



TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYET  
MERKEZ BANKASI

## RESEARCH NOTES IN ECONOMICS

### Optimal Mix of the Extended Nelson Siegel Model for Turkish Sovereign Yield Curve

Oğuzhan Çepni      Doruk Küçüksaraç

**Özet:** Getiri eğrisi, merkez bankaları tarafından kullanılan en temel araçlardan birisidir. Merkez bankalarının getiri eğrisi tahmin etmek için en yaygın kullanılan yöntem Genişletilmiş Nelson Siegel modelidir. Getiri eğrisinin tahmininde bazı teknik unsurlar önem arz etmektedir. Söz konusu unsurlar, amaç fonksiyonunun seçimi ve tahminde kullanılacak tahvil ve bonoların vade dağılımı olarak iki ana başlık altında incelenebilir. Bu bağlamda, bu notta Genişletilmiş Nelson Siegel modeli kullanılarak, Türkiye Hazine tahvil piyasa getiri eğrisi için en uygun amaç fonksiyonu ve vade dağılımı bileşimi incelenmektedir. Temel bulgular, uzun vadeli tahvillerin veri setinden çıkarılmasının kısa vadeli tahvil getirilerinin tahminine olumlu yönde katkı sağladığına işaret etmektedir. Bununla beraber repo işlemlerinin veri setine dâhil edilmesi amaç fonksiyonuna bağlı olmaksızın tüm vadelerde getiri eğrisi tahminini kötüleştirmektedir. Amaç fonksiyonu seçimi olarak ise, ağırlıklandırılmış fiyat farklarının minimize edilmesi repo işlemlerinin eklenmediği durumda daha iyi sonuç vermektedir.

**Abstract:** Yield curve is one of the most fundamental tools used by central banks. The most popular method to estimate yield curve by the central banks is Extended Nelson Siegel model. However, there are some technical differences in yield curve estimation. These differences are mainly related to the choice of objective function and the maturity spectrum of bonds in the data set. In this respect, this note aims to find out the optimal combination of the Turkish Treasury bond market yield curve based on the Extended Nelson Siegel model. Main findings indicate that the exclusion of long-term bonds results in a better in-sample fit for the short-term bonds. On the other hand, the inclusion of repo transactions leads to a worsening in in-sample fit across all maturity segments regardless of the choice of the objective function. Regarding the choice of objective function, weighted price minimization provides better in sample-fit of the yield curve for all different maturity segments when the repo transactions are excluded.

*The CBT Research Notes in Economics is a refereed publication prepared by Central Bank of Turkey with the purpose of disseminating results from research on the Turkish economy with a particular emphasis on macroeconomic developments and issues relevant for monetary policy, and thereby contributing to discussions on economic issues in a timely fashion. All views and opinions expressed in the CBT Research Notes in Economics are of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Central Bank of Turkey and its staff. A written permission must be obtained to reprint the entire text of notes published in CBT Research Notes in Economics series.*

## 1. Introduction

A zero-coupon yield curve depicts the relationship between time-to-maturity and spot rates (zero rates). Since it contains information about the market expectations of future inflation and economic activity, it is widely used by many central banks as a measure for the monetary policy stance. However, yield curve cannot be directly observed since bonds are issued across a finite set of maturities. One of the most common methods for constructing a continuous yield curve is through parametric approaches. The models obtained via these techniques describe the instantaneous forward rates or zero rates at all maturities as a single function of specific unknown parameters. Against this background, a popular parametric model is the one proposed by Nelson and Siegel (1987) and later extended by Svensson (1994), which is quite flexible to capture the different shapes of the yield curve and is widely used by central banks and many practitioners.

However, there are two main issues in the implementation of Extended Nelson Siegel (ENS), which are the maturity spectrum of bonds in the data set and the choices of the objective function. From the point of the maturity spectrum, if the short-term bonds are included, they tend to have higher weights in the optimization procedure since the bonds are generally weighted by the inverse of their durations. This provides a better fit at the short end but not for entire yield curve. This problem can be remedied by ignoring bonds with maturities shorter than some pre-specified maturity, which may result in poor fit at the short end of the curve. One way to solve this problem is to exclude some bonds and fit two separate yield curves, generally for Treasury bills and Treasury bonds individually. Alternatively, the goodness-of-fit can also be improved by increasing the number of short-term securities and/or by including repo transactions to the data set.

The second important point in the implementation of ENS to yield curve estimation depends on the choice of the objective function. If the variance of the yield errors is assumed to be homoscedastic, then weighted price minimization or yield minimization is theoretically the same (Fong and Vasicek, 1982). In practice, the magnitude of the yield errors differs across bonds due to some factors such as liquidity (Berenguer et al., 2013). Therefore, the choice of objective function turns out to be an important issue for yield curve estimation.

The optimization choices of the yield curve estimation in major central banks have been covered in BIS (2005). Table 1 shows the choice of objective function (minimized error), shortest maturity in estimation and relevant maturity spectrum in main central banks. It is observed that although these major central banks have been using the Nelson Siegel (NS) or ENS, there are some differences in the optimization objective and the maturity of the bonds

involved in the estimation. Countries like France and Italy use weighted prices whereas countries such as Germany, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland choose to minimize yields-to-maturities. Additionally, the shortest maturity included in the yield curve estimation differs across the central banks. Although some countries such as Finland, Spain and Sweden use all bonds and bills, some countries exclude bonds with maturities shorter than 3 months or 1 year.<sup>1</sup>

Table 1: The Optimization Routines Followed in the Yield Curve Estimation

Central Bank	Estimation Method	Minimized Error	Shortest Maturity in Estimation	Relevant Maturity Spectrum
Belgium	ENS & NS	Weighted Prices	Treasury Certificates > few days	Couple of days to 16 years
			Bond > 1 year	
Finland	NS	Weighted Prices	> 1 day	1 to 12 years
France	ENS & NS	Weighted Prices	Treasury Bills: All Treasury Notes > 1 month	Up to 10 Years
			Bond > 1 year	
Germany	ENS	Yields	> 3 months	1 to 10 Years
Italy	NS	Weighted Prices	Money Market Rates: Overnight and Libor rates from 1 to 12 months	1 to 30 Years
			Bonds > 1 year	
Norway	ENS	Yields	Money Market Rates > 30 days	Up to 10 Years
			Bonds > 2 year	
Spain	ENS	Weighted Prices	> 1 day	Up to 10 Years
Sweden	ENS	Yields	> 1 day	Up to 10 Years
Switzerland	ENS	Yields	Money Market Rates > 1 day	1 to 30 Years
			Bonds > 1 year	

Source: BIS (2005).

This study aims to find out the optimal combination for the Turkish Treasury bond market yield curve based on ENS model. In doing so, the analysis seeks to answer the following questions: Does the exclusion of some bonds contribute to the fit at the short end of the curve? Does the inclusion of the repo transactions increase the goodness of fit for the yield curve estimation? Does the optimization through the yield-to-maturity minimization provide any improvement for the goodness of fit?

Accordingly, the next section summarizes the related literature. The third and fourth sections briefly present the yield curve estimation methodology and data. Then, the fifth section provides the empirical evidence and the sixth section concludes.

<sup>1</sup> The central banks using spline-based methods rather than parametric methods also have some differences in terms of the bonds included in the yield curve estimation, relevant maturity spectrum and the shortest maturity in estimation. The table is taken from BIS paper (2005).

## 2. Related Literature

Besides the comprehensive BIS study, Anderson et al. (2001) apply spline based techniques for the UK government bond markets. They include repo transactions whose maturities range from overnight to one year. The results indicate the benefit of using data from repo market to derive estimates of the nominal yield curve at short maturities. Yu and Fung (2002) estimate zero-coupon yield curve for Hong Kong SAR government securities using Extended Nelson Siegel with the choices of weighted price and yield error minimization as objective functions. They find out that both objectives result in very good estimates of the zero-coupon yield curve. However, they state that yield error minimization approach is computationally more demanding since it requires one more iteration stage. Additionally, the findings of the paper indicate that convergence problems are more likely to occur in yield error minimization and the results are more sensitive to the choice of the initial parameter values. They state that since the primary interest for the yield curve analysis is in the interest rates, yield error minimization approach is suggested.

Hladikova and Radova (2012) estimate the yield curve of the Czech Treasury bond market employing both yield and price minimization approaches based on different weighting schemes with daily data from 2002 to 2011. According to the price minimization criteria, equally weighted and the inverse of modified duration weighted yield curves show the best performance. Regarding yield minimization, putting equal weights on bonds produces more accurate estimate of yield curve.

The literature related to estimating the yield curve of Turkish Treasury bond market is focused on the comparison of different yield curve estimation methods. One of the most comprehensive studies, Akinci et al. (2006), estimates ENS yield curve for Turkish sovereign bond market using only price minimization excluding the bonds with maturities shorter than 3 months. However, they do not consider the impact of the choice of the objective function.

## 3. Yield Curve Estimation Methodology

The yield curve construction requires estimating zero rates and forward rates. Although zero rates for specific maturities might be calculated using the bootstrap technique, all zero rates and forward rates cannot be observed directly. Since it is not possible to construct a continuous yield curve using the bootstrap technique, parametric methods have been developed to estimate the yield curve. The main idea behind these methods is that they assume a functional form consistent with the properties of interest rates and optimize the parameters in the functional form.

Any bond price traded in the market can be expressed as follows:

$$P_t^i = \sum_{j=1}^M CF_{t_j}^i B_{t,t_j} \quad (1)$$

where  $CF$  denotes the matrix of the cash flows corresponding to bonds and  $M$  stands for the number of different cash flow dates for bond  $i$ . Let  $B_{t,t_j}$  be  $M$ -dimensional vector of zero coupon bond prices at time  $t$  for the maturities of  $t_j$  where  $j = 1, 2, \dots, M$ . If we model the zero coupon bond price  $B_{t,t_j}$  as a function of unknown parameters, then fitted bond prices will be as follows:

$$P_t^{i,fitted} = \sum_{j=1}^M CF_{t_j}^i h(\beta, t, t_j) \quad (2)$$

where  $h(\beta, t, t_j)$  is any parametric function describing the zero coupon bond price and  $\beta$  is a matrix consisting of parameters. The objective is to minimize the weighted difference between the fitted prices and market prices of bonds. The general application is to weight the bonds with the inverse of their durations since the estimation errors for short-term zero rates do not lead to substantial price differences. The objective function can be written as:

$$\min_{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^K \left( \frac{P_t^i - P_t^{i,fitted}}{D_t^i} \right)^2 \quad (3)$$

where  $D_t^i$  denotes the Macaulay duration at time  $t$  and  $K$  stands for the number of bonds.<sup>2</sup> Instead of comparing the bond prices, an alternative method to obtain the parameters is to minimize the squared deviation between estimated and observed yield-to-maturities. In this case, the estimation procedure involves two steps. The first step is to find out the fitted prices based on the parameter estimates. Then, yield-to-maturity for bonds traded in a given day is estimated. However, the relation between bond price and yield-to-maturity ( $y$ ) is nonlinear, so the yield-to-maturity for each bond should be solved numerically<sup>3</sup>.

$$P_t^{i,fitted} = \sum_{j=1}^M CF_{t_j}^i e^{-y_t^{i,fitted}(t_j-t)} \quad (4)$$

<sup>2</sup> The Macaulay duration is the weighted average term-to-maturity based on the cash flows of a bond. The weight of each cash flow is calculated by dividing the discounted value of the cash flow by the price of a bond.


<sup>3</sup> The yield-to-maturity calculation is continuously compounded. The actual yield-to-maturity is also converted to the continuously compounded yields.

After finding the estimated yield-to-maturities, the next step is to minimize the squared difference between the observed yields and estimated yields choosing the optimal parameters according to equation 5.

$$\min_{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^K (y_t^i - y_t^{i,fitted})^2 \quad (5)$$

#### 4. Data and Methodology

The study is conducted using daily weighted average prices of Turkish Treasury bonds in Borsa Istanbul (BIST) Debt Securities Market Daily Bulletin. The data set includes zero-coupon and fixed-coupon bonds. Floating-rate coupon bonds are excluded due to the uncertainty regarding the future coupon payments. Since long-term maturity bonds are issued only after 2010, the sample ranges between January 2011 and May 2016. In order to have a better grasp about the maturity structure of bonds, Chart 1 presents the evolution of the average maturity of bonds traded in BIST. Accordingly, a cursory look suggests that on average the maturity of Turkish Treasury bonds traded in BIST has been increasing over time.



The performance of the yield curve estimation is tested with the inclusion of the repo transactions in BIST Interbank Repo Market. Since repo transactions are perceived to be a safe and a satisfactory substitute for Treasury bills, they are also included. The data obtained from interbank repo data in BIST Debt Securities show that the maturity of the significant portion of the repo transactions is one or three days.

Many central banks widely use the Svensson (1994) model because of its parsimonious nature of the functional form. Specifically, ENS model assumes that the instantaneous forward rates can be described explicitly by the following functional form:

$$f(m, \beta, \tau) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 e^{\frac{-m}{\tau_1}} + \frac{m}{\tau_1} \beta_2 e^{\frac{-m}{\tau_1}} + \frac{m}{\tau_2} \beta_3 e^{\frac{-m}{\tau_2}} \quad (6)$$

where  $m$  denotes the time to maturity,  $\beta = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \tau_1, \tau_2)$  is the parameter set to be estimated. The parameters of ENS model have economically interpretable meanings.  $\beta_0$  reflects a level of the curve or long run expectations about the level of interest rates.  $\beta_1$  represents the slope of the yield curve that can be defined as the difference between long-term and short-term instantaneous forward rate.  $\beta_2$  and  $\beta_3$  can be interpreted as magnitude and direction of the hump.  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  determine the location of the humps in the curve. The zero coupon or spot interest rate can be derived by integrating the instantaneous forward rates.

Spot rates are estimated by assigning some initial values for the parameters set  $\beta = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \tau_1, \tau_2)$  and then theoretical spot rates and discount factors are calculated. Finally, ENS model parameters are computed through the minimization of the squared difference between weighted price errors or yield errors, which are obtained by the difference between actual and fitted price or yield-to-maturities. The in-sample fit are considered to evaluate the performance of different alternatives. In this respect, Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) is used. RMSE is calculated as follows:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^K \frac{(P_i - P_i^{fit})^2}{K}} \quad (7)$$

## 5. Empirical Evidence

One of the focus points of the note is whether the exclusion of the bonds with the maturities greater than pre-specified years contributes to the in-sample fit of the short end of the yield curve. Therefore, the bonds with maturities greater than 2 years and 5 years are excluded.<sup>4</sup> Then, the in-sample fit of the curve across different maturities using weighted price minimization as an objective function are compared. For instance, if none of the bonds are excluded, then RMSE for bonds with 1 to 2-year maturity is around 0.114 (Table 2).<sup>5</sup> However, if bonds with more than 2-year maturity are excluded, RMSE for these bonds drops

<sup>4</sup> 2 years and 5 years can be regarded as medium-term for the yield curve. The results are robust when other medium-term maturities are taken into account.

<sup>5</sup> 0.114 RMSE can be considered as 0.114 percent error since prices of the bonds are around face value (100).

to 0.077. Generally, it is observed that when the bonds with longer maturity are excluded, the in-sample fit at the short end of the yield curve becomes better. This results from the fact that higher weights are assigned to the shorter maturity bonds. However, excluding longer maturity bonds leads to loss of information due to the coupon payments of long-term bonds. The empirical evidence here suggests that the effect of assigning higher weights to bonds with shorter term maturities outweighs the loss of information due to the exclusion of long-term bonds.

			Up to 1 Year	1 to 2 Years	2 to 5 Years	5 to 10 Years
No Filter	RMSE	Average	0.056	0.114	0.211	0.334
		Standard deviation	0.036	0.068	0.133	0.330
5-Year Filter	RMSE	Average	0.055	0.113	0.196	--
		Standard deviation	0.036	0.068	0.137	--
2-Year Filter	RMSE	Average	0.053	0.077	--	--
		Standard deviation	0.035	0.043	--	--

\*2-Year Filter and 5-Year Filter indicate that bonds with maturities greater than 2 years and 5 years are excluded from the dataset.


The previous analysis is repeated by including the repo transactions. Similar to the previous findings, the short end of the yield curve up to 1 year is observed to have a better fit when long-term bonds are excluded. Yet, the in-sample fit worsens significantly with the inclusion of repo transactions (Table 3).

			Up to 1 Year	1 to 2 Years	2 to 5 Years	5 to 10 Years
No Filter	RMSE	Average	0.092	0.209	0.491	1.259
		Standard deviation	0.050	0.123	0.351	1.243
5-Year Filter	RMSE	Average	0.085	0.198	0.563	--
		Standard deviation	0.047	0.119	0.455	--
2-Year Filter	RMSE	Average	0.078	0.207	--	--
		Standard deviation	0.042	0.143	--	--

\*2-Year Filter and 5-Year Filter indicate that bonds with maturities greater than 2 years and 5 years are excluded from the dataset.

Although we include more observation to the data set, the results show that repo transactions do not improve the in-sample fit. This can be attributed to the maturity of the repo transactions. Since the maximum maturity of the repo transactions included in the estimation is 3 days, the repos tend to have very large weights in the optimization. For

instance, Chart 2 shows the effect of the repo transactions in the yield curve estimations on April 25, 2016. The repo transactions tend to have % 96 weights in the optimization, and this situation results in decreases in the weights of the other bonds. Chart 3 shows that the yield curve estimation including the repo transaction results in larger price errors, especially on short-term bonds. In fact, there exists empirical evidence that repo transactions improve the fit of the yield curve in some countries. However, the maturities of the repo transactions in other countries are much longer than one or three days.



We also examine whether the yield error minimization results in better estimates than weighted price minimization. In this respect, yield to maturity for each bond is numerically calculated using estimated prices with the ENS method and the squared difference between estimated and actual yield to maturities is minimized. Since there is no analytical solution for the yield to maturity given bond prices, the optimization through yield to maturity minimization is computationally burdensome. Therefore, we have only reported the yield minimization results for the period between January 2015 and May 2016. The optimal parameters under the yield minimization are used to calculate the price errors for each bond. The results in Table 4 show that the price minimization gives better in-sample fit for the Turkish Treasury bond data than the yield minimization. Additionally, the price errors tend to be larger in yield minimization compared to price minimization for all the bonds with different maturity segments.

			Up to 1 Year	1 to 2 Years	2 to 5 Years	5 to 10 Years	Overall
Yield Minimization	RMSE	Average	0.091	0.148	0.301	0.513	0.334
		Standard deviation	0.050	0.094	0.152	0.394	0.180
Price Minimization	RMSE	Average	0.075	0.102	0.234	0.310	0.220
		Standard deviation	0.051	0.066	0.131	0.205	0.112

The last analysis conducted in the study is to investigate the effect of repo transactions in the yield minimization. The results indicate that the yield minimization provides better sample fit than price minimization when the repo transactions are included. However, the inclusion of repo transactions worsens the in-sample fit for both yield minimization and price minimization.

			Up to 1-Year	1 to 2-Year	2 to 5-Year	5 to 10-Year	Overall
Yield Minimization	RMSE	Average	0.103	0.187	0.393	0.656	0.414
		Standard deviation	0.049	0.114	0.246	0.513	0.227
Price Minimization	RMSE	Average	0.111	0.212	0.424	0.994	0.577
		Standard deviation	0.050	0.132	0.271	0.799	0.358

## 6. Conclusion

This technical note investigates the optimal combination for the Turkish Treasury bond yield curve estimation using the ENS method. First, it aims to test whether the exclusion of long-term bonds results in better fit at the short end of the curve. Second, it seeks to find out whether the inclusion of repo transactions improves the in-sample fit. Finally, it compares the performance of yield minimization with that of weighted price minimization.

The results suggest that fitting two different yield curves for Treasury bond market provides a better fit for short-term bonds. In other words, the exclusion of long-term bonds improves the goodness of fit at the short end of the yield curve. The positive effect of assigning higher weights to the short-term bonds outweighs the adverse effect due to the loss of information from the coupon payments of long-term bonds. The inclusion of repo transactions leads to a worsening in the in-sample fit for all the bonds across different maturity segments. This result might be attributed to very high weights assigned to the repo transactions due to their very short-term nature. Lastly, applying yield-to-maturity

minimization does not improve goodness of fit and weighted price minimization provides more plausible results for the Turkish Treasury bond market. The performance of the yield curve estimated with the inclusion of repo transactions might be improved if the repo market becomes more concentrated around longer maturities like in advanced countries. Additionally, it should be kept in mind that the optimal mix for the yield curve estimation might differ across time depending on the maturity spectrum of the bonds traded, the lengthening of the maturities of repo transactions and increasing homogeneity in terms of liquidity premiums for different maturities.

## References

- Akıncı, Özge., B. Gürcihan, R. Gürkaynak and Ö. Özel, 2006, Devlet İç Borçlanma Senetleri İçin Getiri Eğrisi Tahmini (in Turkish), Central Bank Working Paper No. 06/08.
- Anderson, N. and J. Sleath, 2001, New estimates of the UK real and nominal yield curves, Bank of England Working Paper No. 126.
- Berenguer, E. R. Gimeno and J. M. Nave, 2014, Term structure estimation, liquidity-induced heteroskedasticity and the price of liquidity risk, Bank of Spain Working Paper No. 13/08.
- BIS, 2005, Zero-Coupon Yield Curves: Technical Documentation, BIS Papers No. 25.
- Diebold, F. X., and L. Canlin, 2006, Forecasting the term structure of government bond yields, *Journal of econometrics*, 130(2): 337-364.
- Hladíková, H. and J. Radová, 2012, Term structure modelling by using Nelson-Siegel model, *European Financial and Accounting Journal*, 7(2): 36-55.
- Nelson, C.R. and A.F. Siegel, 1987, Parsimonious modeling of yield curves, *Journal of business*, 60(4): 473-489.
- Svensson, L.E.O., 1994, Estimating and interpreting forward interest rates: Sweden 1992-1994. NBER Working Paper No.4871.
- Vasicek, O.A. and H.G. Fong, Term structure modeling using exponential splines, *The Journal of Finance*, 37(2): 339-348.
- Yu, I. and L. Fung, 2002, Estimation of zero-coupon yield curves based on exchange fund bills and notes in Hong Kong, Hong Kong Monetary Authority Working Paper No. 2002-09.

---

*For questions and comments:*

*Editör, Ekonomi Notları*

*TCMB İdare Merkezi, Anafartalar Mah. İstiklal Cad, No: 10, Kat:15, 06050, Ulus/Ankara/Türkiye*

*E-mail:Ekonomi.notlari@tcmb.gov.tr*