



# ANNEX 1: CHARTS ON DEVELOPMENTS IN LOAN PORTFOLIOS AND ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE


#### 1.1. Lending to households


















4 LENDING SURVEY • MAY 2016







5















7













## 1.2. Lending to the corporate sector














LENDING SURVEY • MAY 2016 12
















Note: The magnitude of tightening/easing is not shown in the chart.













Chart 30 Monitoring/reporting requirements by corporate category (net percentage balance of respondents reporting tightening/easing weighted by market share) per cent per cent per cent 100 100 100 80 80 80 TIGHTENING 60 60 60 40 40 40 20 20 20 0 0 0 -20 -20 20 LOOSENING -40 -40 -40 -60 -60 -60 -80 -80 -80 09 01 03 010 03 011 01 012 03 012 03 013 01 2014 03 2014 03 2014 03 2016 03 2016 03 2016 03 -100 -100 -100 2009 Q1 Q3 2010 Q1 Q3 2011 Q1 Q3 2012 Q1 Q3 2013 Q1 Q3 2014 Q1 Q3 2014 Q1 Q3 2016 Q1 2016 Q1 2009 Q1 Q3 2010 Q1 Q3 2011 Q1 Q3 2012 Q1 Q3 2013 Q1 2014 Q1 2015 Q3 2015 Q3 2016 Q1 2016 Q1 Large- and medium-sized Small- and micro-sized Non-financial corporations enterprises enterprises Note: The magnitude of tightening/easing is not shown in the chart.




















Chart 39 Changes in the quality of the commercial real estate loan portfolio (net percentage balance of respondents reporting improvement/deterioration weighted by market share) per cent 100 80 DETERIORATION 60 40 20 0 -20 IMPROVEMENT -40 -60 -80 -100 **Commercial real** Residential Logistics Retail (shopping Offices estate centres) Portfolio quality 2016 Q1 Portfolio quality 2016 Q2-Q3 (expected)

### **ANNEX 2: METHODOLOGICAL NOTES**

In terms of methodology – starting from January 2010 – the survey consists of the standard questionnaire in each segment, and we might also ask ad hoc questions of current concerns related to the lending segment. The retrospective questions in the questionnaire refer to the previous quarter year (previous quarter in the past), (e.g. to 2015 Q4 in January 2015), whereas forward-looking questions contain projections for the upcoming half year (e.g. for 2016 H1 in January 2015), relative to the trends of the previous quarter year (previous half year in the past).

To indicate changes, the survey used the so-called net change indicator, expressed as a percentage of respondents. This indicator is calculated as follows: market share-weighted ratio of respondents projecting a change (tightening/increasing/strengthening) minus market share-weighted ratio of respondents projecting a change in the opposite direction (easing/decreasing/weakening).

The standard part of the questionnaire asked respondents for changes in willingness to lend (volume of loans), credit standards and credit/disbursement conditions, as well as changes in demand (observed in the last quarter and, as expected for the next half year, seasonally adjusted changes in new credit applications) and in portfolio quality as perceived by the respondent, and changes in the risk assessment of different sectors in the case of the corporate questionnaire. The survey applied a five-step scaling to assess changes in the willingness to lend, demand, standards/conditions, risk parameters, however on the charts we only show the direction, excluding magnitude:

• A rating of 1 reflects a considerable increase in demand and in willingness to lend, a considerable tightening in credit standards/credit conditions, a considerable increase in housing prices and risk parameters and, in the case of the risk assessment of sectors, a score of 1 indicates a considerable increase in risk perception relative to the half year preceding the survey, or relative to the current half year or for the upcoming half year in the case of a forecast.

• A rating of 3 indicates an unchanged assessment, both for the current half year and for the forecast pertaining to the upcoming half year.

• A rating of 5 reflects a considerable decrease in demand and in willingness to lend, a considerable loosening of credit standards/credit conditions, a considerable decline in housing prices and risk parameters and, in the case of the risk assessment of sectors, a rating of 5 indicates a significantly safer climate relative to the half year preceding the survey, or relative to the current half year or for the upcoming half year in the case of a forecast.

Ratings of 2 and 4 allow for an intermediate assessment between two extremes (e.g. demand increasing to some extent).

Keywords used for the purposes of the questionnaire are defined as follows:

**Credit availability** (willingness to lend) reflects the respondent's intention to expand and increase its portfolio in the specific segment.

In terms of **credit conditions**<sup>1</sup>, there is a distinction between price-related and non-price related factors. Non-price related credit conditions (such as collateralisation requirements, loan covenants, maximum size of loans/credit lines, etc.) represent specific contractual terms; the bank will not disburse the loan unless these conditions are met. Regarding the non-price related factors, the survey queried respondents on items such as the spread between the interest rate level and the cost of funds, and risk premium.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> As credit standards and credit conditions are interrelated concepts, we surveyed overall changes in credit conditions and standards, followed by a separate query on individual credit conditions.