# Fiscal Rules: Does Cyclicality Enhance Credibility? International Monetary Fund, FAD:FP

### Robert Zymek (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

6 October 2009

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

"The idea of writing new fiscal rules on paper rather than beginning the hard process of cutting entitlements is a joke." - Olivier Blanchard, 1 October 2009

- Market tolerance of a government's *current* fiscal stance depends on expectations about its fiscal path in the *medium term.* ⇒ Expectations matter!
- Fiscal rules can anchor market expectations if they are credible.
- To ensure such credibility, what exactly should we be writing on that paper?

## In This Presentation...

- ...I provide a formal analysis of the market reception of different fiscal-rule frameworks, using quarterly financial and macroeconomic data from a panel of 22 OECD economies for the period 1990-2008.
- ...I focus on a particular feature of existing fiscal rules: whether they encompass explicit cyclical contingencies (e.g. through a cyclically adjusted or medium-term budget target) or not.
- Related research: Debrun and Joshi (2009), Hallerberg and Wolff (2006), Poterba and Rueben (2001).

- In general, there is no direct "credibility reward" in the form of reduced spreads - from implementing a new fiscal rule, or tightening an existing rule.
- 2 Countries which already enjoy below-average spreads are most likely to operate a cyclical fiscal rule.
- **3** Within this group, cyclical fiscal rules embedded in a tight rule framework are best received by markets.
- Preliminary evidence suggests that cyclical rules are viewed as most durable during economic downturns.

## Presentation Outline

#### Introduction

2 Cyclical vs. Strict Budget-Balance Rules

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- 3 Data and Specification
- 4 Baseline Results
- 5 Robustness Checks
- 6 Summary and Outlook

# Cyclical vs. Strict Budget-Balance Rules (1/2)

## BBRs with Cyclical Contingencies:

- Small risk of "perverse" policy incentives leading to procyclical fiscal policy.
- $\implies$  More durable in times of heightened fiscal stress/uncertainty.
  - However, harder to monitor compliance

## Strict BBRs:

- Easy to monitor compliance.
  - $\implies$  Easier to predict long-term fiscal path if rule is observed.

 However, additional risk that government (deliberately) misjudges cyclical "margin for error".

## Cyclical vs. Strict Budget-Balance Rules (2/2)

- I Trade-off between monitoring complexity and "procyclicality" risk ⇒ empirical question!
- Potential complementarity between rule visibility/ enforcement and cyclical flexibility: the more likely non-compliance is to be detected, and the more severely it is punished, the more "acceptable" may be a cyclical rule.

## Specification

The baseline regression specification is

where

- spread<sub>ct</sub> is the sovereign spread between country c and the US in quarter t.
- X<sub>ct</sub> is a set of country-time-varying control variables (including fiscal and macroeconomic indicators).
- FRI<sub>ct</sub> is an indicator of the strength of the existing fiscal rule framework (ranging from 0 to 1).
- Cycl<sub>ct</sub> is a dummy taking value 1 if country c has a cyclical BBR in quarter t.

## Data - Dependent Variable and Controls

#### Dependent variable:

 spread<sub>ct</sub>: interest-rate differential adjusted for exchange risk, using relative asset swap.
 Source: Thomson Datastream.

#### Key control variables:

- fiscal\_balance<sub>ct</sub>: fiscal balance (% GDP) instrumented with 4 own lags and contemporaneous government tax takings. Source: OECD Analytics.
- *public\_debt<sub>ct</sub>*: public-debt ratio (%), lagged for exogeneity. Source: OECD Analytics.
- maastricht<sub>ct</sub> and euro<sub>ct</sub>: dummy variables, taking value 1 if country signed the Maastricht Treaty and joined the Eurozone, respectively.

## Data - Fiscal Rule Properties

## Fiscal Rule Index (FRI):

- Restricted to budget-balance and debt rules, and central or general government coverage.
- Based on five components:
  - 1 Statutory rank of rule.
  - 2 Existence of external enforcement mechanism.
  - 3 Existence of external monitoring body.
  - 4 Independently set budget assumptions.
  - 5 Transparency.
- Normalised to [0, 1].

## **Cyclicality dummy:**

Dummy taking value 1 if country has a cyclical BBR.

Source: Internal Database for properties, Bloomberg for quarter of legal implementation.

#### Countries in sample:

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom.

# Countries in sample which implement/operate a cyclical fiscal rule:

Australia, Denmark, Germany, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom.

# Baseline Regression - Full Sample

Dep endent variable: Sovereign spread (basis points)	(1)	(2) Fixed effects	(3)	(4) Fixed effects	(5) ArellanoBond
Lag of sovereign spread (basis points)			0.62***	0.46***	0.46***
0 0 I ( I )			(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Average spread (basis points)	1.00****	1.02***	0.62***	0.74****	0.74***
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Fiscal balance (% GDP)			-0.41***	-0.30	-0.06
Les sforthis data @( CDD)			(0.16)	(0.21)	(0.18)
Lag of public debt (% GDP)			-0.01	(0.03**	(0.01)
Inflation (%)			2.49	2.81	4 78*
			(1.93)	(2.96)	(2.61)
Unemployment rate (%)			0.56***	ò.72*́	0.85**
			(0.20)	(0.38)	(0.35)
Output gap (% GDP)			0.25	0.52	0.47
			(0.34)	(0.37)	(0.34)
Slope of yield curve (% points)			2.09***	1.88***	1.96***
Solution and the billing in directory			(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.36)
>Government stability < molcator			(0.27)	(0.29)	(0.27)
>Maastricht< dummy			7.32***	5.75	4.94
			(1.48)	(3.72)	(3.45)
>Eurozone< dummy			-1.78	-2.87***	-2.52**
			(1.14)	(1.30)	(1.21)
>Fiscal rule <index< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>0.70</td><td>-3.49</td><td>-3.23</td></index<>			0.70	-3.49	-3.23
			(3.67)	(5.53)	(5.10)
>Fiscal rule <index *="">Cyclical&lt; dummy</index>			-15.39**	4.30	6.10
Oralical dummer			(6.11)	(8.60)	(7.89)
- Oycheal - Guinniy			(2.66)	(3.33)	(3.05)
			(0.00)	()	(0.00)
Country fixed effects	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Observations	1 299	1 299	1.145	1.145	1 1 3 2
Number of countries	22	22	22	22	22
Adjusted R-squared	0.3	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8

æ

# Baseline Regression - "Trusted" Countries (1/2)

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Dependent variable:	Sov. spread (basis points)	Sov. spread (basis points)	Fiscal balance (% GDP)
	Fixed effects	ArellanoBond	A rellano Bond
Lag of sovereign spread (basis points)	0.37***	0.37***	-0.00*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.00)
Average spread (basis points)	0.69***	0.69***	0.00*
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.00)
Fiscal balance (% GDP)	-0.49*	-0.38	
	(0.28)	(0.25)	
Lag of public debt (% GDP)	-0.03*	-0.02	-0.00***
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.00)
Inflation (%)	-4.21	-2.06	-0.34
	(4.01)	(3.68)	(0.28)
Unemployment rate (%)	3.16***	2.97***	0.02
	(0.68)	(0.63)	(0.05)
Output gap (% GDP)	0.79	0.81	0.07*
	(0.55)	(0.52)	(0.04)
Slope of yield curve (% points)	1.79***	1.89***	-0.00
crope of field caree (repeated)	(0.56)	(0.53)	(0.04)
>Government stability< indicator	0.36	0.43	0.02
~ Government staonity ~ indicator	(0.43)	(0.40)	-0.02
Maatrichte domme	10.00##	10.72***	1 15***
>iviaastricht< dummy	12.20	12.75	1.15***
-E 1	(5.21)	(4.91)	(0.57)
>Eurozone< dummy	-3.09	-5.00	U. 16
	(3.08)	(2.91)	(0.22)

## Baseline Regression - "Trusted" Countries (2/2)

<pre>&gt;Fiscal rule<index>Fiscal rule<index *="">Cyclical&lt; dummy &gt;Cyclical&lt; dummy Lag 1 of fiscal balance (% GDP) Lag 2 of Fiscal balance (% GDP) Lag 3 of Fiscal balance (% GDP) Lag 4 of Fiscal balance (% GDP) Tax payments (% GDP)</index></index></pre>	16.50*** (7.58) -20.36 (14.68) 1.29 (3.89)	14.54*** (7.13) -25.10* (13.64) 2.57 (3.54)	1.14*** (0.57) -1.21 (1.06) 0.12 (0.29) 0.90**** (0.04) 0.06 (0.06) 0.06 (0.06) 0.06 (0.06) -0.24**** (0.04) 0.29**** (0.04)
Country fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	493	490	484
Number of countries	9	9	9

Standard errors in parentheses

\* significant at 10%; \*\* significant at 5%; \*\*\* significant at 1%

## Baseline Results - Event Studies



- Global conditions and country unobservables explain 70% of the data - time-varying macroeconomic conditions only 10%!
- In the full sample, there is no "credibility" effect from fiscal rules (cyclical or strict).
- Low-spread countries seem most likely to implement a strong fiscal rule framework with cyclical contingencies.
- Among these "trusted" countries, well-monitored, well-enforced and cyclical (!) rules are rewarded with lower spreads.

・ロト ・ 日 ・ モ ト ・ モ ・ うへぐ

## Baseline Results - Quantitative Example

- In 2008, New Zealand had one of the lowest FRIs (approx.
   0.3) among low-spread economies, and a strict budget-balance rule.
- Policy experiment: Suppose New Zealand were to
  - **1** double the strength of its fiscal-rule framework.
  - 2 replace its strict BBR with a cyclical BBR
  - 3 do both.

	Policy Change	Fiscal balance (% GDP)	Fiscal perfor- mance effect (basis points)	Credibility effect (basis points)	Total effect (basis points)
	1) FRI: +0.3	+ 0.3	- 0.1	+ 4.4	+ 4.3
Immediate	<ol><li>Cyclicality</li></ol>	+/-0	+/-0	- 7.5	- 7.5
	3) Both	+ 0.3	- 0.1	- 10.8	- 10.8
	1) FRI: +0.3	+ 1.1	- 2.0	+ 7.3	+ 5.3
Long-term	<ol><li>Cyclicality</li></ol>	+/-0	0	- 12.5	- 12.5
_	3) Both	+ 1.1	- 2.0	- 18.0	- 20.0

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ○ □ ○ ○ ○

## Robustness Checks - Basic

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)
Sovereign spread (basis points)	Baseline	Drop Germany	4« 1999Q3
Lag of sovereign spread (basis points)	0 37***	0.37***	0 37***
	(0.03)	(0.03)	0.00
Average spread (basis points)	0.69****	0.70***	0.38***
menuge spreud (ousis points)	(0.04)	(0.04)	0.10
Fiecal balance (% GDP)	-0.49*	-0.85***	-0.07
Tiscal Galance (70 GDT)	(0.28)	(0.31)	(0.61)
Lag of public debt (% GDP)	-0.03*	-0.04**	0.20*
Eng of public acor (/0 GDT)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.11)
Inflation (%)	-4.21	-10.91**	-0.26
Initiation (70)	(4.01)	(4.45)	(5.82)
Unemployment rate (%)	3 16***	3 17***	-2.50
onemproyment rate (70)	(0.68)	(0.74)	(1.78)
Output gap (% GDP)	0.79	1 1/1*	_4 51***
Subar Bab (10 SD1)	(0.55)	(0.59)	(1.41)
Slope of wield curve (% points)	1 79***	1.87***	1 14
prope of yield curve (/v points)	(0.56)	(0.59)	0.80
>Government stability≤ indicator	0.36	0.93*	0.72
- covernmente stateming - inteleaser	(0.43)	(0.48)	(0.71)
≥Maastricht≤ dummv	12 20***	10.81**	8 12
interest of the second se	(5.21)	(5.37)	(9.17)
>Furozone< dummy	-3.09	0.00	7.28
Larozono danniny	(3.08)	(0.00)	(8.89)
≥Fiscal rule≤in dex	16 50***	16 45**	30.87**
	(7.58)	(7.86)	(12.97)
>Fiscal rule <index *="">Cyclical&lt; dummy</index>	-20.36	-37 66**	-101 28****
	(14.68)	(15.72)	(32.61)
>Cvelical< dummy	129	5.78	33.00***
oyonola aanniy	(3.89)	(4.19)	(12.02)
	(5.05)	(1.15)	(12.02)
Country fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
-			
Observations	493	433	200
Number of countries	9	9	9
Adjusted R-squared	0.8	0.8	0.6

## Robustness Checks - Downturns

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)
Sovereign spread (basis points)	Baseline	Output Gap < 0	Real growth < 0
	0.4.000		0.000
Lag of sovereign spread (basis points)	0.46***	0.43***	0.38***
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Average spread (basis points)	0.74***	0.86****	0.81***
	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Fiscal balance (% GDP)	-0.30	0.22	0.30
	(0.21)	(0.39)	(0.44)
Lag of public debt (% GDP)	0.03*	0.02	0.06**
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.03)
Inflation (%)	2.81	8.76	17.02**
	(2.96)	(5.58)	(6.81)
Unemployment rate (%)	0.72*	0.49	-0.15
	(0.38)	(0.52)	(0.69)
Output gap (% GDP)	0.52	0.75	-1.02
	(0.37)	(0.62)	(0.82)
Slope of yield curve (% points)	1.88***	1.08**	1.97***
	(0.39)	(0.54)	(0.66)
>Government stability< indicator	-0.60***	-0.72	-1.07*
	(0.29)	(0.44)	(0.60)
>Maastricht< dummy	5.75	-7.86	53.09***
	(3.72)	(16.60)	(18.44)
>Eurozone< dummy	-2.87***	-2.27	1.09
-	(1.30)	(1.73)	(2.30)
>Fiscal rule <index< td=""><td>-3.49</td><td>26.59</td><td>-13.29</td></index<>	-3.49	26.59	-13.29
	(5.53)	(26.32)	(35.80)
>Fiscal rule <index *="">Cvclical&lt; dummv</index>	4.30	-62.94*	-47.87
· · · ·	(8.60)	(35.13)	(46.09)
>Cvclical< dummy	0.41	40.30***	-93.53***
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	(3.33)	(10.40)	(34.03)
Country fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,145	504	375
Number of countries	22	19	20
Adjusted R-squared	0.8	0.8	0.8

- The baseline finding is robust to the exclusion of individual "trusted" countries, and not peculiar to any sub-period of the full sample.
- Preliminary findings suggest that, conditional on the presence of a fiscal rule, cyclicality reduces the market-perceived risk of fiscal distress *in downturns* (above average unemployment, or negative real growth).
- There is some evidence that this effect is conditional on the overall strength of the fiscal-rule framework - but more work is needed to establish this firmly.

## Summary and Outlook

- Strong, cyclical fiscal rules are most common in "trusted" countries which enjoy below-average spreads.
- In this group, cyclicality appears to enhance credibility, lowering spreads by about 20 basis points in the long run for a reasonable tightening of the FRI.
- Preliminary evidence suggests that, more generally, cyclicality has beneficial effects in economic downturns.

#### Future work:

- Explore the "downturn" subsample.
- Link with theory?

## Many thanks...

... for all comments and suggestions!

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>