

Fiscal Reforms in the New Members States

Seminář strategie hospodářské politiky
a udržitelnost veřejných financí
Smilovice, 2.- 4. května 2005



Ondřej Schneider, Jan Zápal
Charles University

Outline


- I. Hypothesis
 - 2 groups of countries
- II. Evidence
 - Basic facts
 - Reform efforts
 - Evidence from PEPs & CoPrs
 - Sustainability
 - Consolidations
- III. Conclusion

I. Hypothesis

I. Hypothesis


- 2 groups of countries?
 - Large government (46-52% of GDP)
Cyprus, Czech Republic, Hungary,
Malta, Poland, Slovenia
 - Small(ish) government (36-38% of GDP)
Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania,
Slovakia (since 2003)

Large government



General government expenditure in % of GDP

Small(ish) government




General government expenditure in % of GDP

I. Hypothesis


- 2 groups of countries?
 - in the breach of SGP –
Excessive deficit procedure (EDP)
Cyprus, Czech Republic, Hungary, Malta,
Poland, Slovakia
 - compliant with SGP (non EDP)
Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia

EDP



General government budget deficit in % of GDP

non EDP



General government budget deficit in % of GDP


Hypothesis

- Grouping very robust:
 - The „bad“ always are: Cyprus, Czech Republic, Hungary, Malta, Poland
 - The „good“ always are: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania
 - Only Slovenia manages big government and low debt
 - Only Slovakia managed to cut government expenditures massively (but runs deficit)


II. Evidence

Basic facts

■ Indirect taxes




■ Direct taxes



Basic facts


■ Social contributions




% of GDP

Basic facts

■ Employees' compensation




■ Collective consumption




Basic facts

■ Social transfers




■ Investment




Evidence from PEPs & CoPrs

- Pre-Accession Economic Programme (PEP)
 - 2001
 - 2002
 - 2003
- Convergence Programme (CoPr)
 - Spring 2004
 - Autumn 2004

Evidence from PEPs & CoPrs



Evidence from PEPs & CoPrs



Sustainability

- Benchmark primary deficit


$$(r-y) \cdot b$$

- r ... real interest rate
- y ... real growth of output
- b ... debt to GDP ratio

- Actual primary deficit based on 2000-2004


Sustainability gap as a difference

Sustainability




Sustainability gap, 2000-2004 data

Growth accounting




Growth accounting



Consolidations

■ Definition of consolidation



Consolidations


	Deficit reduction	Total revenue	Total expenditure	Collective consumption	Employees' compensation	Social transfers	Subsidies	Investment
Successful	5,45	-2,20	-7,70	-1,50	-1,85	-1,58	-0,25	-0,30
Not successful	4,62	0,14	-4,50	-0,50	-0,44	-0,54	-0,16	-0,52

Consolidations




Successful consolidations reduce deficit more

Consolidations



Successful consolidations
do not rely on revenue
increases

Consolidations



Successful consolidations rely on expenditure cuts


Consolidations

Successful consolidations
rely on
painful
expenditure cuts

	expenditure	Collective consumption	Employees' compensation	Social transfers	Subsidies	Investment
Successful	-1,50	-1,85	-1,58	-0,25	-0,30	
Not successful	-0,50	-0,44	-0,54	-0,16	-0,52	

Consolidations


... and less on investment



Planned consolidations

	Deficit reduction	Total revenue	Total expenditure	Employees' compensation
Consolidations pre EU accession - realized	4,86	-0,53	-5,41	-0,84
Consolidations post EU accession - planned	5,28	1,75	-3,53	-1,27

Planned consolidations




Planned consolidations

	Deficit reduction	Total revenue	
Consolidations pre EU accession - realized	4,86	-0,53	
Consolidations post EU accession - planned	5,28	1,75	

Post EU accession consolidations rely heavily on revenue increases

Planned consolidations



Planned consolidations

Consolidations
pre EU
accession -
realized

Consolidations
post EU
accession -
planned

... but bureaucrats will
not be happy

Employees'
compensation

-0,84

-1,27

Reform efforts

- NMS differ in their reform efforts
- Main reforms: pensions, health care, tax, fiscal decentralisation, budgetary rules and procedures
- Most reform minded: Estonia, Slovakia
- Almost no reforms: Hungary, Czech Republic

Reform efforts

■ Pension system reforms

	2. pillar introduction
Cyprus	-
Czech Republic	-
Estonia	2002
Latvia	2001
Lithuania	2004
Hungary	1998
Malta	-
Poland	1999
Slovenia	2000
Slovakia	2005

III. Conclusion

Ranking fiscal policies

- 14 criteria

- Reform efforts
- Consolidation success
- Sustainability gap
- Dependency ratios
- EDP
- Revisions
- ... etc.

Ranking fiscal policies

Sub-index no.1

Reform efforts

- *Pension reform*
- *Health care reform*
- *Fiscal stance*
- *Consolidation*

	Rank
Slovakia	10
Estonia	9
Slovenia	8
Latvia	7
Malta	6
Lithuania	5
Poland	4
Cyprus	3
Hungary	2
Czech Republic	1

Ranking fiscal policies

Sub-index no.2

Ageing impact

- *Dependency ratio*
- *Fertility*
- *Room to rise tax*
- *Discretion*

	Rank
Estonia	10
Cyprus	9
Slovakia	8
Latvia	7
Lithuania	6
Hungary	5
Poland	4
Slovenia	3
Malta	2
Czech Republic	1

Ranking fiscal policies

Sub-index no.3

Fiscal functions

- *Stabilization*
- *Fiscal stance*
- *Consolidation*

	Rank
Malta	9
Estonia	9
Slovakia	8
Slovenia	7
Lithuania	6
Cyprus	4
Latvia	4
Poland	3
Czech Republic	2
Hungary	1

Ranking fiscal policies

Sub-index no.4

Past behavior

- *EDP*
- *Revisions*
- *Speed*
- *Sustainability*
- *Fiscal stance*
- *Stabilizations*

	Rank
Estonia	10
Latvia	7
Lithuania	7
Slovenia	7
Slovakia	6
Cyprus	5
Hungary	4
Malta	3
Poland	2
Czech Republic	1

Ranking fiscal policies

OVERALL INDEX	Rank
Estonia	10
Slovakia	9
Latvia	8
Lithuania	7
Cyprus	6
Slovenia	5
Poland	4
Hungary	3
Malta	2
Czech Republic	1

Thank You for Your attention

We welcome any comment