



Fiscal Union - Toward a Treasury for the euro area?

Eulalia Rubio

Senior Research Fellow, Jacques Delors Institute

EMU Forum 2016

Completing Economic and Monetary Union

24-25 November 2016, Vienna

Current EMU fiscal framework has major shortcomings

- EMU not well-equipped to respond to a new sovereign debt crisis
 - Debt levels remain very high and continue to increase in some countries (IT)– likelihood of crisis not negligible
 - ESM has limited lending capacity, lengthy procedure for activation and lacks proper democratic accountability
 - OMT not tested but might be politically contentious ('hidden' fiscal transfers) and difficult to use it after a long period of QE

Current EMU fiscal framework has major shortcomings(2)

- EMU as a whole performs badly as regards fiscal stabilisation
 - No provisions or instruments to directly manage the euro area aggregate fiscal stance
 - Aggregate fiscal stance pro-cyclical between 2011-2014, broadly neutral or slightly expansive afterwards
 - Fiscal spillovers larger in deep recessions and when monetary policy at the zero-lower bound

Current EMU fiscal framework has major shortcomings(3)

- Limited capacity to stabilise at national level
 - Heterogeneous monetary unions need mechanisms to deal with large asymmetric shocks
 - SGP does not allow counter-cyclical action in severe and long recessions
 - Financial risk-sharing a complement but not substitute for fiscal risk-sharing
 - Truly transnational banking union unlikely to emerge even in the long term in the absence of credible political commitment to keep euro

Ways to improve the status quo

- Complete BU and progress towards CMU
- ESM+
 - Generalise QMV, harmonise national parliaments' involvement, create rapid-response facility based on jointly-guaranteed debt (Enderlein et al 2016).
- Fiscal discipline
 - Develop consensual interpretation of SGP's flexibility clauses, strengthening role of EFB and coordinate with national fiscal councils
- Temporary measures to boost investment
 - Increase EFSI's lending capacity, extend investment clause to corrective arm, exclude all national co-funding of EU-supported investments from SGP calculus

Further possible reforms?– different ideas at debate

- Strengthen market discipline introducing a rules-based sovereign debt insolvency regime
- Convert ESM into a real lender-of-last resort/create 'eurobonds'
- Equip EMU with macro-economic stability capacity
 - Unemployment insurance scheme in diff variants
 - Intergovernmental 'rainy day' scheme
 - Euro-area budget based on common resources/borrowing capacity
 - Euro-area treasury with exceptional powers of coordination

Four criteria when thinking on further reforms

- Consistency
- Political feasibility
- Pragmatism
- Appropriate sequencing

Three consistent views of fiscal union

| | MARKET-BASED REGIME (I) | MARKET-BASED REGIME (II) | 'SUI GENERIS' FISCAL FEDERALISM |
|--|---|---|--|
| Protection against sovereign debt crises & fiscal discipline | Rules-based insolvency regime, ESM confined to temporary liquidity crises Instrument to deal with debt legacy (e.g. debt redemption fund) | Rules-based insolvency regime, ESM confined to temporary liquidity crises Instrument to deal with debt legacy (e.g. debt redemption fund) | European Monetary Fund (EMF) with extensive competences to issue mutually-guaranteed debt Reinforced powers of fiscal surveillance (including the power to veto national budgets) |
| Macro-economic stabilisation | Rules-based fiscal risk-sharing capacity + arrangement to coordinate national fiscal policies in exceptional circumstances | Fiscal capacity in charge of over-the-cycle and cross-country stabilisation | No need for further fiscal risk-sharing, EMF used to manage intertemporal aggregate demand in exceptional circumstances |
| Governance | Stronger euro group (e.g. full time euro group president, more use of QMV), COM in charge of managing the rules-based mechanism, accountability through national executives | Strong euro area executive (e.g. 'double-hat' euro area minister of finance) with large discretionary capacity, accountability through national&EU parliament | Strong euro area executive (e.g. 'double-hat' euro area minister of finance) with large discretionary capacity, accountability through national&EU parliament |

On political feasibility....

Member States' replies to the analytical paper published in preparation of the 5 presidents' report (February 2015)

| No major reform needed | Need further budgetary integration for solidarity/macro-economic stability purposes | Creation of insolvency regime |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| ESTONIA, FINLAND, GERMANY, IRELAND, LITHUANIA, MALTA, THE NETHERLANDS | CYPRUS, FRANCE, GREECE, ITALY, LATVIA, LUXEMBOURG, PORTUGAL, SLOVAKIA, SLOVENIA, SPAIN | |

Note: lacking contributions from Austria and Belgium

Design principles for a fiscal risk-sharing mechanism

- Only limited to exceptional circumstances
- Minimum convergence needed before introducing it
- Minimum adjustment capacity (make adoption of certain reforms a condition for access to)
- A tax-based instrument preferable
- Should not lead to permanent transfers but do not obsess with perfect neutrality

How to build a EMU stabilisation function on EFSI?

Five Presidents' Report (2015):

- In stage 2 (from June 2017 onwards), to set up a *“macroeconomic stabilisation function for the euro area”*
- *“A prospective stabilisation function could, for example, be built on the EFSI as a first step”*

How to build a EMU stabilisation function on EFSI?

- Establish a euro area investment platform co-financed by EFSI and with contributions from all euro area NPBs in proportion of their GDP
- Commitment to increase lending capacity in bad times (through increased EFSI contribution and contributions from NPBs)
- Selection of projects based on strict quality criteria, no subject to geographical pre-allocation, priority to projects having significant short-term impact on growth and employment

How to build a EMU stabilisation function on EFSI?

Advantages:

- May have significant fire power (in DE, FR and IT NPB's loans to non-financial corporates represent around 11-20% of total loans)
- Allocation to high-quality projects

Problem:

- Need to harmonise landscape of NPBs in EMU

| EUR bn (2012) | KfW | CDC | BPI France Financement | Cassa Depositi e Prestiti | ICO | European Investment Bank | Total |
|--|-------------|-------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| Balance sheet total (Total Assets, 2012) | 497,5 | 393,7 | 29,9 | 305,4 | 115,2 | 508,1 | 1 850,0 |
| Total loans | 118,5 | 155,6 | 15,6 | 100,5 | 88,8 | 293,4 | 772,3 |
| Country | Germany | | France | Italy | Spain | European Union 1/ | |
| Long-term credit rating | AAA/Aaa/AAA | | AA/AA1/AA+ | BBB/Baa2/BBB+ | BBB/Baa2/BBB+ | AAA/Aaa/AAA | |
| Memo | | | | | | | |
| Nominal GDP (2012) | € 2 666 | | € 2 032 | € 1 567 | € 1 029 | € 12 960 | |
| MFI Loans to NFC | € 909 | | € 876 | € 875 | € 729 | € 4 674 | |
| Balance sheet/GDP | 19% | | 21% | 19% | 11% | 4% | 14% |
| Total loans/GDP | 4% | | 8% | 6% | 9% | 2% | 6% |
| Total loans/MFI Loans to NFC | 13% | | 20% | 11% | 12% | 6% | 17% |

Thank you!

www.delorsinstitute.eu