

Knetsch, Thomas A.; Micheli, Martin; Kafke, Phil; Schimmelpfennig, Mario

Article — Published Version

Consistent Commercial Real Estate Market Indicators: Methodology and an Application to the German Office Market

Review of Income and Wealth

Provided in Cooperation with:

John Wiley & Sons

Suggested Citation: Knetsch, Thomas A.; Micheli, Martin; Kafke, Phil; Schimmelpfennig, Mario (2025) : Consistent Commercial Real Estate Market Indicators: Methodology and an Application to the German Office Market, Review of Income and Wealth, ISSN 1475-4991, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, Vol. 71, Iss. 4,
<https://doi.org/10.1111/roiw.70036>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/330154>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ORIGINAL ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Consistent Commercial Real Estate Market Indicators: Methodology and an Application to the German Office Market

Thomas A. Knetsch | Martin Micheli  | Phil Kafke | Mario Schimmelpfennig

Deutsche Bundesbank, Directorate General Data and Statistics, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Correspondence: Martin Micheli (martin.micheli@bundesbank.de)**Received:** 28 March 2025 | **Revised:** 28 August 2025 | **Accepted:** 1 September 2025**Funding:** The authors received no specific funding for this work.**Keywords:** price index | rent index | rental yield index | vacancy rate

ABSTRACT

We develop a statistical-methodological framework for a set of core commercial real estate market indicators, which consists of a market price index, a gross rent index, and a net rental yield index, as well as a vacancy rate. We argue that the indicators should be (macro-)consistent, meaning that the asset valuation relation between the market price, rental income, yield, and vacant space of an individual property carries over to the macro indicators. In case of a bottom-up compilation of all indicators, macro-consistency is met if (1) target universes are common, (2) the granular data source is complete, and (3) price and rental yield indices are weighted with capital value shares while the rent index and the aggregate vacancy rate are weighted by rental income shares. We exemplify the established statistical-methodological framework by compiling a consistent set of annual indicators of the German office market using appraisal data from a real estate consulting company.

JEL Classification: C43, R33

1 | Introduction

The urgent demand for frequent, timely, and high-quality real estate statistics has been expressed by policymakers since the Global Financial Crisis of 2007–2008. The detrimental interlinkages between abrupt declines in real estate prices, excessive lending, and fallacious mitigation of risks caused the Great Recession and severely threatened financial stability in many parts of the world. In order to implement effective macroprudential monitoring and policy, existing information gaps have had to be filled. Macroprudential authorities identified missing data in both residential and commercial real estate (CRE) markets. Price and rent indices, transaction volumes, and construction activity, as well

as lending indicators (e.g., credit volumes, loan-to-value ratios, debt service-to-income ratios) were among the indicators most urgently needed.

Data collection, methodological development, and indicator compilation have been initiated and/or advanced on the basis of international initiatives such as the G20 Data Gaps Initiative (Heath and Goksu 2016) or the recommendations of the European Systemic Risk Board (ESRB) on closing real estate data gaps (European Systemic Risk Board 2016, 2019). The latter have shaped the statistical efforts in European countries with regard to the development of indicators for CRE markets. In the 2019 amendment to the initial recommendation, the Statistical Office

The authors are greatly indebted to Robert Hill for his extensive review. The authors are grateful to participants at the “ISI 2023 - 64th World Statistics Congress,” the 25th conference “Messung der Preise,” and members of the Task Force “Commercial Real Estate Indicators” of the European Statistical System for their helpful comments. The views expressed in this paper are solely those of the authors and should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the Deutsche Bundesbank or the Eurosystem.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2025 The Author(s). *Review of Income and Wealth* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of International Association for Research in Income and Wealth.

of the European Union (Eurostat) “is recommended to propose Union legislation establishing a common minimum framework for the development, production and dissemination of a database on indicators on the physical CRE market” (European Systemic Risk Board 2019, Recommendation F).¹ This triggered coordinated action in and among European statistical offices and central banks, as well as other institutions with the aim of making progress in this statistical field.²

Of primary interest for macroprudential authorities in Europe is a set of CRE market indicators consisting of price, rent, and yield indices, as well as vacancy rates and activity indicators such as building starts. The former three are usually dealt with as closely related indicators. While the number of building starts is definitely statistical information of a different nature, the vacancy rate plays an intermediate role. On the one hand, it is linked to activity indicators as a measure of tension or slack in real estate markets. On the other hand, vacant space affects rental income and yields, suggesting that the vacancy rate is connected to price, rent, and rental yield indices. In this paper, we show that by integrating the vacancy rate, the demand-side view of the space market, focusing on an observable rent concept, is reconciled with the investors’ perspective on the investment market. In particular, we suggest the set of core CRE market indicators consisting of a market price index, a gross rent index, a net rental yield index, and a vacancy rate.

At the level of individual properties, these four indicators are mathematically directly connected by the income approach to asset valuation. When developing CRE market indicators, one aim worth considering is to ensure that this mathematical link carries over to the macro level (henceforth called macro-consistency), as users might be puzzled if this property is not met. This target may or may not be feasible as regards available data sources. For the time being, we observe that macro-consistency is of less practical relevance for statistical offices, as they usually struggle with patchy data, meaning it is only possible to proceed following an indicator-by-indicator approach (European Commission 2023).

Eurostat (2017) is perhaps the most recent and comprehensive document for the compilation of CRE market indicators.³ The focus is on the statistical-methodological treatment of price indices. The other indicators are only touched upon. Interconnections between them are sketched, viewing the economic rather than the statistical dimension. A discussion about macro-consistency is missing altogether. In the academic literature, there are several papers that deal with the compilation of price indices. Among the price indices discussed in Fisher et al. (1994), Diewert and Shimizu (2015), and Diewert et al. (2016) are some examples that build on the ratio between net operating income and the capitalization rate. The income approach is thus applied to the construction of indices. However, consistency is ensured by imposing it at the macro level. Thus, it does not emerge as a result of a bottom-up approach using granular data.

In this paper, we show that macro-consistency requires core CRE market indicators to be defined on a common target universe and be compiled using a data source comprising complete and consistent information about prices, rental income, and vacant space.

This collection is available, preferably, at the level of transacted individual properties or, at least, in a partly aggregated and stratified manner. Additionally, we prove that macro-consistency is ensured if price and rental yield indices are weighted by capital value shares, whereas rent indices and vacancy rates are weighted by rental income shares. This result is valid irrespective of the index formula type (e.g., Laspeyres, Lowe) as long as it is applied to each individual indicator in exactly the same way. Weight updating procedures are included in this uniformity requirement, too. As a consequence, macro-consistent core CRE market indicators can also be constructed using chain-linked Laspeyres-type indices with an annual updating of weights, which is common practice in price and house price statistics (Eurostat 2013, 2018).⁴

The paper includes an empirical illustration of the proposed weighting scheme using data for the German office market. We use annual information on prices, rents, and vacancy rates in 125 German towns and cities. Each town and city represents one stratum. Information refers to a typical property for each stratum. The dataset is provided by the real estate consulting agency *bulwiengesa*. Information on prices and rents represents market values assessed by experts and refers to a typical property in the respective stratum. The object quality of the representative property is held constant over time. *Bulwiengesa* additionally provides annual information on floor space and vacant floor space of office buildings in these German towns and cities.

The available dataset suits the compilation exercise at hand insofar as pricing information at the city level serves consistent stratum data, which are aggregated by means of the proposed index formulae. To our best knowledge, this is the only dataset accessible to us, with which we are able to exemplify the proposed statistical-methodological framework and, in particular, illustrate empirical differences between macro-consistent indicators and alternative choices commonly used. We acknowledge that some of the characteristics of the dataset make it non-suitable for physical CRE index compilation, which is compliant with the ESRB recommendation, as the information is not transaction-based, not available on a quarterly frequency, and does not cover Germany as a whole (Knetsch 2021, 457). For the statistical-methodological issues addressed in this paper, however, it is also neither crucial that the dataset is appraisal-based nor that the constant-quality assumption across time and space is not ensured by running hedonic regressions or applying a repeat sales method but backed solely by the belief that the expert judgments refer to objects that are typical across cities (i.e., prime segment) and normalized over time. By contrast, potential doubts in these respects compromise the usefulness of the resulting macro-consistent core indicators for the German office market for real estate and financial stability analyses.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we focus on individual properties and outline the income approach to the valuation of an individual commercial property. In Section 3, we introduce the concept of macro-consistency of core CRE market indicators and lay down the requirements in terms of target universe and data source. We then switch to the stratum level and derive formulae to be applied to a bottom-up compilation of aggregate indicators. In Section 4, we apply these formulae to exemplify macro-consistent core CRE

market indicators using data for office markets in 125 German towns and cities. In the final section, we draw conclusions.

2 | Income Approach to the Valuation of Individual CRE

Market Value and Price. Let the market value x_t of a property at the end of period t be represented by

$$x_t = p_t q \quad (1)$$

where p_t is the market price per square meter and q is the floor space in square meters. The floor space is assumed to exhibit constant quality over time, that is, the property does not depreciate due to wear and tear or economic obsolescence.

Rent. The property is assumed to generate rental income. When the property is rented out, rental income is the revenue the landlord receives from the tenant(s), usually by means of monetary transactions. Owing to the complexity of rent agreements, there is no unambiguous approach to characterize the rent. The literature distinguishes various forms. Eurostat (2017) lists four rent concepts: asking rents, contract rents, consideration rents, and net effective rents.

Asking rents are perhaps most easily measurable, as they are often disclosed when rental space is advertised. However, asking rents poorly proxies contractual rents. Apart from the regular payment, rent agreements may include rent-free periods, prespecified rent changes, and indexation. Wheaton and Torto (1994) propose looking at the consideration rent, which includes all components whose payable amounts are determined in the contract,⁵ calculating the undiscounted sum and dividing it by the term of the agreement. The consideration rent ignores the timing of the payments. Webb and Fisher (1996) suggest adopting a present value approach. In their concept of a net effective rent, they go beyond the consideration rent in terms of scope, too, by balancing all cash inflows and outflows that are agreed upon in the contract.

Eurostat (2022b) draws a distinction between gross rents and different types of net rents. The different rental concepts reflect differences in the costs that tenants have to bear vis-à-vis the commercial lessor. Gross rents include all costs associated with the property. Single net rents exclude property taxes. Double net rents exclude property taxes and insurance. Triple net rents exclude property taxes, insurance, maintenance, and repair costs. Eurostat (2022a) argues that the net rent should be informative of a landlord's income after operating expenses have been deducted.

The ESRB recommendation defines the rent as “the amount of money actually paid by the tenant to the owner of the property, net of any incentives (e.g., rent-free periods, contributions to refurbishment) and charges” (European Systemic Risk Board 2016). A rent index employing this definition approximately tracks the evolution of rental payments, thereby taking the tenants' perspective. This follows the practice of statistical offices in the construction of residential rent indices by European statistical offices (Eurostat 2018) and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (Adams et al. 2022). Ambrose et al. (2015) also take the tenants' perspective when calculating a repeat rent index. The literature

commonly employs this perspective and the resulting interpretation of the term rent when estimating the effect of object-specific characteristics such as the height of a building (Koster et al. 2014) or its energy efficiency (Eichholtz et al. 2010) on office rents.

Apart from considering rents from the tenants' perspective, it is also possible to take the investors' perspective (Eurostat 2022a; Ambrose et al. 2023). This perspective is particularly relevant in the context of CRE. Investment decisions are evaluated on the basis of discounted future cash flows (D. Geltner 1990). The cash flow is given by net operating income, which is gross rental income net of total costs. In formal terms, the net operating income generated by a property in period t may be written as

$$n_t q = [r_t - c_t] q \quad (2)$$

where n_t denotes net operating income, r_t gross rental income, and c_t total costs, with all flow variables being measured in value terms per square meter.

The major cost components in CRE are vacancy and operating costs.⁶ In the remainder, we express these costs as percentages of rental income and may thus write

$$c_t = [vr_t + or_t] r_t \quad (3)$$

where vr_t denotes the vacancy rate of the property and or_t the fraction of rental income that is eaten up by operating costs. The vacancy rate of an individual property may be measured as the fraction of total to vacant floor space.

Rental Yield. The ESRB recommendation defines the rental yield as the “ratio of annual rents to the market value of the immovable property” (European Systemic Risk Board 2016). Following this interpretation, if the concept of net operating income is employed, the rental yield is conceptually close to the capitalization rate (or cap rate), which relates net operating income to the market value of the property at the time of investment.

$$y_t = \frac{n_t}{p_{t-1}} \quad (4)$$

The mathematical relationship between the market price, the (gross) rent, the rental yield, and the vacancy rate at the level of the individual property can be described by

$$y_t = \frac{[\alpha - vr_t] r_t}{p_{t-1}} \quad (5)$$

This results from plugging (2) and (3) into (4) under the assumption that the fraction of operating costs is constant over time, that is, $or_t = or$ and $\alpha = 1 - or$ with $0 \ll \alpha < 1$.

Relationship Between Core CRE Indicators To assess the profitability of an investment, the literature commonly looks at the total return:

$$tr_t = \frac{p_t - p_{t-1}}{p_{t-1}} + \frac{n_t}{p_{t-1}} \quad (6)$$

For real estate, the total return is given by the sum of the change in the value of the property and the net rental yield. This measure can be easily computed based on the set of indicators proposed in this paper. If changes in property prices are negligible, total

returns and rental yields are equivalent. In the long run, real estate returns seem to predominantly be determined by the rental yield, the contributions of changes in the value of the property have been substantially lower (Eichholtz et al. 2021; Chambers et al. 2021).

Employing an asset pricing approach and assuming future net operating income at its initial level over the whole useful life T : $n_{t+\tau} = n_t$, $\tau = 1, \dots, T$, the market price of a property in period $t - 1$ can be expressed as the discounted sum of future net income flows:

$$p_{t-1} = \beta n_t + \beta^2 n_{t+1} + \dots + \beta^{T+1} n_{t+T} \quad (7)$$

where β is the discount factor.

This implies that the discount factor is equivalent to the inverse of one plus the cap rate, if the useful life approaches infinity:

$$\beta = \frac{1}{1 + y} \quad \text{for } T \rightarrow \infty \quad (8)$$

3 | Deriving Macro-Consistent CRE Market Indicators

We conceptualize macro-consistency of core CRE market indicators by imposing three requirements. First, target universes need to be common to the individual indicators. Second, available granular data need to be complete as regards the information about market prices (including price-determining variables) and the rental situation (i.e., rental income, vacant space). Third, index formulae need to be of the same type, with capital value weights being applied to the price and rental yield indices and rental income weights to the rent index and the vacancy rate.

In Section 3.1, we lay down the framework conditions regarding target universes and data sources. In Section 3.2, we derive index formulae and weighting schemes for consistent sets of core CRE market indicators of Lowe type. Section 3.8 presents formulae for sets of chain-linked Laypeyres-type indices.

3.1 | Target Universes and Data Sources

One approach to the compilation of core CRE market indicators is to consider them as unrelated statistical entities, each of which serves individual purposes or user interests and poses different challenges as regards the availability of data sources. One example is a rent index, which is intended to be used in national accounts and is thus conceptually similar to a producer price index for the sector “Renting and operating of own and leased real estate; non-residential” (68.20.2).⁷ Diewert and Shimizu (2017) calculating commercial property price indices (CPPI) for the compilation of the System of National Accounts is a further example. These indices distinguish, among other things, between the price of the structure and the price of land.⁸ The (usual) definition of the vacancy rate as a percentage of vacant marketable floor space to total marketable floor space measured is another example. With square meterage as the measurement unit for the constituents of the vacancy rate, the vacancy rate is an indicator of real estate market tensions, which is very closely related to activity indicators (such as building permits and starts) rather than to price, rent, and rental yield indices.

An alternative approach takes the valuation of individual CRE as a starting point, based on the reasoning that the relationship between the market price, the gross rent, the net rental yield, and the vacancy rate, derived for an individual property in (5), should carry over to the respective macro indicators. In this line of argument, the respective macro indicators are not only aggregates of a sample of observations measured at different points in time. Instead, they reflect price, rent, and rental yield developments, as well as the ratio of vacant space for a representative property of the CRE market. Except for in a few very exceptional cases, an individual, perhaps hypothetical, property can only be representative in a single target universe. Hence, the core CRE market indicators must share the same target universe in this approach.

We derive the common target universe from the overlap of the maximum target universes of price indices and rent indices. These target universes are defined along orthogonal dimensions, as illustrated in Figure 1. In general, each property may be classified as nontransacted, transacted, or newly built. These are categories of the investment market that are relevant for prices. At the same time, each property, or even each separate unit thereof,⁹ may be grouped into a space market category. It may be classified as nonleased, leased, or vacant. Leased properties may be further broken down into those rented out under an existing or new contract.

The maximum target universe of a price index consists of all nontransacted, transacted, and newly built properties. A rent index can, at most, cover all leased and vacant properties. The intersection represents the common target universe of price and rent indices and, as a corollary, it applies to rental yield indices and vacancy rates, too.

The availability of data is usually another factor that may shrink the coverage of the indicators if the condition of macro-consistency is to be met. In a bottom-up calculation using granular data, macro-consistency will only be achieved if the price and the rental situation are observed for each and every property in the dataset. If we further require observations to be solely transaction-based, we will be able to compile macro-consistent indicators on the basis of transacted properties that are rented out. The dataset is expandable to newly built properties that are (intended to be) rented out.

In CRE price statistics, a distinction is generally made between indices for sales and stocks (see Eurostat 2017, Section 4.6). For the former, the restriction on transactions is conceptually adequate whereas for the latter, the application of transaction-based information on prices and rental income to the nontransacted part of the real estate stock is reasoned by the argument that this information is the best source for market valuations (i.e., assessing the value of the property if it were being sold at the market). In this sense, the coverage of the price index can be extended to the complete real estate stock.

For rent and rental yield indices as well as the vacancy rate, a two-step argumentation is needed to use the information about the rental income and vacant space of transacted properties, with the aim of covering the complete real estate stock. First, the observations from the transacted properties may be taken as the best information base to proxy the rental income and vacant space of




FIGURE 1 | Target universe and data source of core CRE market indicators.

the nontransacted real estate stock. Second, as rental income is actually earned only when the property is rented out, an expansion of the information to the nonleased part of the real estate stock requires imputation. It is a matter of the index concept whether imputations should be included.

From the discussion so far, we conclude that a bottom-up compilation of macro-consistent core CRE market indicators can only be based on granular data about the price and the rental situation of transacted, leased properties. With some additional assumptions, it is nonetheless possible to construct indices covering the complete real estate stock.

The bottom-up compilation with granular data is a less realistic scenario for current practice, given that CRE datasets available at statistical offices suffer from a low number of observations. Substantial heterogeneity further complicates the analysis in this data-scarce environment. In a second-best approach, it may be possible to construct macro-consistent indices if we assume that the sample of properties at hand is representative for both the investment and the space market dimensions. However, we would observe prices and price-determining variables for some subset of properties and information about the rental situation for another subset, with the subsets partially overlapping each other. Under these assumptions, it seems advisable to calculate price and rent indicators using all observations available, instead of using only those properties for which we have information on prices and rents.

3.2 | Formulae for Lowe Indices

In this section, we derive formulae for a bottom-up compilation of macro-consistent core CRE market indicators, assuming that

target universes are common and the granular dataset is complete. The formulae refer to the stock of properties, which is either rented out or vacant. First, we derive the Lowe index formulae for price, rent, and rental yield indices. Then, we augment this set of three indicators with the vacancy rate.

In the following, we switch from looking at individual objects to looking at strata. Let I denote the number of strata that are designed to group each and every individual property in a territory, with the set of strata $\{i : i = 1, 2, \dots, I\}$ meeting the following conditions. First, each stratum contains objects, which are, or better: are made uniform with regard to all characteristics.¹⁰ Second, strata do not overlap and cover the universe as a total. Let us denote the price, gross rent, net operating income, and the rental yield, which are representative for stratum i in period t , by $p_t(i)$, $r_t(i)$, $n_t(i)$, and $y_t(i)$, respectively. Let us further denote the total floor space of stratum i in period t by $q_t(i)$.

Figure 2 illustrates the timing of events. At the end of a period, the investment market opens. Properties are transacted, and we observe strata-specific prices and quantities. After the investment market has closed, a new period begins, and the space market opens. Properties that are available at the space market in period t correspond to quantities on the investment market at the end of period $t - 1$. In the space market, properties either are rented out or remain vacant in the respective period. We observe period t gross rents, net operating income, and vacancies. After the space market has closed, the investment market opens, and period t quantities are determined, which represent the quantities available on the space market in period $t + 1$. Given this timing and the definitions in Section 2, the rental yield of period t represents the return in period t on an investment in period $t - 1$.




FIGURE 2 | Timing of events.

3.3 | Price Indices

Following Eurostat (2017), let us define a price index for stocks of commercial properties using a Lowe index:

$$P_t^{Lo} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I p_t(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I p_0(i) q_b(i)} \quad (9)$$

where t denotes the reporting period, 0 the price reference period, and b the weight reference period. As price and weight reference periods do not change over time in a set of Lowe indices, in the following, we abstain from indicating these two time-invariant reference periods for simplicity.

The Lowe price index (9) may be written as a weighted sum of price relatives:

$$P_t^{Lo} = \sum_{i=1}^I w_P^{Lo}(i) \frac{p_t(i)}{p_0(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad w_P^{Lo}(i) = \frac{p_0(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^I p_0(j) q_b(j)} \quad (10)$$

where $w_P^{Lo}(i)$ is henceforth called the Lowe price weight of stratum i . The Lowe price indices are transitive and may thus be calculated by updating from one period to the next using the formula:

$$\frac{P_t^{Lo}}{P_{t-1}^{Lo}} = \sum_{i=1}^I \tilde{w}_P^{Lo}(i, t-1) \frac{p_t(i)}{p_{t-1}(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{w}_P^{Lo}(i, t-1) = \frac{p_{t-1}(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^I p_{t-1}(j) q_b(j)} \quad (11)$$

where $\tilde{w}_P^{Lo}(i, t-1)$ is the updated Lowe price weight of stratum i . This weight is time-dependent. It results from evaluating period b quantities at period $t-1$ market prices and is equivalent to price-updating the market value of CRE in stratum i from the weight reference period b to period $t-1$.

3.4 | Rent and Net Operating Income Indices

Paralleling the construction of price indices, we define a Lowe gross rent index:

$$R_t^{Lo} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I r_t(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_0(i) q_b(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^I w_R^{Lo}(i) \frac{r_t(i)}{r_0(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad w_R^{Lo}(i) = \frac{r_0(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^I r_0(j) q_b(j)} \quad (12)$$

It can also be written in recursive form

$$R_t^{Lo} = R_{t-1}^{Lo} \sum_{i=1}^I \tilde{w}_R^{Lo}(i, t-1) \frac{r_t(i)}{r_{t-1}(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{w}_R^{Lo}(i, t-1) = \frac{r_{t-1}(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^I r_{t-1}(j) q_b(j)} \quad (13)$$

where $\tilde{w}_R^{Lo}(i, t-1)$ is the Lowe rent weight of stratum i updated to period $t-1$. It results from rent-updating gross rental income generated by CRE in stratum i .

In the same way, we define a Lowe index for net operating income:

$$N_t^{Lo} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I n_t(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I n_0(i) q_b(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^I w_N^{Lo}(i) \frac{n_t(i)}{n_0(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad w_N^{Lo}(i) = \frac{n_0(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^I n_0(j) q_b(j)} \quad (14)$$

In its recursive form, it reads

$$N_t^{Lo} = N_{t-1}^{Lo} \sum_{i=1}^I \tilde{w}_N^{Lo}(i, t-1) \frac{n_t(i)}{n_{t-1}(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{w}_N^{Lo}(i, t-1) = \frac{n_{t-1}(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^I n_{t-1}(j) q_b(j)} \quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{w}_N^{Lo}(i, t-1)$ is the Lowe net operating income weight of stratum i updated to its period $t-1$ value.

3.5 | Aggregate Rental Yields and Rental Yield Indices

In deriving a formula for the aggregate rental yield, we start from the idea of measuring the performance of a time-invariant portfolio of assets. In particular, the portfolio considered is representative of the CRE stock in period b , that is, $q_b(1), q_b(2), \dots, q_b(I)$. The market value of this portfolio at the end of period $t-1$ is $\sum_{i=1}^I p_{t-1}(i) q_{t-1}(i)$. Net operating income of this portfolio in period t is given by $\sum_{i=1}^I n_t(i) q_{t-1}(i)$. The portfolio's rental yield Y_t^{Lo} in period t is

$$Y_t^{Lo} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I n_t(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I p_{t-1}(i) q_b(i)} \quad (16)$$

where the superscript Lo indicates that quantities of the weight reference period b are used. Expanding the numerator in (16) by $p_{t-1}(i)$, applying the definition of the cap rate (4) to the strata level and using the definition of price updated weights (11), we end up with the compact expression:

$$Y_t^{Lo} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I [n_t(i)/p_{t-1}(i)] [p_{t-1}(i) q_b(i)]}{\sum_{i=1}^I [p_{t-1}(i) q_b(i)]} = \sum_{i=1}^I \tilde{w}_P^{Lo}(i, t-1) y_t(i) \quad (17)$$

The aggregate rental yield is equivalent to the weighted sum of rental yields over all strata, if the weights of the chain-linking formula of Lowe price indices (11) are used. Hence, the aggregate rental yield is based on capital value share weights.

Changes in a rental yield index are constructed on the basis of the ratio (Y_t^{Lo}/Y_{t-1}^{Lo}) . This yield index is consistent with the Lowe price index (9) and the Lowe index for net operating income (14) in the sense that the definition of an individual property's cap rate (4) carries over to the aggregate framework:

$$Y_t^{Lo}/Y_{t-1}^{Lo} = \frac{N_t^{Lo}/N_{t-1}^{Lo}}{P_{t-1}^{Lo}/P_{t-2}^{Lo}} \quad (18)$$

This implies that, at the aggregate level, the change of the rental yield in percent is approximately equal to the percentage change of net operating income net of the percentage change in the market price.

3.6 | Aggregate Vacancy Rate

In the following, we augment this set of three indicators—a price, a rent, and a rental yield index—by a vacancy rate. For the mathematical relationship on the individual property level to carry over to the aggregate level, the aggregate vacancy rate requires a specific definition and weighting scheme.

On the level of individual properties, the relationship between net operating income, the gross rent, and the vacancy rate results from combining (2) and (3). Assuming the fraction of operating costs to be constant over time and across strata, this relation for stratum i reads

$$n_t(i) q_b(i) = \alpha r_t(i) q_b(i) - vr_t(i) r_t(i) q_b(i) \quad (19)$$

Aggregating over all strata yields an expression for the relation on the aggregate level

$$\sum_{i=1}^I n_t(i) q_b(i) = \sum_{i=1}^I \alpha r_t(i) q_b(i) - \sum_{i=1}^I vr_t(i) r_t(i) q_b(i) \quad (20)$$

The aggregate net operating income in period t of the population of properties in the weight reference period b is equivalent to the gross rental value less operating expenses and less forgone profit due to vacancies.

For a set of Lowe indices, we define the aggregate vacancy rate as

$$VR_t^{Lo} = \sum_{i=1}^I \frac{r_t(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^I r_t(j) q_b(j)} vr_t(i) \quad (21)$$

The superscript Lo indicates that the vacancy rate uses the same weight reference period as the Lowe indices for prices and gross rents. The weighting scheme underlying the aggregate vacancy rate is based on rental income shares, as in the case of the gross rent index. The only difference to the rental income weight in (13) is that rental income is price updated to period t instead of period $t-1$.

Dividing (20) by (20) for the observation period $t=0$ yields an expression linking the Lowe index for the gross rent to the one for net operating income via the vacancy rate.¹¹

$$N_t^{Lo} = \frac{\alpha - VR_t^{Lo}}{\alpha - VR_0^{Lo}} R_t^{Lo} \quad (22)$$

The evolution of a net rental yield index can be described by changes in the price and the gross rent index as well as a vacancy rate between two time periods. Eliminating net operating income in (18) using (22), the rental yield index evolves according to

$$Y_t^{Lo}/Y_{t-1}^{Lo} = \frac{\alpha - VR_t^{Lo}}{\alpha - VR_{t-1}^{Lo}} \frac{R_t^{Lo}/R_{t-1}^{Lo}}{P_{t-1}^{Lo}/P_{t-2}^{Lo}} \quad (23)$$

3.7 | Discussion

There are different ways to measure vacancies. Vacancies could, for example, be measured in terms of properties, floor space, the market value of properties, or the value on the rental market. Eurostat (2022a) argues that the general consensus is to measure vacancies in terms of vacant floor space and suggests using this measure. However, the integration of the vacancy rate into a set of macro-consistent CRE market indicators requires the valuation of vacant space by their value on the rental market. Compared to weighting vacancies by buildings or floor space, relatively expensive CRE markets get a higher weight than relatively cheap ones.

Measuring vacancies with their value on the rental market is based on two economic arguments. First, whether commercial space is vacant or occupied is per se value-neutral. What is interesting, however, is the way vacant commercial space affects commercial lessors, for example. A rent-weighted aggregate vacancy rate enables us to calculate foregone profit, which might be useful with respect to the assessment of financial soundness of commercial lessors. Second, taking differences in the quality of properties into account, which rents are indicative of, simplifies the calculation of productive capital.

3.8 | Formulae for Chain-Linked Laspeyres-Type Indices

In this section, we derive annually chain-linked macro-consistent core CRE market indicators. Here, price and rent indices are of Laspeyres-type, which is the concept usually applied in official price statistics in Europe.¹² In contrast to Section 3.2, the rental yield index here measures the performance of a time-varying portfolio of assets.

In particular, prices and quantities are determined in the investment market and settle at the end of the period. A chain-linked

price index tracks the evolution of price changes for a portfolio that is representative of quantities at the time of investment.

Gross rents and net operating income are determined in the market for office space. This market opens at the beginning of a period. For example, in period t , gross rents and net operating income represent the values from renting out the property over period t . Available office space for lease in period t has been determined in the investment market at the end of period $t - 1$. The quantities therefore refer to period $t - 1$.

The index formulae that track changes in gross rents (25) and net operating income (26) of a Laspeyres-type form are shifted by one period due to the timing convention. Quantities therefore refer to period $t - 2$ instead of period $t - 1$.¹³

$$P_t^{CL} = P_{t-1}^{CL} \sum_{i=1}^I w_P^{t-1}(i, t-1) \frac{p_t(i)}{p_{t-1}(i)} \quad \text{and}$$

$$w_P^{t-1}(i, t-1) = \frac{p_{t-1}(i)q_{t-1}(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^I p_{t-1}(j)q_{t-1}(j)} \quad (24)$$

$$R_t^{CL} = R_{t-1}^{CL} \sum_{i=1}^I w_R^{t-2}(i, t-1) \frac{r_t(i)}{r_{t-1}(i)} \quad \text{and}$$

$$w_R^{t-2}(i, t-1) = \frac{r_{t-1}(i)q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^I r_{t-1}(j)q_{t-2}(j)} \quad (25)$$

$$N_t^{CL} = N_{t-1}^{CL} \sum_{i=1}^I w_N^{t-2}(i, t-1) \frac{n_t(i)}{n_{t-1}(i)} \quad \text{and}$$

$$w_N^{t-2}(i, t-1) = \frac{n_{t-1}(i)q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^I n_{t-1}(j)q_{t-2}(j)} \quad (26)$$

The weights' superscript indicates the weight reference period; the second term in parenthesis indicates the observation period of prices and rents that is used to evaluate the respective quantities.

A rental yield index in a set of chain-linked indices results from chaining changes in the rental yield based on a coherent weighting scheme. Given the definition of the rental yield (16), the evolution of a rental yield index can be described by

$$Y_t^{CL} = Y_{t-1}^{CL} \frac{N_t^{CL}/N_{t-1}^{CL}}{P_{t-1}^{CL}/P_{t-2}^{CL}} \quad (27)$$

3.9 | Vacancy Rate Index

Similar to Section 3.2, we augment this three-variables set by an indicator for the vacancy rate. In the context of chain-linked Laspeyres-type indices, the aggregate vacancy rate reads

$$V R_t^{t-2} = \sum_{i=1}^I \frac{r_t(i)q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{j=1}^I r_t(j)q_{t-2}(j)} v_{r_t}(i) = \sum_{i=1}^I w_R^{t-2}(i, t) v_{r_t}(i) \quad (28)$$

The subscript indicates the observation period of the vacancy rate; the superscript indicates the weight reference period. The weighting scheme is based on rental income shares. Similar to

(21), the weight resembles that of the gross rent, but rental income is updated to period t instead of period $t - 1$.

Dividing (20) for the observation period t and the weight reference period $b = t - 2$ by (20) for the same weight reference period and the observation period $t - 1$ yields an expression linking chain-linked Laspeyres-type indices for the gross rent to net operating income via the vacancy rate.¹⁴

$$\frac{N_t^{CL}}{N_{t-1}^{CL}} = \frac{\alpha - V R_t^{t-2} R_t^{CL}}{\alpha - V R_{t-1}^{t-2} R_{t-1}^{CL}} \quad (29)$$

Using (29) to eliminate net operating income from (27), the evolution of a net rental yield index can be described by

$$Y_t^{CL}/Y_{t-1}^{CL} = \frac{\alpha - V R_t^{t-2} R_t^{CL}/R_{t-1}^{CL}}{\alpha - V R_{t-1}^{t-2} P_{t-1}^{CL}/P_{t-2}^{CL}} \quad (30)$$

Chain-linked Laspeyres-type indices compare the evolution of a variable using the same weight reference period (chain link) and link these changes to an index. In the three-variable case, prices, rents, and rental yields are linked multiplicatively, which only requires information on the change in the respective aggregate to construct a set of indicators.

Vacancy rates, however, are subtracted from the fraction of rental income that remains after operating expenses have been deducted. We therefore cannot use a growth rate similar to prices, rents, and rental yields, but require a vacancy rate for two time periods using the same weight reference period to describe the evolution of a net rental yield index.

One way to circumvent this issue is to simplify the relation (30) by employing an approximation. Substituting the first fraction on the right-hand side by its first-order approximation, we can rewrite (30) as

$$Y_t^{CL}/Y_{t-1}^{CL} \approx \left(1 - \frac{\Delta V R_t^{CL}}{\alpha - V R}\right) \frac{R_t^{CL}/R_{t-1}^{CL}}{P_{t-1}^{CL}/P_{t-2}^{CL}} \quad (31)$$

where VR represents the steady-state vacancy rate.¹⁵ The steady-state vacancy rate is the rate in the long run equilibrium, which would occur in the absence of shocks. Due to frictions, it may, for example, take time to find a new tenant after the previous one has left the building, while some offices remain vacant even in the absence of shocks. $\Delta V R_t^{CL} = V R_t^{t-2} - V R_{t-1}^{t-2}$ is the change in the aggregate vacancy rate for the weight reference period $t - 2$ for the observation period t in percentage points. An indicator for the vacancy rate results from chaining changes in the vacancy rate with a common weight reference period.

4 | Application to the German Office Market

This section presents a case study for the construction of a macro-consistent set of core CRE market indicators using the example of the market for office space in Germany.

In the following subsection, we provide an overview of the data used to compile the indicators. In Subsection 4.2, we present a

macro-consistent set of four indicators, consisting of a price, a gross rent, and a net rental yield index as well as a vacancy rate. In Subsection 4.3, we compare the macro-consistent version of the indicators to alternative specifications proposed in the literature or used in practice.

4.1 | Dataset

This paper uses a dataset provided by bulwiengesa, a real estate consulting agency for stakeholders in the German real estate market. We have annual information on prices, gross rents, and vacancy rates for office space in 125 German towns and cities. Each town and city represents one stratum.¹⁶ Our dataset starts in 1995. Especially for towns and cities in the former German Democratic Republic, office markets required several years to adjust after the German reunification. The last year of observations is 2023.

Information on prices and rents is based on assessments of market experts for a typical property in the respective stratum. The data is not subject to appraisal smoothing—a phenomenon that has often been documented for appraisal-based indices in the literature, for example, D. Geltner (1993); Clayton et al. (2001). Knetsch (2021, 443) presents arguments as to why appraisal errors might be absent in the bulwiengesa data.¹⁷ In Section 4.2, we provide empirical evidence by comparing the cyclicity of the appraisal-based office price index for 125 towns and cities based on data by bulwiengesa to the transaction-based office price index by vdp, which points to the absence of appraisal smoothing.

Prices and gross rents refer to prime properties.¹⁸ Prices reflect net purchase prices per square meter in the respective year and exclude ancillary acquisition costs such as land transfer taxes, administrative expenses (notary and registration fees), as well as expert and broker fees. Rents represent monthly square meter rents that could be obtained under a new lease starting in the respective year. We annualize this monthly information. Rents correspond to the contractually agreed starting rent regardless of incentives, incidental expenses, and taxes. Rents track the evolution of contract rents, therefore representing gross rents.

Vacancy rates are calculated as the ratio of marketable vacant office space to total marketable office space in the respective town or city. Total office space is the sum of the net usable area in square meters of existing offices and office space under construction that will be available for occupancy within three months.¹⁹

Vacant office space is the sum of the vacant net usable area in square meters that is available for sale or letting and ready for occupancy within three months.²⁰ The reporting date for these space indicators is the end of the year.

Net operating income is calculated as gross rents less operating expenses and forgone profit associated with vacancies. We assume a constant operating cost rate of 20% of the gross market rent across cities and over time. Gross and net yields are calculated dividing gross rents and net operating income by prices.

Table 1 reports summary statistics for unweighted averages across the 125 strata and the standard deviation for the different indicators. Our dataset contains observations for 125 towns and cities in 29 years, which implies a maximum of 3625 observations per indicator. On average, the square meter price of an office building in the reference year 2015 was €1517. Over the sample period, prices increased by about 0.9% per year. The annual gross rent was about €136 per square meter, which is equivalent to about €11 per month. On average, gross rents increased by about 0.7% per year, which is substantially less than the growth rate of office prices. About 5.8% of office space was vacant in the observation period, which is roughly equal to the vacancy rate in the reference period 2015 (6.1%). Office space increased over time in our sample, on average by about 0.9% per year. In 2015, office space averaged 1461 k m² per town or city.

Using prices, gross rents, and vacancy rates, we calculate net operating income and net rental yields at the city level. Net operating income is substantially less than the gross rent. In 2015, net operating income was €101 per square meter on average. In our sample, its mean growth rate was 0.7% per year. As vacancies in the first and the last year of our sample were roughly equal, the gross rent and net operating income expanded at a similar average rate. The average gross yield in our sample was 10.1%. The average net rental yield was substantially lower (7.4%).

4.2 | Macro-Consistent Core CRE Market Indicators

Using the dataset provided by bulwiengesa, we compile macro-consistent sets of core CRE market indicators for office markets in the years from 1995 to 2023. We calculate aggregate indicators for 125 towns and cities, as well as for the seven largest cities.²¹ This city group is a good proxy for the metropolitan areas in Germany and has played a prominent role in real estate market

TABLE 1 | Unweighted descriptive statistics.

	Mean (2015)	Transformation	N	Median	Mean	SD
Price	€1517	growth rate:	3500	1.2%	0.9%	7.3
Gross annual rent	€136	growth rate:	3500	0.0%	0.7%	4.6
Vacancy rate	6.1%		3625	4.7%	5.8%	4.2
Office space	1461 k m ²	growth rate:	3500	0.5%	0.9%	1.5
Annual net operating income	€101	growth rate:	3500	0.6%	0.7%	5.1
Gross rental yield	10.9%		3625	9.7%	10.1%	3.2
Net rental yield	8.0%		3625	7.2%	7.4%	2.0

analysis for many years. Information on floor space is available at the same time as information on prices and rents. The exposition in this subsection is restricted to Laspeyres indices.

In Figure 3, the time series of the price, the gross rent, and the net rental yield indices, as well as the aggregate vacancy rate are displayed for the 125 towns and cities as well as for the seven largest cities. Comparing the two city groups with each other, the core indicators generally show a rather similar development in qualitative terms. However, there are differences with respect to quantitative changes. In general, absolute changes for the seven largest cities are larger than for the 125 towns and cities.

From 1995 to 2015, the price and rent indices fluctuated in approximately two full cycles without drifting clearly upwards or downwards. In the build-up of the dot-com bubble and prior to the outbreak of the Global Financial Crisis, office prices somewhat increased. During the following recessions, office prices dropped slightly below the respective pre-build-up level. The latest upswing in the German office market began in 2010 and lasted for about one decade. Since 2022, office prices have declined, picking up pace in 2023.

In the beginning of our observation period, gross rents developed similarly to prices, more or less mimicking the cyclical pattern, albeit with a smaller amplitude. The prolonged increase in rental prices started in the early 2010s. In contrast to office prices, the upward trend in the rental market for offices remains intact until the end of the sample period. Rents have continued to increase, even after the COVID-19 pandemic.

Rental yields are an indicator for the profitability of an investment. They typically co-move with the level of interest rates. Net rental yields relate the initial annual net profit from an investment in office space to the initial investment. In the first half of our observation period, net rental yields were rather stable. As interest rates declined in the aftermath of the Global Financial Crisis of 2007–2008 and the Great Recession, rental yields also plummeted. This is related to the fact that prices accelerated much faster than rents in the early 2010s. Since the trough in 2021, rental yields have picked up due to declining prices and further increasing rents.

Vacancy rates are an indicator for market tightness. Typically, if vacancy rates for offices are high, abundant supply of office space faces an only limited demand. This puts pressure on rental prices. Vacancy rates for offices declined during the build-up of the dot-com bubble. After the bubble had burst, vacancy rates increased substantially and remained elevated till the early 2010s and the start of the latest property price cycle. Prior to the pandemic, vacancy rates dropped below the levels prior to the dot-com bubble. With the pandemic affecting the demand for office space, vacancy rates started to increase in 2020.

Let us now investigate the presence of appraisal errors in the bulwiengesa data. The literature has argued that appraisal data is prone to appraisal smoothing and lags transaction data (D. M. Geltner 1991; D. Geltner 1993). We therefore compare the cyclical component of the office price index for the 125 towns and cities to the transaction-based one by vdp.²² The trajectories of the cyclical components are very similar (Figure 4). In the time period under

consideration, the cyclical assessment is the same. If there are differences with respect to smoothness, the appraisal-based cycle is less smooth than the transaction-based one since about 2012. The smaller regional coverage of 125 towns and cities in comparison to the whole country might be one explanation for this difference. The right panel shows the correlation of the appraisal-based cyclical component to the transaction-based vdp index. The contemporaneous correlation is strongest, which is an indication for no appraisal smoothing in our dataset.

4.3 | Comparison of Macro-Consistent Core CRE Market Indicators With Alternative Choices


The core CRE market indicators need to be designed specifically in order to meet the conditions of macro-consistency. In this subsection, we compare macro-consistent indicators for the 125 towns and cities with alternative specifications of the indicators.

Figure 5 compares the gross rent and the net operating income indices to illustrate similarities and differences in the evolution of the two rent indicators. As we compare indices, differences in the level of the two indicators are driven by the choice of the base year. We therefore compare the changes in the two indices. The general trend of both indicators is rather similar. However, there are distinguishable differences with respect to quantitative changes. From 2000 to 2004, net operating income declined substantially more than the gross rent. From then until 2019, net operating income expanded substantially more than the gross rent, by about 13%.

The differences between the rental yield indices, displayed in Figure 6, reflect the differences in the rent indices, albeit with the opposite sign. Gross rental yields exhibit a higher volatility and tend to overstate changes in the profitability of an initial investment in the office market as they do not account for changes in costs in comparison to the core indicator. The intuition is straightforward. During, say, an upswing in the office market, prices typically increase more than rents as prices reflect increased revenue in not just one period but the entirety of a property's remaining lifetime. Moreover, the vacancy rate decreases if the market is running hot. This decreases the wedge between gross rents and net rental income, implying a higher growth rate of net operating income.

Figure 7 compares a rental income-weighted vacancy rate to a floor space-weighted one. In our sample, the core indicator is substantially more volatile than a floor space-weighted indicator. The intuition is similar to the one for the rental yield index. In an office market boom, vacancy rates go down due to an increased demand for office space. Demand for high quality (and expensive) office space typically increases disproportionately, so that value-weighted vacancy rates decrease more than floor space-weighted vacancy rates, in which space of high and low quality is weighted equally.

In the period from about 2003–2013, the rental income-weighted core vacancy rate was substantially higher than the floor space-weighted one. The difference amounted to up to 1.1 percentage points, implying that office markets in cities with high prices had especially high vacancy rates. With office



Source: bulwiengesa AG, authors' calculation.
 Deutsche Bundesbank

S4X0001.Chart

FIGURE 3 | Macro-consistent core indicators.




FIGURE 4 | Cyclicity of price indices for offices in Germany.




FIGURE 5 | Rent and net operating income (NOI) indices.

markets running hot, vacancy rates fell substantially, especially in structurally high-priced markets. Prior to the pandemic in 2019, the core vacancy rate index was about 0.3 percentage points lower than its floor space-weighted equivalent. This implies that there are non-negligible differences between the two weighing

schemes. Floor space weights underestimate the value of offices not utilized in the productive process due to vacant space.

Finally, we investigate the effect of different weighting schemes on rental yields. We argue that to be integrated in a consistent set of indicators, rental yields should be weighted by capital value




FIGURE 6 | Rental yield index with and without vacancy costs.




FIGURE 7 | Vacancy rate according to different weighting schemes.

shares. Apart from this weighting scheme, one might also, in principle, consider a weighting scheme based on the numerator, net operating income, or an average of the two weighting schemes.

Figure 8 illustrates how the weighting scheme affects the rental yield index. The general trend of the three indices is

very similar. However, some non-negligible differences remain. Given capital value shares, rental yields are representative of a portfolio of offices as discussed in Section 3.2. The capital value share-weighted core indicator is slightly more volatile than the alternative. Capital value shares give markets with high-quality properties, the big cities where prices fluctuate more, a higher weight than the other weighting schemes. The




FIGURE 8 | Rental yield indices according to different weighting schemes.

difference in the weighting scheme accumulates to up to twelve index points.

5 | Conclusions

In this paper, we have developed a statistical-methodological framework for the bottom-up compilation of macro-consistent core CRE market indicators. The set consists of a market price index, a gross rent index, a net rental yield index as well as a vacancy rate. Consistency requires, first, that the target universe be common and, second, that the granular dataset be complete as regards the information about market prices (including price-determining characteristics) and the rental situation (i.e., rental income, vacant space). If the granular dataset is not complete, as second best, assumptions can ensure the applicability of the framework. The third condition refers to weighting schemes. The price index and the net rental yield index must be based on capital value shares, whereas the gross rent index and the vacancy rate must be based on rental income shares.

In an exemplary application, we have compiled a consistent set of indicators for the German office market. The compilation is based on annual appraisal data for 125 towns and cities provided by bulwiengesa. This application can illustrate the benefits of macro-consistent CRE indicators. From 1995 to about 2010, office prices in Germany went through two cycles. However, these cycles were mild in comparison to the prolonged increase in prices since 2010. This raises the question as to whether the price index adequately captures the price development during the first two cycles. The other CRE indicators can be used to cross-check the development of the price index. First, the rental price index shows a similar pattern to the price index. Second, rental yield

indices based on the other CRE indicators seem to be in line with the evolution of interest rates. This cross check also makes us confident that the divergent development of price and rent indices at the current edge adequately captures market developments. Even though rental yield indices have increased substantially in the last two years, they remain well below the levels observed prior to the low interest rate period. However, these indicators cannot fulfil at least two important user needs, namely, that they are at quarterly frequency and are based on granular transaction-based information.

The granular CRE transaction data currently available are often rather patchy in the price or rent dimension or both. While it may not be advisable to follow a bottom-up approach under these circumstances, it is nonetheless worthwhile considering how to configure the core set of CRE market indicators and to impose macro-consistency. For instance, a two-step procedure might be applied. The first step would be to compile the market price index, the gross rent index and the vacancy rate using the individually most appropriate, albeit not necessarily uniform, datasets. The second step would be to infer the net rental yield index by applying the income approach to asset valuation at the aggregate level. This is definitely a third-best solution but probably viable in many instances of current statistical practice.²³

Further efforts are needed to develop granular data sources in order to make them fit for the bottom-up compilation of quarterly core CRE market indicators. From this paper, we conclude that the data requirements are high. In particular, the market price and price-determining characteristics as well as rental income and vacant space must be available for each and every transacted property. Such a full-information transaction database is difficult to collate with data from notaries and other administrative

sources because information about the rental situation is missing. In addition, share deals are not covered. Transaction databases arising from the lending business of banks are perhaps better suited provided that they capture sales activity to a sufficient degree.²⁴

Apart from macro-consistency, we have identified conceptual issues which are to be further discussed between compilers and users of CRE market statistics. For example, a sharpening of definitions is welcome, particularly as regards the space market variables. To enhance the interpretation, it should be clarified what exactly constitutes rental income and which cost components are to be deducted from income.

Acknowledgements

Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

Ethics Statement

The authors have nothing to report.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from bulwiengesa. Restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for this study.

Endnotes

¹ In the ESRB recommendations and related literature, the attribute “physical” is used to distinguish price, rent, and rental yield indices as well as vacancy rates, building starts, transactions, and so on from lending indicators or financial information. In the remainder of this paper, we refer to the multitude of nonfinancial indicators using the term “CRE market indicators.”

² In Europe, CRE market indicators generally fall within the remit of statistical offices. Depending on the country-specific distribution of statistical competences, however, central banks play different roles, ranging from users to (co-)compilers because of (joint) responsibility for these statistics.

³ For an in-depth discussion of the issues raised in this report, see Hill and Steurer (2020).

⁴ In terms of practical index compilation, we consider the upper level of aggregation (i.e., the level from which weighting information is available) while, for the lower level of aggregation, we (implicitly) assume that (sub-)indices are aggregated by any formula that maintains consistency at the level of individual properties. The granular information might be aggregated by a (weighted) geometric mean, for instance.

⁵ When rents are indexed to a price index, rent graduations are not considered in the consideration rent, as they are unknown a priori.

⁶ Operating costs may consist of maintenance costs, administrative expenses, and other operating costs that cannot be apportioned to tenants.

⁷ In the German version of the current statistical classification of economic activities (*Klassifikation der Wirtschaftszweige, Ausgabe 2008*), the NACE Rev. 2 sector 68.20 is further broken down into residential and nonresidential real estate. NACE is the acronym of the respective European classification called *Nomenclature statistique des activités économiques*.

⁸ A CPPI conceptualized for the purpose of financial stability and macroprudential supervision may not be equally suited for national accounts. Eurostat (2021) categorizes differences in CPPI concepts along six dimensions: the treatment of land, the period of interest, the comparability across regions and countries, the granularity, the data, and the coverage. In national accounts, a deflator for gross fixed capital formation (GFCF) in “Buildings other than dwellings” (AN1121) is required. As land is not a produced asset, land is not part of GFCF (Lequiller and Blades 2014). Hence, Diewert and Shimizu (2017) show how to employ a builder’s model to decompose changes in observed prices into a land, a structure, and a capital expenditures component. With respect to financial stability and macroprudential supervision, however, the value of the property as a whole (i.e., the composite of land and structure) is relevant because this may serve as collateral for credit.

⁹ For the sake of simplification, we do not distinguish the degree of granularity between the investment and the space markets, though it turns out to realistically feature CRE markets. As any separate unit is generally rentable and saleable, we continue to denote the granular unit by property in both dimensions.

¹⁰ There are several ways to take differences in object quality into account. The repeated sales method (Bailey et al. 1963) accounts for such differences by comparing the price of a property at two points in time. Assuming that the object has not changed over time, the observed change in the transaction price represents the price change of an object with constant quality. The Case–Shiller Indices are the most prominent examples of repeated sales indices, see Case and Shiller (1987) for a description of the method. Employing a structural time series model, Francke (2010) makes the repeated sales method applicable even to thin markets with only a small number of observations. The hedonic method uses all observations, not just repeated sales, and adjusts for variation in the quality of observed properties. Hedonic theory postulates that the price of a good can be decomposed into the contributions of its characteristics (Rosen 1974). Establishing comparability of properties via a hedonic price function has therefore been a popular approach ever since (King and Mieszkowski 1973; Linne-man 1980; Eurostat 2013) and has been recommended for CRE (Eurostat 2017). For residential real estate in Germany, this approach has been applied, for example, by the Federal Statistical Office of Germany (Dechent 2008), vdpResearch, and Bauer et al. (2013). Alternative approaches include the comparison of typical objects, which is employed by bulwiengesa (Deutsche Bundesbank 2020), for example, by using narrowly defined strata.

¹¹ For a derivation of (22), see Section A in Appendix A.

¹² Given a quarterly frequency, annual expenditure shares would have to be price updated to the fourth quarter.

¹³ Using period $t - 1$ quantities would imply a Paasche index, as $t - 1$ quantities are only determined at the end of the period and refer to the quantities that are available for lease in period t .

¹⁴ For a derivation of (29), see Section A in Appendix A.

¹⁵ We abstract from variation in the steady-state vacancy rate due to changing weights.

¹⁶ For the list of the 125 strata, see Table B1 in the Appendix.

¹⁷ First, the pricing information collected by bulwiengesa data is explicitly transacted-related, meaning that they are asked to provide their knowledge about the prices, rents and yields of those properties that are ready to be transacted under current market conditions. The promise that notional and stale appraisals are absent makes the bulwiengesa dataset highly valuable for real estate analysis and consulting to investors (Leifer 2004, 437). This standing has been earned and maintained over a long time.

¹⁸ Prime offices are the most attractive properties in the respective city. They are representative for the top three percent of the market. These properties are typically located in the inner-city area and exhibit a leasable area of at least 500 square meters (seven largest cities),

300 square meters (large cities) or 200 square meters (medium-sized towns).

¹⁹ Information on the stock of office space in 1995 is based on a complete count for some cities or an estimate based on the number of office workers for others. If there is no new complete count available, the stock of office space is updated based on information on additions and disposals.

²⁰ This is based on information by market participants, market observers, and portals for marketing vacant office space.

²¹ The seven city aggregate consists of indicators for Berlin, Dusseldorf, Frankfurt am Main, Hamburg, Cologne, Munich, and Stuttgart.

²² The cyclical component is calculated using an HP filter on the log-transformed indices with $\lambda = 100$.

²³ In manuals and recommendations, statistical methods are often given a rating of A, B, or C in order to signal compilers whether the method is preferred (A), acceptable (B), or prohibited (C). Adopting this, we could assign an A rating to the fully fledged bottom-up approach while the alternative could be given a B.

²⁴ In Germany, such a transaction database is maintained by vdpResearch.

References

Adams, B., L. Loewenstein, H. Montag, and R. Verbrugge. 2022. “Disentangling Rent Index Differences: Data, Methods, and Scope.” Working Paper 55, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Ambrose, B. W., N. E. Coulson, and J. Yoshida. 2015. “The Repeat Rent Index.” *Review of Economics and Statistics* 97, no. 5: 939–950.

Ambrose, B. W., N. E. Coulson, and J. Yoshida. 2023. “Housing Rents and Inflation Rates.” *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 55, no. 4: 975–992.

Bailey, M. J., R. F. Muth, and H. O. Nourse. 1963. “A Regression Method for Real Estate Price Index Construction.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 58, no. 304: 933–942.

Bauer, T. K., S. Feuerschütte, M. Kiefer, et al. 2013. “Ein Hedonischer Immobilienpreisindex Auf Basis von Internetdaten: 2007–2011 [A Hedonic Real Estate Price Index Based on Internet Data: 2007–2011].” *AStA Wirtschafts- Und Sozialstatistisches Archiv* 7, no. 1: 5–30.

Case, K. E., and R. J. Shiller. 1987. “Prices of Single Family Homes Since 1970: New Indexes for Four Cities.” Working Paper 2393, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Chambers, D., C. Spaenjers, and E. Steiner. 2021. “The Rate of Return on Real Estate: Long-Run Micro-Level Evidence.” *Review of Financial Studies* 34, no. 8: 3572–3607.

Clayton, J., D. Geltner, and S. W. Hamilton. 2001. “Smoothing in Commercial Property Valuations: Evidence From Individual Appraisals.” *Real Estate Economics* 29, no. 3: 337–360.

Dechent, J. 2008. “Hauserpreisindex – Projektfortschritt Und Erste Ergebnisse für Bestehende Wohngebäude [House Price Index – Project Progress and First Results for the Stock of Residential Properties].” *Wirtschaft Und Statistik* 1, no. 2008: 69–81.

Deutsche Bundesbank. 2020. “Quality report on residential property price indices on the basis of data provided by bulwiengesa AG.”

Diewert, E., and C. Shimizu. 2017. “Alternative Approaches to Commercial Property Price Indexes for Tokyo.” *Review of Income and Wealth* 63, no. 3: 492–519.

Diewert, W., K. Fox, and C. Shimizu. 2016. “Commercial Property Price Indexes and the System of National Accounts.” *Journal of Economic Surveys* 30, no. 5: 913–943.

Diewert, W., and C. Shimizu. 2015. “A Conceptual Framework for Commercial Property Price Indexes.” *Journal of Statistical Science and Application* 3, no. 9–10: 131–152.

Eichholtz, P., N. Kok, and J. M. Quigley. 2010. “Doing Well by Doing Good? Green Office Buildings.” *American Economic Review* 100, no. 5: 2492–2509.

Eichholtz, P., M. Korevaar, T. Lindenthal, and R. Tallec. 2021. “The Total Return and Risk to Residential Real Estate.” *Review of Financial Studies* 34, no. 8: 3608–3646.

European Commission. 2023. “Final Progress Report on Commercial Real Estate Statistics.” Commission Staff Working Document 434.

European Systemic Risk Board. 2016. “Recommendation of the European Systemic Risk Board on Closing Real Estate Data Gaps.” (ESRB/2016/14), 31 October 2016.

European Systemic Risk Board. 2019. “Recommendation of the European Systemic Risk Board Amending Recommendation ESRB/2016/14 on Closing Real Estate Data Gaps.” (ESRB/2019/3), 21 March 2019.

Eurostat. 2013. *Handbook on Residential Property Price Indices (RPPIs)*. Publication Office of the European Union.

Eurostat. 2017. *Commercial Property Price Indicators: Sources, Methods and Issues*. Publication Office of the European Union.

Eurostat. 2018. *Harmonised Index of Consumer Prices (HICP). Methodological Manual 2018*. Publication Office of the European Union.

Eurostat. 2021. “User Needs for Commercial Real Estate (CRE) Indicators for Financial Stability and Macroprudential Supervision, Draft chapter 2 of the Manual on Commercial Real Estate Indicators.”

Eurostat. 2022a. “Indicators of CRE Market, Draft chapter 4 of the Manual on Commercial Real Estate Indicators.”

Eurostat. 2022b. “Methods for Compiling CRE Indicators. Draft chapter 7 of the Manual on Commercial Real Estate Indicators.”

Fisher, J. D., D. M. Geltner, and R. B. Webb. 1994. “Value Indices of Commercial Real Estate: A Comparison of Index Construction Methods.” *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 9: 137–164.

Francke, M. K. 2010. “Repeat Sales Index for Thin Markets: A Structural Time Series Approach.” *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 41: 24–52.

Geltner, D. 1990. “Return Risk and Cash Flow Risk With Long-Term Riskless Leases in Commercial Real Estate.” *Real Estate Economics* 18, no. 4: 377–402.

Geltner, D. 1993. “Estimating Market Values From Appraised Values Without Assuming an Efficient Market.” *Journal of Real Estate Research* 8, no. 3: 325–345.

Geltner, D. M. 1991. “Smoothing in Appraisal-Based Returns.” *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 4: 327–345.

Heath, R. M., and E. B. Goksu. 2016. “G-20 Data Gaps Initiative II: Meeting the Policy Challenge.” IMF Working Paper 43, International Monetary Fund.

Hill, R. J., and M. Steurer. 2020. “Commercial Property Price Indices and Indicators: Review and Discussion of Issues Raised in the CPPI Statistical Report of Eurostat (2017).” *Review of Income and Wealth* 66, no. 3: 736–751.

King, A. T., and P. Mieszkowski. 1973. “Racial Discrimination, Segregation, and the Price of Housing.” *Journal of Political Economy* 81, no. 3: 590–606.

Knetsch, T. A. 2021. “Compilation of Commercial Property Price Indices for Germany Tailored for Policy Use.” *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie Und Statistik* 241, no. 4: 437–461.

Koster, H. R., J. van Ommeren, and P. Rietveld. 2014. “Is the Sky the Limit? High-Rise Buildings and Office Rents.” *Journal of Economic Geography* 14, no. 1: 125–153.

Leifer, H.-A. 2004. "Price Indicators for Residential Real Estate in Germany [Preisindikatoren für Wohnimmobilien in Deutschland]." *Allgemeines Statistisches Archiv* 88: 435–450.

Lequiller, F. I., and D. W. Blades. 2014. *Understanding National Accounts*. 2nd ed. OECD Publishing.

Linneman, P. 1980. "Some Empirical Results on the Nature of the Hedonic Price Function for the Urban Housing Market." *Journal of Urban Economics* 8, no. 1: 47–68.

Rosen, S. 1974. "Hedonic Prices and Implicit Markets: Product Differentiation in Pure Competition." *Journal of Political Economy* 82, no. 1: 34–55.

Webb, R., and J. D. Fisher. 1996. "Development of an Effective Rent (Lease) Index for the Chicago CBD." *Journal of Urban Economics* 39, no. 1: 1–19.

Wheaton, W. C., and R. G. Torto. 1994. "Office Rent Indices and Their Behavior Over Time." *Journal of Urban Economics* 35, no. 2: 121–139.

Appendix A

Derivations

This section presents the derivation of Equations (22) and (29).

Derivation of (22)

Dividing (20) by (20) for the observation period $t = 0$ yields:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^I n_t(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I n_0(i) q_b(i)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I \alpha r_t(i) q_b(i) - \sum_{i=1}^I vr_t(i) r_t(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I \alpha r_0(i) q_b(i) - \sum_{i=1}^I vr_0(i) r_0(i) q_b(i)} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Using (14), we can rewrite the left side of (A1) as N_t^{Lo} . Expanding the right side by $\sum_{i=1}^I r_0(i) q_b(i)$, we can rewrite (A1) as

$$N_t^{Lo} = \frac{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^I \alpha r_t(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_0(i) q_b(i)} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I vr_t(i) r_t(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_0(i) q_b(i)}}{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^I \alpha r_0(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_0(i) q_b(i)} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I vr_0(i) r_0(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_0(i) q_b(i)}} \quad (\text{A2})$$

Using that α does not depend on the individual stratum i , using (12), and expanding the second fraction in the numerator by $\sum_{i=1}^I r_t(i) q_b(i)$, we can rewrite this expression as

$$N_t^{Lo} = \frac{\alpha R_t^{Lo} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I vr_t(i) r_t(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_t(i) q_b(i)} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I r_t(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_0(i) q_b(i)}}{\alpha - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I vr_0(i) r_0(i) q_b(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_0(i) q_b(i)}} \quad (\text{A3})$$

Given the definition of the aggregate vacancy rate for Laspeyres indices (21) and again using (12), (A3) simplifies to

$$N_t^{Lo} = \frac{\alpha R_t^{Lo} - V R_t^{Lo} R_t^{Lo}}{\alpha - V R_0^{Lo}} \quad (\text{A4})$$

which can easily be rearranged to yield (22) in the main text.

Derivation of (29)

Dividing (20) for the observation period t and the weight reference period $b = t - 2$ by (20) for the same weight reference period and the observation period $t - 1$ yields:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^I n_t(i) q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I n_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)} \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I \alpha r_t(i) q_{t-2}(i) - \sum_{i=1}^I vr_t(i) r_t(i) q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I \alpha r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i) - \sum_{i=1}^I vr_{t-1}(i) r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Using (26), we can rewrite the left side of (A5) as $\frac{N_t^{CL}}{N_{t-1}^{CL}}$. Expanding the right side by $\sum_{i=1}^I r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)$, we can rewrite (A5) as

$$\frac{N_t^{CL}}{N_{t-1}^{CL}} = \frac{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^I \alpha r_t(i) q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I vr_t(i) r_t(i) q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)}}{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^I \alpha r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I vr_{t-1}(i) r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)}} \quad (\text{A6})$$

Using that α does not depend on the individual stratum i , using (25), and expanding the second fraction in the numerator by $\sum_{i=1}^I r_t(i) q_{t-2}(i)$, we can rewrite this expression as

$$\frac{N_t^{CL}}{N_{t-1}^{CL}} = \frac{\alpha \frac{R_t^{CL}}{R_{t-1}^{CL}} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I vr_t(i) r_t(i) q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_t(i) q_{t-2}(i)} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I r_t(i) q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)}}{\alpha - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I vr_{t-1}(i) r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^I r_{t-1}(i) q_{t-2}(i)}} \quad (\text{A7})$$

Given the definition of the aggregate vacancy rate for chain-linked indices (21) and again using (25), (A7) simplifies to

$$\frac{N_t^{CL}}{N_{t-1}^{CL}} = \frac{\alpha \frac{R_t^{CL}}{R_{t-1}^{CL}} - V R_t^{t-2} \frac{R_t^{CL}}{R_{t-1}^{CL}}}{\alpha - V R_{t-1}^{t-2}} \quad (\text{A8})$$

which can easily be rearranged to yield (29) in the main text.

Appendix B

Tables

TABLE B1 | Definition of city-groups and towns and cities covered.

City group	Explanation	List of towns and cities
7 largest cities	Originally introduced by bulwiengesa; meanwhile adapted by other compilers (e.g., Federal Statistical Office of Germany, Deutsche Bundesbank, vdp)	Berlin, Dusseldorf, Frankfurt (Main), Hamburg, Cologne, Munich, Stuttgart
Large cities excluding 7 largest cities	BBSR definition of a large city: at least 100,000 inhabitants	Aachen, Augsburg, Bergisch Gladbach, Bielefeld, Bochum, Bonn, Bottrop, Braunschweig, Bremen, Bremerhaven, Chemnitz, Darmstadt, Dortmund, Dresden, Duisburg, Erfurt, Erlangen, Essen, Freiburg (Breisgau), Fürth, Gelsenkirchen, Göttingen (City), Hagen, Halle (Saale), Hamm, Hannover, Heidelberg, Heilbronn, Herne, Hildesheim (City), Ingolstadt, Jena, Karlsruhe, Kassel, Kiel, Koblenz, Krefeld, Leipzig, Leverkusen, Lübeck, Ludwigshafen, Magdeburg, Mainz, Mannheim, Moers, Mönchengladbach, Mülheim (Ruhr), Münster, Neuss (City), Nuremberg, Oberhausen, Offenbach (Main), Oldenburg, Osnabrück, Paderborn (City), Pforzheim, Potsdam, Recklinghausen (City), Regensburg, Remscheid, Reutlingen (City), Rostock, Saarbrücken, Siegen (City), Solingen, Trier, Ulm, Wiesbaden, Wolfsburg, Wuppertal, Würzburg
Medium-sized towns	BBSR definition of a medium-sized town: at least 20,000, but below 100,000 inhabitants	Albstadt, Aschaffenburg, Bamberg, Brandenburg (Havel), Coburg, Cottbus, Dessau-Roßlau, Detmold, Düren (City), Eisenach, Flensburg, Frankfurt (Oder), Friedrichshafen, Fulda (City), Gera, Gießen (City), Görlitz, Greifswald, Gütersloh (City), Halberstadt, Hanau, Kaiserslautern, Kempten (Allgäu), Konstanz (City), Landshut, Lüdenscheid, Lüneburg (City), Marburg, Minden, Neubrandenburg, Neumünster, Offenburg, Passau, Plauen, Ratingen, Ravensburg (City), Rosenheim, Salzgitter, Schwerin, Stralsund, Suhl, Tübingen (City), Villingen-Schwenningen, Weimar, Wilhelmshaven, Witten, Zwickau