |
| Big Data Consumption | 0 | Daily |
| Big Data Investment | 0 | Daily |

Source: Own Elaboration through Turkstat, OSD, Markit, CBRT and own Big Data

Figure 7 Daily MAEs of equally weighted nowcast combinations between 2006Q1 and 2020Q3


* We run the models on daily basis assuming that big data variables are released daily but the rest of variables are announced at a specific date as shown in Table A1. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that each month consists of 30 days and calculate nowcasts for the reference quarter for 150 days until GDP is announced. Instead of showing each model individually, we take simple averages of all models' nowcasts.


## Conclusions

- Financial Transactions' BigData improve accuracy of Nowcasting models in Turkey. It is useful more than $50 \%$ of the time (even with prevalence).
- The contribution is more relevant during the first 45 days (when Hard relevant Data is scarce) and uncertain crisis times.
- The Standard Nowcasting Models as Dynamic Factor Model (DFM) \& Bayesian VARs (BVAR) appears to be a good alternative model even in a volatile environment (Turkey has been exposed to relevant shocks during last 4 years).
- Nowcast combination outperform most of the single models in many cases but not in short term.
- Non-Linear Models could be more useful during Turning Points but no evidence they supposed an advantage during COVID in this exercise.


# Thanks!! <br> Follow this and other indicators in real time here 

https://www.bbvaresearch.com/en/special-section/charts/
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