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Introduction

• Independent fiscal councils on the rise
• Figures based on updated IMF dataset on IFCs
• Key questions addressed here:
  • How do they affect deficits/debt?
  • What settings are conducive to their emergence and design?
• Politico-economic model – 2 types of debt bias:
  • Short-termism: driven by chance to be voted out of office
  • Opportunism: more debt to appear more competent
• IFC makes competence signal more precise
• Welfare evaluation depends on
  • Intertemporal allocation resources
  • Average competence incumbent (if re-elected)
• Crucial role for competence versus congruence
Updated data IFCs by Debrun, Zhang & Beetsma
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Motivation for model

• Most IFCs in our dataset enjoy some or substantial independence

• Their activities (positive and normative analysis, etc.) produce information on efficiency and legitimacy of allocation of public resources

• Information is disseminated through public reports and the media

• Helps to enhance fiscal transparency towards general public

• Our results can help explain why “long-run sustainability” and “monitoring of fiscal rules” are part of the mandate of many IFCs
The model – I

• Two political parties, incumbent P and challenger Q compete for office
• Period-\( t \) resources for public consumption:
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  g_1 &= \eta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + d \\
  g_2 &= \eta_2 + \varepsilon_2 - d
  \end{align*}
  \]
• Competence: \( \eta_P, \eta_Q \sim N(\bar{\eta}, \sigma^2_\eta) \)
• Independent of \( \varepsilon_t \sim N(0, \sigma^2_\varepsilon) \)
• Debt is subject to upperbound \( d \leq D \)
The model – II

• Utility: \( E[u(g_1)] + \text{Pr}(R) \cdot (g_2) + (1 - \text{Pr}(R)) \cdot (-K) \)

• Utility loss from not being re-elected: \( K > D - \bar{\eta} \)

• Voters care about competence and political color, prefer \( P \) over \( Q \) if: \( \eta_P \geq \eta_Q + \Delta \)

• Challenger (incumbent) favored if \( \Delta > 0 \) (\( \Delta < 0 \))

• Voters receive signal about competence:

\[
s_1 = \eta_1 + \mu_1 \quad \text{with} \quad \mu_1 \sim N\left(0, \sigma^2_\mu\right)
\]
The model – III

• Timing:
  • Nature draws the unobserved competence levels
  • Society or incumbent chooses whether to install IFC or not
  • Start period 1: incumbent sets debt (unobserved to voters)
  • Nature draws the shock $\varepsilon_1$
  • Voters observe public consumption $g_1$ and receive signal $s_1$
  • Start period 2: elections
Benchmark: social planner – I

• Planner selects debt + appoints policymaker for remaining policies

• After this planner observes incumbent's competence

• Period 2: planner reappoints incumbent if $\eta_i \geq \bar{\eta} + \Delta$

• Planner maximizes

$$E\left[u\left(g_1\right)\right] + \text{Pr}\left(\eta_i \geq \bar{\eta} + \Delta\right) \cdot \left(E\left[\eta_i | \eta_i \geq \bar{\eta} + \Delta\right] - d\right) + \left(1 - \text{Pr}\left(\eta_i \geq \bar{\eta} + \Delta\right)\right) \cdot (\bar{\eta} - d + \Delta) =$$

$$E\left[u\left(\eta_i + \varepsilon_i + d\right)\right] + (\bar{\eta} - d) + \sigma_\eta \cdot \phi\left(\Delta / \sigma_\eta\right) + \Delta \cdot \Phi\left(\Delta / \sigma_\eta\right)$$
• Two selection effects:
  
  • Re-elected incumbent is more competent than average – effect largest when partisan preferences least important ($\Delta = 0$)
  
  • Selection effect due to better fit in terms of political color

• First-best debt level:

$$E\left[u'(\eta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + d^{\text{FB}})\right] = 1$$
Debt in political game – I

- Incumbent’s posterior expectation:

\[
\hat{\eta}_I = E(\eta_1 | g_1, s_1) = \frac{h_\eta \bar{\eta} + h_\varepsilon (g_1 - d) + h_\mu s_1}{h_\eta + h_\varepsilon + h_\mu} = \frac{h_\eta \bar{\eta} + h_\varepsilon (\eta_1 + \varepsilon_1) + h_\mu s_1}{h_\eta + h_\varepsilon + h_\mu}
\]

- From an ex ante perspective: \( \hat{\eta}_I \sim N(\bar{\eta}, \sigma_h^2) \)

- Where \( \sigma_h^2 = \frac{h_\varepsilon + h_\mu}{h_\eta + h_\varepsilon + h_\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{h_\eta} = \frac{h_\varepsilon + h_\mu}{h_\eta + h_\varepsilon + h_\mu} \cdot \sigma_\eta^2 \)

- Measure of informativeness: higher means \( g_1 \) and \( s_1 \) have more discriminatory power in drawing conclusions about competence ex post
Debt in political game – II

- Voter forms beliefs \( \hat{d}_v \) about debt

\[
\hat{\eta}_v = E\left( \eta_1 \mid g_1, s_1, \hat{d}_v \right) = \frac{h_\eta \bar{\eta} + h_\epsilon \left( g_1 - d + (d - \hat{d}_v) \right) + h_\mu s_1}{h_\eta + h_\epsilon + h_\mu} = \hat{\eta}_I + \frac{h_\epsilon}{h_\eta + h_\epsilon + h_\mu} \left( d - \hat{d}_v \right)
\]

- Incumbent’s re-election probability

\[
p = Pr(\hat{\eta}_v \geq \bar{\eta} + \Delta) = Pr\left( \hat{\eta}_I \geq \bar{\eta} + \Delta - \frac{h_\epsilon}{h_\eta + h_\epsilon + h_\mu} \left( d - \hat{d}_v \right) \right) = 1 - \Phi \left( \Gamma \left( d, \hat{d}_v \right) \right)
\]

- Where \( \Gamma \left( d, \hat{d}_v \right) = \frac{1}{\sigma_h} \left( \Delta - \frac{h_\epsilon}{h_\eta + h_\epsilon + h_\mu} \left( d - \hat{d}_v \right) \right) \)

- Increase in debt lowers \( \Gamma \left( d, \hat{d}_v \right) \) and raises re-election chance
• Incumbent’s objective:

\[ E[u(g_1)] + p \cdot (E[\hat{\eta} | \hat{\eta}_v \geq \bar{\eta} + \Delta] - d) + (1 - p) \cdot (-K) = \]

\[ E[u(\eta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + d)] + \left[1 - \Phi\left(\Gamma(d, \hat{d}_v)\right)\right] \cdot (K + \bar{\eta} - d) + \sigma_h \cdot \phi\left(\Gamma(d, \hat{d}_v)\right) - K \]

• First-order condition:

\[ E[u'(\eta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + d)] = \left[1 - \Phi\left(\Gamma(d, \hat{d}_v)\right)\right] - q_h \cdot \phi\left(\Gamma(d, \hat{d}_v)\right)(K + \bar{\eta} - d + \sigma_h \cdot \Gamma(d, \hat{d}_v)) \]

• Where

\[ q_h \equiv -\frac{\partial \Gamma(d, \hat{d}_v)}{\partial d} = \frac{1}{\sigma_h} \cdot \frac{h_\varepsilon}{h_\eta + h_\varepsilon + h_\mu} \]
Debt in political game – IV

• In equilibrium $\hat{d}_v = d$, hence $\Gamma(d,d) = \Delta / \sigma_h$

• Hence: $E[u'(\eta_l + \varepsilon_1 + d^e)] = [1 - \Phi(\Delta / \sigma_h)] - q_h \cdot \phi(\Delta / \sigma_h) \cdot (K + \bar{\eta} - d^e + \Delta)$

• Two effects both pushing debt up
  
  • First term: “short-termism effect”
  
  • Second term: “opportunism effect” – choose higher debt to signal higher competence
    
    • In equilibrium futile
    
    • Disappears if noise in signal shrinks to zero
Effect of IFC on equilibrium debt – I

- IFC reduces increases precision signal, i.e. $h_\mu$
- Differentiate f.o.c. for debt to $h_\mu$:

$$
\begin{align*}
&\left\{ E\left[u''(\eta_i + \epsilon_i + d^e)\right] - q_h \cdot \phi(\Delta / \sigma_h) \right\} \cdot \frac{\partial d^e}{\partial h_\mu} = H(\Delta) \\
&= \phi(\Delta / \sigma_h) \cdot \frac{\Delta}{\sigma_h^2} + \phi(\Delta / \sigma_h) \cdot \left\{ 2h_\epsilon + \frac{q_h}{\sigma_h} - q_h \cdot \frac{\Delta^2}{\sigma_h^3} \right\} \cdot (K + \bar{\eta} - d^e + \Delta)
\end{align*}
$$

- Proposition 1: if $h_\epsilon \to 0$, only short-termism effect is present, installing IFC raises (lowers) debt if $\Delta<0$ ($\Delta>0$)

  - Incumbent’s electoral advantage in terms of political colour ($\Delta<0$) weakens when more precise signal allows better assessment of competence
Proposition 2: consider opportunistic debt motive in isolation. Installing an IFC lowers equilibrium debt if $|\Delta| < \bar{\Delta}$, while it raises equilibrium debt if $|\Delta| > \bar{\Delta}$

Here, $\bar{\Delta}$ is the $\Delta$ for which effect of IFC on equilibrium marginal re-election probability $q_h \cdot \phi(\Delta / \sigma_h)$ is zero.

IFC lowers $q_h$, mitigating incentive to raise debt, and pushes $\Delta / \sigma_h$ towards zero, strengthening incentive to raise debt.

First effect dominates if political colour of relatively minor importance ($\Delta$ not too far from zero).

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d^e}{d \mu} & \uparrow \quad \bar{\Delta} \\
\Delta & \quad 0 \\
\frac{d^e}{d \mu} & \downarrow \\
\end{align*}
\]
Effect of IFC on equilibrium debt – III

• Overall effect of IFC on debt depends on combination of the two effects

• Proposition 3: there exist two cut-offs $\Delta_L(K, h_\varepsilon)$ and $\Delta_H(K, h_\varepsilon)$ with $-\bar{\Delta} < \Delta_L(K, h_\varepsilon) < 0 < \bar{\Delta} < \Delta_H(K, h_\varepsilon)$ such that
  • If $\Delta < \Delta_L(K, h_\varepsilon)$ or $\Delta > \Delta_H(K, h_\varepsilon)$ equil. debt increases with IFC
  • If $\Delta_L(K, h_\varepsilon) < \Delta < \Delta_H(K, h_\varepsilon)$ equil. debt decreases with IFC
Would incumbent want to install an IFC? – I

• Incumbent’s equilibrium utility is:

\[ U^P \equiv E\left[u(\eta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + d^e)\right] + \left[1 - \Phi(\Delta / \sigma_h)\right] \cdot (K + \bar{\eta} - d^e) + \sigma_h \cdot \phi(\Delta / \sigma_h) - K \]

• Differentiate and exploit f.o.c. of debt to give:

\[
\frac{\partial U^P}{\partial h_\mu} = -q_h \cdot \phi(\Delta / \sigma_h) \cdot (K + \bar{\eta} - d^e + \Delta) \cdot \left(\frac{\partial d^e}{\partial h_\mu}\right) + \\
\frac{\Delta}{\sigma_h^2} \cdot (K + \bar{\eta} - d^e) \cdot \phi(\Delta / \sigma_h) \cdot \left(\frac{\partial \sigma_h}{\partial h_\mu}\right) + \left(1 + \frac{\Delta^2}{\sigma_h^2}\right) \cdot \phi(\Delta / \sigma_h) \cdot \left(\frac{\partial \sigma_h}{\partial h_\mu}\right)
\]

• First term is effect on inter-temporal allocation of resources; second term concerns effect on re-election chance times unconditional average amount of resources; third term concerns effect on selection effect
Would incumbent want to install an IFC? – II

- Proposition 4:
  - If $0 \leq \Delta \leq \Delta_H(K, h_e)$, incumbent benefits from installing an IFC
  - If $\Delta \leq \Delta_L(K, h_e)$ and benefit from holding office sufficiently large, incumbent loses from installing an IFC
  - When opportunistic motive absent and $K$ sufficiently large, incumbent loses (benefits) when $\Delta < 0$ ($\Delta > 0$)

As regards first part, more precise info allows firmer conclusion about competence ex post, hence updated competence perception more likely outweighs worse fit in terms of political colour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent loses</th>
<th>Inconclusive</th>
<th>Incumbent gains</th>
<th>Inconclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K sufficiently large</td>
<td>$\Delta_L(K, h_e)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\Delta_H(K, h_e)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would society want to install an IFC? – I

• Equilibrium social welfare

\[
U^S \equiv E \left[ u \left( \eta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + d^e \right) \right] + \left[ 1 - \Phi \left( \Delta / \sigma_h \right) \right] \cdot \left( E \left( \hat{\eta}_I \mid \hat{\eta}_V \geq \bar{\eta} + \Delta \right) - d^e \right) + \Phi \left( \Delta / \sigma_h \right) \cdot \left( \bar{\eta} - d^e + \Delta \right)
\]

\[
= E \left[ u \left( \eta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + d^e \right) \right] + \left( \bar{\eta} - d^e \right) + \sigma_h \cdot \phi \left( \Delta / \sigma_h \right) + \Delta \cdot \Phi \left( \Delta / \sigma_h \right)
\]

• Sum of last two terms is smaller than in expression for planner: selection effect is larger for planner who observes competence perfectly at end of period 1

• Differentiate and use f.o.c. for debt
Would society want to install an IFC? – II

• Proposition 5

• If $\Delta_L(K,h_\varepsilon) \leq \Delta \leq \Delta_H(K,h_\varepsilon)$ society benefits from installing an IFC

• If $\Delta < \Delta_L(K,h_\varepsilon)$, an IFC lowers social welfare for $K$ large enough

• If $\Delta > \Delta_H(K,h_\varepsilon)$, an IFC lowers social welfare for $K$ large enough

• In absence of opportunistic motive and sufficiently concave utility society loses (gains) from installing an IFC if $\Delta < 0$ ($\Delta > 0$)
Comparison incumbent and society

- If $0 \leq \Delta \leq \Delta_H(K, h_\epsilon)$ incumbent and society both in favour
- If $\Delta < \Delta_L(K, h_\epsilon)$ and $K$ sufficiently large, incumbent and society both against
- If $\Delta > \Delta_H(K, h_\epsilon)$ and $K$ sufficiently large, society against, incumbent inconclusive
- If $\Delta_L(K, h_\epsilon) \leq \Delta < 0$, society is favour, while incumbent inconclusive
Alternative improvements in transparency – I

• Three alternatives:
  • Additional signal $s_2 = d + \tau$ with $\tau \sim N(0, \sigma^2_{\tau})$
  • Actual debt $d$ observed perfectly with probability $\rho$
  • Incumbent’s actual competence observed perfectly with prob. $\gamma$

• Prop. 6: Increase in precision of $\tau$ has no effect on debt, nor on equilibrium welfare of incumbent or society.

• Prop. 7: Increase in $\rho$ lowers debt and raises welfare incumbent and society
• Proposition 8:

• If $\Delta > 0$, increase in $\gamma$ lowers debt and raises $U^p$ and $U^S$
• If $\Delta < 0$, increase in $\gamma$ has ambiguous effects on debt and $U^p$ and $U^S$
• In that case, if $\rho$ is sufficiently close to 1 (opportunism motive vanishes), debt is increasing in $\gamma$, while $U^p$ is decreasing in $\gamma$ for $K$ sufficiently large and $U^S$ is decreasing in $\gamma$ for concavity in first-period utility sufficiently weak.
Concluding remarks

• IFCs are on the rise
• Designs are highly heterogeneous
• We assume that well-designed IFCs raise fiscal transparency
• If competence is voters’ only concern, both incumbent and society would prefer to install an IFC
• If incumbent has strong electoral advantage, an IFC boosts debt and may lower incumbent and social welfare
• If incumbent has strong electoral disadvantage, an IFC boosts debt and may lower social welfare
• If incumbent has a moderate electoral disadvantage, both the incumbent and society would benefit from an IFC
• If incumbent has moderate electoral advantage, society prefers IFC
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