

von Hagen, Jürgen; Mundschenk, Susanne

Working Paper

The functioning of economic policy coordination

ZEI Working Paper, No. B 08-2001

Provided in Cooperation with:

ZEI - Center for European Integration Studies, University of Bonn

Suggested Citation: von Hagen, Jürgen; Mundschenk, Susanne (2001) : The functioning of economic policy coordination, ZEI Working Paper, No. B 08-2001, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung (ZEI), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/39486>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung
Center for European Integration Studies
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn



Jürgen von Hagen and Susanne Mund-
schenk

**The Functioning of
Economic Policy
Coordination**

Working Paper

**B 08
2001**

The Functioning of Economic Policy Coordination

by

Jürgen von Hagen

ZEI, University of Bonn, Indiana University, and CEPR

and

Susanne Mundschenk

ZEI, University of Bonn

Mai 2001*

Correspondence
Walter Flex Straße 3
D-53113 Bonn
Tel: +49-228-739199
Fax: +49-228-731809
vonhagen@uni-bonn.de
smundsch@uni-bonn.de

* This is a revised version of a paper presented at the European Commission's (ECFIN) workshop on "The Functioning of EMU: Challenges of the Early Years", 21 March 2001.

I. Introduction

The beginning of Stage III of Economic and Monetary Union (EMU for short) has brought a qualitative change in the framework for economic policy making in the member states. The combination of the single currency and the Single Market creates a unified economic area in which national borders increasingly lose importance for the economic decisions of suppliers and consumers. At the same time, however, large parts of economic policy remain the domain of national or subnational policies. The increasing discrepancy between the European organization of private economic decisions and the national orientation of those parts of economic policy that are not directly regulated by the rules of EMU and the Single Market is the next, important challenge for the development of economic integration in Europe. The key question is, how national economic policies should be coordinated among themselves and with the single monetary policy of the ECB.

Economists have analyzed this issue from two perspectives. The first takes the organization of economic policies at the national level as given and asks, how much coordination of these national policies is necessary.¹ Coordination is interpreted as a process of (formal or informal) agreement among independent, national actors. From this perspective, coordination is the exception to the rule. Economic analysis of this process identifies conditions that justify the exception, focusing on the existence and magnitude of international “spill-overs” or policy externalities.

The alternative perspective takes the common economic area as the starting point of the analysis. Standing in the tradition of the economic theory of federalism, it starts from the assumption that, in an economic area characterized by trade and factor mobility, the activities of private economic agents and of economic policymakers are interdependent. Coordination is the process that makes these activities mutually consistent in equilibrium. Coordination is a matter of degree and ranges from competition among independent national or regional authorities to merging such authorities to a supranational one. In this view, whether or not economic policies should be coordinated in the EMU is not a sensible question, the proper question is what the best mechanism for coordination in a given field of economic policy is.

This is the perspective we pursue in this paper. In section 2, we develop our view in more detail, following a distinction between “club goods” and “national goods” in economic policy making in EMU. In section 3, we review the existing mechanisms for policy coordination in the EU and discuss the linkages between them and the club goods

¹ For simplicity, we abstract from the fact that subnational jurisdictions are also involved in the making economic policy.

of EMU. In section 4, we turn to the question whether the current framework for policy coordination promises a sound functioning of EMU. Section 5 concludes.

II. Principles of Policy Coordination

We distinguish two sources of interdependence between national economic policies in EMU, club goods and horizontal spill overs. The latter are the more conventional ones that have been dealt with in traditional literature. The first is the more innovative one and is characteristic for Stage III of EMU.

II.1. EMU Club Goods

We define EMU “club goods” to be economic variables that are shared among all member states.² The first club good is the largely unified, competitive market for goods, services, capital, and – to a lesser extent – labor. Additional club goods result from the fact that the members of the euro area share a single currency, a common central bank, and a common payment system. The price level of the euro area is such a club good. Since a common currency implies that the price level can reasonably be defined only for the entire currency area, it is obvious that all EMU members together enjoy price stability or suffer from the lack of it.³ In the same vein, low currency risk (reflected in the common level of long-term interest rates), external balance (reflected in the level and variability of the exchange rate of the common currency against other currencies), and the stability of the EMU banking sector and financial markets (reflected in efficient and stable financial intermediation) are club goods whose benefits accrue to all member states simultaneously.

The importance of these club goods is best illustrated by an example. Starting from a macroeconomic equilibrium, assume that a large EMU member state adopts a tax policy that leads to a slow-down in economic growth and an increase in prices in this country, e.g., an increase in social security taxes. As a result, the euro-area price level moves upwards. The ECB will react to this change with an increase in its interest rate. By assumption, this change will upset the macro economic equilibria in the other EMU member states. Preserving the quality of the EMU club good price stability in the presence of national policy actions by one member creates economic costs for the other members.

The point of the example is that the existence of EMU club goods implies a new channel of externalities between national economic policies. Policies of individual member

² The classical analysis of the economics of club goods is Olson (1965).

³ Note that individual countries can experience price developments that differ from the average inflation rate in the euro area. However, such differential developments must be properly interpreted as regional *relative price movements*, which can be expected to be temporary and which cannot be the subject of EMU monetary policy.

states that affect policy-relevant euro-area aggregates have economic implications for the other member states, because the ECB will react to them and this reaction is felt by all member states. Consequently, it is not enough to look at the direct transmission of policy impulses between countries, as the traditional literature on policy coordination has done in the past, to identify the need for cooperative policies in the euro area.

The existence of EMU club goods invites free-riding behavior and discourages policies that improve the quality of the club goods. Consider a situation of a persistent external deficit of the euro area, which would lead to a depreciation of the euro in the longer run. The external deficit calls for a fiscal contraction in the euro area to reduce aggregate demand. But which member state will take the appropriate steps and cut public expenditures? As each government has an incentive to wait for others to do so, the fiscal adjustment will come too late, if at all. As a result, there is not enough collective action to maintain the quality of the club good of external balance. Generally, governments in the euro area have weaker incentives to pursue policies improving the quality of the club goods than governments in national currency systems have with regard to national economic target variables, as the benefits from doing so fall partly on other governments in EMU.⁴ As in other, more conventional contexts, the club good character of important economic variables in EMU implies that non-cooperative national economic policies do not yield efficient policy outcomes.

There are two basic channels through which national economic policies affect the EMU club goods. The first, obvious one is that some national policies directly affect the relevant euro area aggregates. As indicated in the example above, this is true for policies affecting the price level. Policies affecting the common exchange rate and external balance, and to the extent that the ECB takes euro-area wide economic growth and unemployment into consideration when setting its monetary policy, policies affecting these variables are also relevant here.⁵ This regards primarily public spending and taxation, i.e. the macro economic policies of euro area governments. But note that this goes beyond budget deficits and public debts, the focus of the Stability and Growth Pact, as the level and the structure of public sector revenues and expenditures have important macro effects on growth, employment, and prices.

⁴ Recognition of this problem with regard to the level of public sector debts and deficits has been the justification for the Excessive Deficit Procedure of the Maastricht Treaty and the Stability and Growth Pact.

⁵ Although the ECB's main goal is price stability, it has a wider mandate of pursuing the general economic policies in the community provided that price stability is not endangered. Furthermore, the policy statements of the ECB clearly reflect a concern with cyclical developments in the euro area.

The second channel works through national economic structures that shape the environment in which ECB monetary policy operates. For example, structural changes affecting the slope of the Phillips curve or the NAIRU in an individual euro area economy will change the constraints the ECB faces for its low-inflation policy. As the long-run equilibrium inflation rate of the euro area depends on such parameters⁶, national economic policies affecting them will have an impact on the common inflation rate in the euro area. Again, the club good character of price stability in EMU implies reduced incentives for governments to undertake policies improving the structural environment of the single monetary policy, if such policies carry political or economic costs in the short run.⁷ The implication is that policy coordination in the euro area does not naturally stop with macro economic policies (Jacquet and Pisani-Ferry, 2000), but includes structural policies that affect the performance and flexibility of European markets for goods, services, and labor.

One might suggest at this point that the EMU club goods call for cooperative policy making among the larger member states but not the small ones, as policies in the latter have negligible effects if any on the euro-area aggregates. But this conjecture is misleading in two ways. First, the adverse incentive effects are larger for the small countries than for the large ones precisely because the large ones can anticipate the consequences of their actions on euro-area aggregates and subsequent monetary policy reactions. Therefore, the larger countries will internalize these effects partly, though not fully. In contrast, the small countries will not anticipate any such effects and, therefore, have even weaker incentives to conduct policies preserving the quality of the euro-area club goods than the larger ones. Second, the small countries together make up about 25 percent of euro-area GDP, i.e., taken together they are not small. The implication is that one should not limit considerations of policy coordination to the large states.

The need for cooperative policymaking in the presence of important club goods has, of course, long been recognized in the context of the EU's first club good, the Internal Market order (Jacquet and Pisani-Ferry, 2000). Here, new cooperative policies are developed and proposed by the European Commission, and the proper implementation of the existing policies is monitored by the Commission and enforced by the European Court. Internal Market law and its implementation have replaced large parts of national legislation in the relevant areas in the member states. Furthermore, the process of monitoring and

⁶ This is the basic tenet of models of monetary policy based on credibility arguments. See e.g. Barro and Gordon (1983).

⁷ See e.g. Sibert and Sutherland (1997), Calmfors (1998) and von Hagen (1999a and b). Saint-Paul and Bentolila, (2000) show that small reforms may find a higher political incentives within EMU, since the "There is no alternative" (TINA) strategy lowers the costs in the presence of shocks.

enforcing the high quality of the club goods involves private agents who have the right to take legal action against violations of the Internal Market order.

The framework for cooperative policy making with regard to the EMU club goods is much less developed today. Below, we review the existing policy mechanisms for this purpose. Here, we state a few principles. An important difference between the Internal Market and the EMU club goods is obviously that the former consists largely of legal rights and obligations for private individuals and private and public institutions, while the latter consist largely of macroeconomic developments. The difference is important, because the Internal Market club good is a traditional subject of public and private law. In contrast, economic variables such as “price stability” are difficult to define from a legal perspective, and the extent to which they are provided by the relevant institutions such as the ESCB is difficult to assess on a legal basis.⁸ Even fervent advocates of monetary policy rules are unlikely to favor legally binding constraints on monetary policies, as this would leave the central bank unable to respond to macro economic shocks. The result would be an undesirable destabilization of output and employment in the euro area.⁹ Thus, in the context of the EMU club goods, cooperative policies will have to rely on a framework that allows for a more flexible setting of policies.

In principle, cooperative policymaking can have a narrow or a broad agenda in this context. The narrow agenda would consist of monitoring the national economic policies of the EMU member states and vetoing policies that are expected to worsen the quality of the club good. The Excessive Deficit Procedure and the Stability and Growth Pact are examples for this. The main challenge here is to identify policies that might affect the club goods adversely and to dissuade member governments from adopting or continuing such policies. The broad, ambitious agenda would go beyond that and develop cooperative policies to improve the quality of the EMU club goods.¹⁰

II.2. Horizontal Spill-overs

Traditional analysis of international economic policy coordination focuses on horizontal spill-overs of economic policy between countries. Spill-overs arise when the policies adopted by one country have a direct effect on economic variables relevant for

⁸ The question whether a central bank should be subject to a legal obligation to keep the rate of inflation below a certain number has been discussed extensively in the literature, e.g., in the context of the Reserve Act of New Zealand and the statutes of the ECB. See e.g. von Hagen (1997).

⁹ See Fratianni, von Hagen, and Waller (1997) for an analysis of these issues.

¹⁰ Kenen (1990) distinguishes between a ‘policy optimizing approach’ based on economic analysis and a ‘regime preserving approach’ which characterizes the practical attitude of governments. The latter is a no-conflict rule with the purpose of preventing conflicts between national economic policies and the club goods. The distinction corresponds to our concept of narrow and broad coordination.

economic policies in other countries. The focus of the argument is on national targets of economic policy of the individual member states. Thus, we may speak of “national goods” in contrast to “club goods”. Here, the transmission mechanisms are based primarily on quantity effects and international arbitrage. An example for the former is the rise in aggregate demand in one country due to the rise in another country’s demand for imports following, say, a fiscal expansion. An example for the latter is a rise in interest rates in one country following the rise in interest rates in another country due to interest rate parity. Spill-overs can be positive, as in the case of a fiscal expansion causing aggregate demand to go up in other countries, or negative, as in the case of a fiscal expansion causing interest rates to go up in other countries. Note that the existence and relevance of spill-overs does not hinge on the assumption that countries face similar shocks.

The literature has dealt extensively with such cases, primarily in a context of game theory (see Hamada and Kawai 1997; McKibbin 1997; and Milner 1997 for comprehensive reviews). The main idea is that failing to recognize the externalities implied by policy spill-overs leads to inefficient policy outcomes. Thus, horizontal spill-overs demand cooperative policymaking among the countries affected by the externalities.

The direction and intensity of such externalities among the euro-area countries is an empirical question.¹¹ Existing studies (e.g. in Buti and Sapir, 1998) typically find that horizontal spill-overs are too small and ambiguous to justify explicit policy coordination in EMU. However, such results are necessarily based on historical data and misleading, since monetary integration is likely to lead to new and stronger spill-overs. On the one hand, monetary integration should intensify trade integration and thus increase positive spill-overs. On the other hand, monetary integration has created a unified financial market in the euro area and, hence, increased international asset price linkages.

II.3. Elements of Cooperative Policymaking


According to the Tinbergen paradigm, rational economic policy consists of the following elements: A set of policy goals, which are first expressed qualitatively (e.g., price stability) and then quantified in target levels (e.g., inflation rates below two percent annually), an objective function defined over these goals and the degree to which they are achieved, a set of instruments available to the policymaker allowing him to move the target variables close to the desired levels, and an economic model describing the links between

¹¹ McKibbin (1997) points out that empirical studies of international policy coordination typically find that the gains from cooperative policies are small. This result, however, comes mainly from comparing optimal cooperative with optimal non-cooperative policies and from considering policy settings with no uncertainty. Gains from cooperation can be larger if more simple policy rules are evaluated or uncertainty is taken into consideration.

instruments and goals as well as any trade-offs between the goals. Given these elements, an optimal policy is the solution of maximizing the objective function given the constraints described by the model.

Consider two countries, $j=1,2$, each pursuing rational economic policies to reach three linearly independent national policy goals¹², NG_{ij} , $i = 1, 2, 3$. Each government has a set of linearly independent policy instruments I_{kj} , $k=1, \dots, n$, available to achieve its goals. Each economy is described by a model linking instruments and objectives. Figure 1 illustrates the problem of policy coordination in the presence of horizontal spill-overs.

Figure 1: Policy Cooperation with Horizontal Spill-Overs




A first point to note here is the role of policy trade offs. If each government had $n=3$ independent instruments available, it would be able to achieve all three goals fully at the same time. Realistically, we assume that each government has only two instruments available, $n=2$. Consequently, policymaking involves trade-offs between the goals. Decision making then requires an objective function evaluating this tradeoff and indicating a most desired combination of instruments and levels of achievement in the three goals.

Figure 1 also shows that the policy instruments of country one have an impact on the goals of country two, a horizontal spill-over. Non-cooperative policymaking is, therefore, inefficient. This inefficiency can be overcome by setting policies cooperatively. Formally, this involves the optimization of the sum of the two objective functions.

¹² The linear independence assumption means that no pair of goals is perfectly correlated.

Consider now a situation where the two countries have formed a club and where the former goal variable $i=1$ has become the club good. This situation is described in figure 2. As indicated in the figure, the relevant model for the club economy is now an encompassing one that includes both of the national models. Policymaking in this setting is more complex for a number of reasons.

Figure 2: Policy Cooperation with Club Goods



Note, first, that policy making would be extremely simplified in this setting if the set of instruments available to each country had a certain property of separability. Specifically, assume that the combined instrument I_{1j} , $j=1,2$, affects only the first goal variable, such that all remaining policy trade-offs involve the second instrument and the other two goals. In this case, the countries might create a specialized club agency vested with the power to use the combined instruments to achieve the first policy goal. The national authorities would then be able to focus entirely on the remaining goals of national economic policy. Efficient policymaking would still require cooperative policies among the two countries to account for the horizontal spill-over. Importantly, however, there would not be a trade-off to be considered in reaching the desired level of the club good and the desired levels of the national goal variables. That is, the club authority could be committed entirely to a full achievement of the first policy goal with no need to evaluate any choices between different degrees of achieving this and the remaining policy goals at the national level. But note that this separability would hold before the formation of the club already. That is, one should be

able to observe that both countries fully reach the first policy goal before the formation of the club.

This separability is obviously important in the case of EMU. Here, the club agency is the ECB, which the mandate to pursue price stability as its principal goal without regard to any other variables. Only if price stability has been achieved, the ECB is allowed - and required - to consider other policy goals. As we will see below, a framework for cooperative policymaking among the ECB and the national governments has not yet been developed. Thus, the current setup of the EMU seems to rely on the assumption that a separability of the kind described here holds in the euro area (Padoa-Schioppa, 1999). But the fact that price stability was not always achieved before EMU, and that national monetary authorities formulated their policies in a context of trade-offs between price stability, unemployment and output growth suggests that the assumption of separability between monetary policy and other policy instruments available to target the remaining goals of economic policy is questionable in practice. If the separability between policies does not hold in the way described above, the setting of national economic policies in the club becomes more difficult. The reason is that the economic constraints given by the model of the club and the national economies imply a conflict potential between the national authorities.¹³

A first approach to deal with this conflict potential is to define a joint objective function over the club good and the national policy goals. The joint objective function would make the two governments' valuation of different degrees of achieving the policy goals explicit and, therefore, its construction would require a political bargaining process. Optimization of this joint objective function would then yield optimal values for all national policy instruments (and the instruments of a club authority, if it exists.) This optimization would simultaneously solve the horizontal externality problem.¹⁴

A second approach is to give the club good preeminence over all other goals of economic policy and require full achievement of the associated goal regardless of the achievements in other policy dimensions. As in the case of the ECB, this preeminence could be institutionally underpinned by creating a special club agency vested with sufficient instruments to achieve this goal and independent from the national governments. Its independence would assure that the club agency would pay no attention to other policy

¹³ The existence of such a conflict potential has been recognized by the Luxembourg Council in 1997 which concluded that "...To the extent that national economic developments have an impact on inflation prospects in the euro area, they will influence monetary conditions in that area. It is for this basic reason that the move to a single currency will require closer Community surveillance and coordination of economic policies among euro-area Member States."

goals unless the first goal had been fully achieved. Such an approach appears attractive at first glance, because it does not seem to require a political agreement regarding the valuation of trade-offs between the club- good and the national policy goals.

Preeminence of the club good, however, only moves the conflict potential between the national policy goals and the club good to a different level. To illustrate this, assume that the first government, because of a large negative shock to its target variable NG_{21} wants to increase the use of instrument I_{21} and that this has a damaging effect on the club good. Suppose that maintaining the desired level of the club good requires either a reduction of the second government's use of instrument I_{22} or a response by the club authority that affects both countries negatively. There are now three outcomes: (1) The first government renounces the use of I_{21} and, thus, implicitly accepts a lower degree of achieving NG_{21} . (2) The first government increases the use of I_{21} and the second government reduces the use of this instrument, i.e., it implicitly accepts a lower degree of achieving NG_{22} . (3) The first government increases the use of I_{21} , the second government does not react, but the club authority does, causing a lower degree of achieving the other policy goals in both countries. Any choice between these three outcomes (or convex combinations of them) involves a judgment of the fair distribution of "welfare" among the two countries. This is equivalent to optimizing a joint objective function defined over the policy goals of both countries that takes a full achievement of the goal connected with the club good as given. The outcome of such an optimization would be less efficient than that of optimizing a joint welfare function, as it amounts to a constraint optimization. As long as there is a non-zero correlation between the club good and the national policy goals, judgements regarding the implied trade-offs or the distribution of costs across the club members cannot be avoided.

The analysis so far has assumed that the club provides only one club good. Above, we have identified several club goods in the context of the EMU. The existence of several such goods further complicates the situation, as trade-offs between these club goods must be considered in addition to the trade-offs between them and the national economic policy goals. One implication is that the approach of giving one club good preeminence over all other goals of economic policy will only work if the provision of all club goods is strongly positively correlated. A related implication is that the creation of a single club agency charged with the provision of the first club good will not guarantee a satisfactory provision of the other club goods. In the context of macroeconomic policies, this is the well-known problem of the policy-mix (Jacquet and Pisani-Ferry, 2000). One way out of this dilemma

¹⁴ Dixit and Lambertini (2000) provide a simple model of the Barro Gordon type for horizontal externalities that allows also for some sort of monetary and fiscal policy interactions using two

would be to charge the club agency with the task of providing all club goods in satisfactory quantities. But this would require the club agency to evaluate trade-offs between them and make choices accordingly; a task that would be too demanding for an independent agency. Thus cooperative policymaking is required among the members to assure a satisfactory performance of the club.

The essence of this discussion is that cooperative policymaking in the context of a club good requires a decision making framework that contains the following elements:

- A framework of analysis (a model) linking policy instruments and policy goals at the national level and the level of the club;
- A framework for evaluating the degree of achievement of policy goals and for evaluating trade-offs among them (an objective function);
- A procedure for deriving optimal instrument values at the national and the club level (a collective choice mechanism).

One might object to this analysis that it relies too much on optimizing economic policies, an unrealistic assumption in practice. The literature on cooperative policymaking, however, has shown that the gains from cooperation are even larger when governments follow policy rules that are simpler than those implied by full optimization (McKibbin, 1997, von Hagen, 1993). Importantly, the conflict potential implied by trade-offs between the club good and national policy goals is not removed by simplifying economic policies.

What, if the club members cannot agree on such procedures? In the absence of a club agency charged with producing and maintaining the club good, this would lead to permanent underprovision of the latter. The result would be a poor performance of the club that would undermine its stability. Thus, the creation of a club agency is an essential step in setting up a club with no or little cooperative policymaking. But note that this suffices only in the presence of a single club good. With multiple club goods, underprovision of some of them would still be the consequence.

With a club agency, the club would enjoy a high level of provision of the club good, but this might come with more or less unsatisfactory degrees of achievement regarding the national goals of economic policy. Each member state would optimize its economic policies given the level of club good provision delivered by the club agency, and each member would have to accept that it could not do any better than that. This could well be an acceptable outcome as long as no individual member engages in policies that impinge heavily on the club good and force the club agency to react in ways inflicting significant costs on the other members. Thus, even in the absence of cooperative policymaking, the

policy objective functions with different weights for the goals for ECB and national authorities.

functioning of the club requires mechanisms of “narrow cooperation”, i.e., rules that prevent club members from imposing economic costs on others.

Furthermore, individual club members in such a scenario have incentives to engage in structural policies – changing properties of their economies reflected in the parameters of the economic models – that improve the outcomes of their policies with regard to their national policy goals given the provision of the club good by the club agency. In fact, this is often regarded as an attractive aspect of such a scenario, as the lack of cooperative policymaking would create competition among the members and this competition would improve the performance of the national economies.¹⁵ Ex ante, however, it is not at all clear what such reforms would imply for the ability of the club agency to deliver the club good. Again, a framework of “narrow cooperation” would be required to prevent such developments.

The situation would be more difficult, if a member state were hit by a large shock, the adjustment to which had significant adverse consequences for the other members, while not adjusting to it was politically and economically very costly and would call the country’s club membership in question. Some cooperative action would then be required. While this suggests that one could leave cooperative policymaking to times of crises, it would still be necessary to develop a framework for exceptional cooperation that would contain all the elements mentioned above and a mechanism for identifying and declaring crisis.

Individual rationality suggests that no member would have joined the club expecting this outcome to be worse than staying outside the club. Thus, although the absence of cooperative policymaking yields worse results than cooperative policymaking, it should still be better than not forming the club at all, and it should be viable in normal times, i.e., the absence of large shocks. Still, the power of the reference point of staying outside the club is likely to vanish as the club grows older. Over time, therefore, it is likely that the demand for more cooperative policymaking increases.

III. Mechanisms for Policy Coordination in the EU

The purpose of the following section is to describe the existing processes of policy coordination. We discuss how they relate to each other and in what ways they differ. We then identify obstacles in the present EU network of coordination procedures with respect to existing club goods.

¹⁵ As shown by Oates and Schwab (1988) and Sinn (1997), however, the analogy of competition on private markets and competition among governments is not as simple as the popular argument suggests.

Prior to the start of monetary integration, policy coordination in the EU was based on two main methods, harmonization of policies based on common rules of behavior and delegation to Community institutions (Jacquet and Pisani-Ferry, 2000). The administration of the Internal Market and Common Agricultural Policy are prime examples for delegation, where the authority over common policies was given to Community institutions. The coordination of monetary policies within the European Monetary System was an example for rule-based coordination among national authorities. EMU has added further examples of coordination based on these methods. The conduct of the single monetary policy by the ECB is an obvious example for delegation. The fiscal strictures of the Excessive Deficit Procedure and the Stability and Growth Pact are examples for rules-based coordination in EMU. But in addition to these traditional methods of coordination, the Maastricht Process and the development of the Union during the 1990s have introduced new ones that are based on dialogue, the exchange of information, peer pressure and persuasion.

III.1. Actors

According to the Treaty (Art. 99), member states coordinate their economic policies at the EU level within the Council of Ministers with the participation of all 15 member states and the presence of the European Commission and the ECB where deemed necessary. The Council of Economics and Finance Ministers (ECOFIN) is the relevant one for the discussion and decisions about government deficits, spending, and taxation, while the Employment/Social Affairs Council deals with employment and social policies. In the coordination procedure established by the Treaty (Art. 99), the Council adopts policy guidelines and recommendations by majority voting on a proposal from the Commission, thereby following the conclusions of the European Council - the Heads of State or Government of the 15 member states and the highest level of coordination. Although the title of ECOFIN suggests otherwise, it is noteworthy that the members of this body are far from being a homogeneous group, as the functional and the political role of finance ministers varies considerably across EU member states.

The 1997 European Council in Luxembourg agreed to the establishment of the Euro group, now known as the Euro12-Group, of the finance ministers of the EMU member states, in recognition of the specific coordination requirements among participants of the euro area. Since the Euro Group has no legislative responsibility, its role is to assess the economic situation and to discuss the major policy issues for the euro area. It is chaired by a minister of a participating EMU member state, including in periods when the EU presidency is held by a non-EMU member. This subgroup of ECOFIN gathers in connection with ECOFIN meetings.

The European Commission is present both at ECOFIN and Euro12 meetings. The Commission has the right for initiatives in Council meetings and to provide analysis for multilateral surveillance. The Economic and Financial Committee (EFC) has advisory and preparatory functions for the Council meetings. It consists of representatives of national administrations and national central banks, as well as two representatives of the European Commission and the ECB. Within the limits set by the consensus agreements of the national governments, both institutions, the EFC and the European Commission have played leading roles in the development of the coordination process, e.g. by proposing the various procedures reviewed below. While the European Commission and the EFC cover macroeconomic and financial issues, the Economic Policy Committee (EPC), which consists of officials from economics ministries, concentrates on structural policies.¹⁶

According to insider views, the European Council and ECOFIN can hardly be regarded as effective institutions for cooperative decision making. Padoa Schioppa (1999) argues that ECOFIN is too large of a forum to develop concrete policy actions or policy rules. Furthermore, it involves too many participants and catches too much media attention to facilitate confidential discussions and deliberations.¹⁷ The more informal Euro12-Group allows a more concentrated debate, since national delegations are restricted to two persons. However its role is limited since decisions can be taken only at the Council level. Jacquet and Pisani-Ferry (2000) argue that the Euro12-Group has played a useful role in developing the quality of economic policy debates among its members, but that the role of this group is largely exhausted with this function.

Art. 113 forms the Treaty basis for a dialogue between the Council and the ECB. It foresees the participation of the ECB in Council meetings where matters relating to monetary policy are discussed. In turn, the Council president has the right to participate in meetings of the ECB Governing Council and to submit motions for deliberation by the Governing Council. But since the president of the EU Council represents all members of the EU, he is not necessarily a good counterpart for the ECB to discuss the policy mix in the euro area. This is partly recognized by the practice that, if the EU presidency falls on a non-euro state, the Council president is represented by the chairman of the euro group, i.e. the finance minister from the next EMU member state to hold the EU presidency. The ECB president is always invited to participate in meetings of the Euro12 -Group.

In a study based on surveys of the national central banks and finance ministries, Bini-Smaghi (2000) finds that the quality and frequency of the dialogue between Council

¹⁶ Under to the Lisbon strategy, structural policies should gain more prominence on the policy agenda.

and ECB are lower compared to the dialogues between the national finance ministries and the central banks before the start of EMU. As long as national finance ministries regard their policy as a matter of national concern, the reduced information exchange reduces the incentive to internalize the ECB's reaction and therefore leads to insufficient coordination.

Table 1: The annual EU Procedures and actors involved

Procedures	Form of Coordination and Instruments	Actors	Tasks
Broad Economic Policy Guidelines (Art 99 Amsterdam Treaty)	Core of economic policy coordination within the EU defining common objectives Annual guidelines and recommendations to member states	Council (EU11 Group) European Commission Member States	The BEPGs defines the economic policy orientations for the EU in accordance with Art 2. The BEPG integrate the different processes mentioned below.
Multilateral surveillance (Art 99 (3) Amsterdam Treaty))	Monitoring process Peer review	Council European Commission Member States	The Process monitors and assesses the economic developments and policies in Member States as well as in the Community as a whole. It forms the basis for Community compliance procedure (art 99 (4))
Excessive Deficit Procedure (EDP) (Art 104) Stability and Growth Pact (SGP) Regulation 1467/97	Common rules and objectives - Budgetary Surveillance - Pecuniary sanctions MS submit annually stability or convergence programmes	European Council European Parliament National Governments (Finance Ministries) European Commission	The EDP and SGP represent an obligation on Member States to achieve medium-term budgetary positions close to balance or in surplus. .
Cologne Process ECOFIN 1999	Informal macroeconomic dialogue at Community level - Informal exchange of view - 2 meetings per year	- ECB (+ representative of non EMU CB) -European Commission -Troika of current, subsequent and preceding presidency of ECOFIN and Labor/Social ministers Social Partners	The Cologne Process aims at improving the interaction between wage developments and monetary, budgetary and fiscal policy at the EU level. The Process was installed to complete the Cardiff and Luxembourg process.
Luxembourg Process (Art 128 Amsterdam Treaty)	Open coordination (Guidelines and recommendations to member states) Peer review Benchmarking, best practices pecuniary incentives (ESF)for MS to provide high quality information MS submit annually National Action Plans	European Council European Commission National Governments (Labour and Finance Ministries)	The Luxembourg process coordinates the European Employment Strategy. The purpose is to improve the effectiveness of national employment and labour market policies by better focusing on respective problem groups, improving the set of instruments and establishing a continuous evaluation process.
Cardiff Process ECOFIN 1998	Monitoring process within the Single Market - Identification of good practice - Peer review	European Commission Economic Policy Committee Nat. Gov (Econ + Fin Min.)	The Cardiff process is a multilateral review of economic reforms in product, capital and labour markets. The purpose is to improve the market efficiency of Member States' economies so as to enhance the favourable environment for growth, high employment and social cohesion.

¹⁷ Italianer (1999) states that because of the abundance of accompanying officials the focus of attention has shifted towards the twice yearly informal meetings of ministers of finance and central bank governors which often managed to give decisive political impulses to the EMU process.

III.2. Processes

Table 1 presents an overview of the processes of policy coordination in the context of EMU. They include the Broad Economic Policy Guidelines, the process of multilateral surveillance, the Excessive Deficit Procedure and the Stability and Growth Pact, the Luxembourg, the Cologne, and the Cardiff process.

III.2.1. The Broad Economic Policy Guidelines

The Broad Economic Policy Guidelines (BEPGs) form the center of economic policy coordination process at the Community level in accordance with Art. 99 of the Treaty. The BEPGs consolidate the different existing processes (Luxembourg, Cologne and Cardiff, see below) and aim at exploiting the synergies between them. BEPGs also form the reference for the multilateral surveillance procedure, under which the consistency of national economic policies with the BEPGs and the functioning of EMU in general are monitored. The multilateral surveillance procedure includes the possibility to make confidential or public assessments of the policies of individual member states and to give confidential or public recommendations to their governments. The European Council decides by unanimity vote on the BEPG upon proposals by the European Commission and recommendations by ECOFIN.

The BEPG do not sufficiently recognize the existence of club goods in the euro-area that are not shared by non-EMU members of the EU. Thus, they do not constitute a proper framework for developing the macroeconomic policies to be adopted by the EMU member states to secure a proper policy mix. When the European Commission considered EMU matters explicitly in the BEPG 2000, Council ministers including some EMU members objected that distinction. When the BEPG for 2001 did not distinguish between EU and EMU in its analysis, some of the same Council members claimed that such a distinction would have been useful. This example suggests that the process of policy coordination is still in flux.

In the BEPG for 1998, 1999 and 2000 responsibility with respect to the club good 'price stability' was assigned not only to monetary policy but also to national fiscal policy by recommending that countries in which inflationary pressures were building up (Ireland, Spain and Portugal) should rely on fiscal policy to avoid overheating. Moreover, the BEPG include recommendations for the behavior of the social partners. It is unclear, however, whether or not the bodies developing and discussing the BEPG can make commitments on behalf of the social partners in the member states and secure the implementation of this part of the guidelines at the national level.

III.2.2. Procedures for the Control of Fiscal Deficits and Debts

Fiscal policy remains a national competence for EMU member states, but under several constraints. EMU Procedures for the conduct of fiscal policy are the Excessive Deficit Procedure (EDP), the Mutual Surveillance Procedure (Art. 99, 100, 111 TEU), the Stability and Growth Pact (Regulation 1467/97). The No-Bail-Out-Rule (Art. 103 TEU, Art. 21 ESCB Protocol) protects member states from becoming responsible for financial liabilities of other member states against their will. The Excessive Deficit Procedure includes the mandate (Art 3 of the Protocol) that the member states of EMU should implement appropriate institutions at the national level that enable them to fulfill their obligation to maintain sustainable finance. In contrast to the obligation for all member states to have independent central banks, there is, however, no explanation of what this obligation means in practice. For members of the EMU, the EDP is an unconditional obligation to avoid excessive deficits. In addition, the SGP calls for medium-term budgetary positions close to balance or in surplus. The higher the debt-to-GDP ratios of the country, the greater must be their efforts to reduce them rapidly. Member states are required to take immediate corrective actions, if they are found to have an excessive deficit. The EDP and the SGP allow for the imposition of financial sanctions in such cases – a feature that distinguishes these from other coordination procedures.

In this context, EMU members are required to produce annual Stability programs that present the main fiscal decisions and budgetary choices on the path to the medium term objective for budgetary positions close to balance or in surplus (2001-2004 for the latest programmes). The Council considers whether the budget-policy strategy and the economic targets continue to meet the requirements of the SGP and the BEPG. In order to prevent the occurrence of excessive deficits, the Council may give an early warning in line with Article 99(4) of the Treaty.

While the combination of the EDP and the SGP acknowledge the importance of fiscal discipline for the conduct of monetary policy, it is still unsatisfactory with respect to the EMU club goods for several reasons.

- First, the procedure focuses on individual member country performance with no regard to the aggregate fiscal policy stance of the euro area as a whole. Implicitly, it is based on the assumption that being close to balance is unconditionally the proper contribution of fiscal policy to macroeconomic stability in the euro area. While this may be true in the long run, conventional macroeconomics hold that stability demands different constellations of monetary and fiscal policy at different stages of the business cycle.
- Second, it focuses narrowly on deficits and debts and ignores the policies that affect the common exchange rate and external balance as well as the contribution

of fiscal policies to growth, employment and prices, such as the level and structure of public spending and taxation. In the context of policy coordination, the emphasis of the EDP and SGP on government borrowing is justified only if one assumes that national fiscal policies affect the EMU club goods and cause horizontal spill-overs predominantly through their capital market effects.

- Third, the EDP and SGP are designed to prevent countries from running excessive deficits that are defined in terms of fixed, numerical thresholds. No guidance is provided, however, for the member countries' fiscal policies in times when the numerical limits have been achieved. There is now ample evidence showing that problems with non sustainable public finances are typically the result of policies that allow a small number of spending items to run out of control (e.g. Perotti, Strauch and von Hagen, 1998). The recent reemergence of fiscal laxity in the EMU member states (see von Hagen, Hughes-Hallett and Strauch 2000) is consistent with that experience. It suggests that the rules for fiscal policy do not do enough to guide fiscal choices in good times and prevent the emergence of excessive deficits.

Within the existing framework for policy coordination, the place for formulating and monitoring the achievement of such objectives would be the BEPG. It is interesting, therefore, to note that the Commission's and the Council's recent recommendations for more fiscal discipline in Ireland were made under Art 99.4 (BEPG), although the analysis was made in the context of the SGP (Fisher and Reitano, 2001). Thus, there seems to be some recognition of the incompleteness of the framework for fiscal policy coordination provided by the EDP and the SGP. But the weaknesses of the BEPG for policy coordination in the EMU context also suggest that the potential for using them for the purposes indicated above is limited.

III.2.3. The Cologne Process

Under German Presidency, an informal macroeconomic dialogue known as the Cologne Process was introduced. It institutionalized a bi-annual informal process of consultations between public authorities and representatives of wage bargainers without setting objectives. The dialogue discusses technical macroeconomic issues on a national level and reports them subsequently for a political exchange between the ECB, ECOFIN, the Labor and Social Affairs Councils, the Commission, and the social partners. ECOFIN is represented by the 'troika' of the past, current, and subsequent presidencies. The social partners are represented by their respective organizations at the European level.

The Cologne Process aims at improving the interaction between wage developments and monetary, budgetary and fiscal policies in order to achieve stronger

growth and higher employment while maintaining price stability. Although the dialogue explicitly considers the necessity of wage policies at the national level to be consistent with the EMU club good of price stability, the forum is unlikely to play a major role in the coordination process. This is due to the fact that the EU federations of trade unions and employers unions do not have the authority to represent a common view of the respective partners in all the different member countries and, therefore, cannot assure the enforcement of any agreements on guidelines for wage policies at the national level. This, in turn, is due to the institutional heterogeneity of social partner organizations in the member countries (See OECD ,1996).¹⁸ There is nevertheless a role for improving the information content for fiscal, monetary and wage policy making in the presence of common price level as our club good.¹⁹

III.2.4. The Cardiff and Luxembourg Processes

According to a popular view, EMU membership should increase the willingness of governments to undertake politically inconvenient reform policies, as this is the only remaining policy tool to deal with asymmetric shocks. However, Sibert and Sutherland (1997), and Calmfors (1998) argue that reform incentives for member states can be less than outside EMU, as monetary policy no longer eases costly reforms in the national context and the benefit of one country's reform will be spread to all members of the euro area. In light of these arguments, the Luxemburg and Cardiff processes may be seen as attempts to reinforce reform incentives for member states via peer pressure. In addition, the two processes aim at improving employment and the functioning of the Single Market.

The Cardiff process monitors structural reforms and innovations of member states in product, capital and labor markets. In this process the Economic Policy Committee plays a leading role as it conducts a multilateral surveillance (Synthesis Report). Instruments used are peer pressure and an extensive reporting, monitoring and evaluation system. In accordance with the Lisbon strategy, more emphasis has been put on the identification of best practices. The Cardiff Process is now linked to the Single Market Report. Its relies on the concept of competition between different jurisdictions and aims at abolishing barriers to the free movement of goods, services, capital and labor. In 2000, quantitative indicators were developed by the Commission to improve the assessment in this area.

¹⁸ Wyplosz (1999) argues that further centralization at EU level is also hindered by the diverging labour costs throughout Europe where in Germany labour costs are five times larger than in Portugal.

¹⁹ Collignon (2001) emphasizes that the underlying philosophy of the Macroeconomic Dialogue is to structure a debate in Europe where relevant policy information could be shared in a consensus building way.

The Luxembourg process was launched at the end of 1997 and reinforced by the inclusion of the Employment Chapter (Title VIII) in the Amsterdam Treaty.²⁰ The Luxembourg process aims at building a coherent approach to actively dealing with structural labor market problems in EU countries. The purpose is to improve the effectiveness of national employment and labor market policies by better focusing on problem groups, by improving the set of instruments, and by establishing a continuous evaluation process. The four 'pillars' and 22 'guidelines' serve to guide labor market and employment policies and as a basis for the assessment of country activities.

The Treaty sets up a framework for an annual multilateral surveillance procedure similar to the multilateral surveillance procedure of Art. 99 and in some aspects goes even further than that by giving the Council the possibility to adopt incentive measures. Specifically, the disbursement of monies from the European Social Fund has been made conditional on the member states' compliance with the Luxembourg process.

Even a short glance reveals a lack of substantial foundation of the pillars and guidelines of the Luxembourg Process. For example, the employment benefit from active labor market policies comes from addressing specific market failures. They can improve overall employment performance, if they are targeted specifically at individual market failures. Therefore, policies cannot be simply translated from one country to another, an implication, which is not explicitly considered in the current evaluation process. These fundamental weaknesses probably reflect a more basic problem of the Luxembourg process, i.e., the absence of a truly European employment problem. A review of the individual labor market performances shows that some countries have achieved full employment, while others have not. Among the latter, some countries have predominantly regional unemployment problems (Italy and Germany), while others have problems with specific social groups, which may be age-related (youth unemployment in France) or skill related (e.g., in the UK).

The practical experience with the process so far has shown that monitoring labor market policies across countries is not an easy task. The Luxembourg process demands a common evaluation of the 'input' and 'output' of active labor market policies. The definition and use of common indicators is complicated by the prevalence of different statistical conventions and different institutional settings which imply that the same indicator can mean very different things in different countries.

²⁰ The Treaty recognizes that member states retain the principal responsibility for employment policies. Nevertheless, Art. 125 calls for the development of a coordinated employment strategy by the member states and the Community, and Art. 126 calls upon the member states to contribute to the objectives of this strategy through their employment policies, to regard promoting employment as a matter of common concern, and to coordinate their actions in this regard.

As a result, the impact of Luxemburg Process for its main objective employment creation is less clear given different structural problems of the member countries. The process may nevertheless have an impact on reform incentives of member states and therefore affect the EMU club good. However, the main actors involved in the process are the Ministers of Labour and Social partners who may not account for the implications of their choices for the quality of club goods in this context. Thus, the process accounts insufficiently for the interaction between labor market policy and other policies.

IV. Effectiveness of Policy Coordination

In this section, we go back to our analysis to assess the effectiveness of these procedures in light of the exigencies for coordination in EMU. Several criteria can be derived from our analysis: the scope of cooperative policymaking in the EMU, the ability to face trade-offs and make choices between relevant policy alternatives, the ability to commit policies at the national level, and the quality of the analysis within the processes.

IV.1. Scope of Cooperative Policies

Our review of the existing procedures at the EU level shows that the scope of cooperative policymaking is broad even today, much broader in fact than a traditional reading of the concept of economic policy coordination in the EU context would lead one to expect.²¹ The policies covered by the existing processes range from budgetary policies over labor market policies to regulatory policies at the national level. This is consistent with our view that cooperative policymaking should include policies that affect the environment and the constraints of the common monetary policy in EMU. Still, the existing procedures do not cover all relevant aspects of the broader policies involved, as in the case of the level and structure of public spending, although the Commission makes visible efforts to broaden the assessment of public finances in this regard (e.g. Commission, 2000).²²

Nevertheless, there are significant limitations of the scope of cooperative policymaking. A first one is the fact that the existing procedures do not address all the different club goods of the EMU explicitly. A partial exception is exchange rate policy, which is at the center of the coordination between monetary and fiscal policies. Art. 111 TEU foresees that the EMU members of ECOFIN can decide, by qualified majority, following a recommendation of the ECB or the European Commission, and if price stability

²¹ As discussed in Harden and von Hagen (1997), the term 'economic policy' has traditionally been interpreted to mean mainly budgetary policy.

is not endangered, on general exchange rate policy orientations. This creates an opportunity for cooperative exchange rate policies, albeit outside the ordinary processes described above. However, clear rules and procedures for such cooperation in case of reduced quality of the club good – exchange rate stability or misalignments - are missing. A viable alternative would be a framework that would allow the Council to respond to signals coming from the exchange markets on the basis of an analysis of the Commission and the ECB (Jaquet and Pisani Ferry, 2000). For the current-account club good no provisions are foreseen in the Treaty, although the Treaty has provisions for Community assistance in the case of an individual member country facing severe external imbalances. Similarly, the current processes pay no attention to the club good of financial market stability.

Another, significant limitation in the scope of cooperative policymaking is that the current procedures focus entirely on *ex-ante* coordination. That is, the participating countries (and the ECB, where applicable), reveal what they intend to do given their expectations about future economic circumstances. What will happen, if these expectations fail to materialize, however, is not part of the various procedures. This limitation is particularly important in the context of coordination between monetary and fiscal policy in the EMU, where the development of transparent rules for cooperative reactions to shocks could greatly help guide private sector expectations, which in turn largely determine the outcomes of macroeconomic policies.

IV.2. Ability to Face Trade-offs and Make Relevant Choices

Above, we have shown that EMU creates the need for formulating trade-offs between its club goods and between these and the national goals of economic policy. The current procedures for cooperative policies do neither make room for that nor for making the relevant choices. On the one hand, the processes are rather compartmentalized in terms of policy fields, while the analysis and evaluation of trade-offs requires dealing with more than one field of policy at a time. On the other hand, such an analysis and discussion currently only happens in the context of the BEPG. Yet, the specificity of the BEPG and the analysis surrounding them generally seems rather low (Pisani Ferry, 2001). For reasons stated above, the EU Council, the relevant decision making body in this context, does not seem to be the appropriate body for a detailed assessment of trade-offs and policy choices.

²² The Lisbon Council has asked the Commission to develop a concept of “Quality of Public Finances” as a broader framework and to evaluate the connection between public finances and economic growth.

The difference between EU and EMU matters particularly in this regard. At the level of the EU, the Internal Market constitutes the principal club good. As in pre-EMU times, the coordination of economic policies is deemed important in this context to assure that countries do not engage in policies that undermine the smooth functioning of the Internal Market – competitive devaluations being the traditional example. The euro area, however, has a broader need for policy coordination. Fears among the non-EMU members of the EU, that closer and more intensive policy coordination among the EMU states might have adverse consequences for their own competitive positions in the Internal Market have, so far, been an obstacle to the design of more effective processes.

The lack of a practical equivalent of what economists call an objective function of economic policy leaves the process of policy coordination in a vulnerable and risky state. It implies that there is neither a framework nor a forum to discuss in depth and detail choices between different degrees of achievement of different policy goals at the EMU and the national level and the distribution of costs of policy adjustment at the national level to achieve a good overall performance of the EMU. The implicit assumption of this setup seems to be that a competitive process of policy coordination, i.e., one in which each country does all it can to pursue its own goals at the national level given a common monetary policy and the Excessive Deficit Procedure, serves to guarantee the best performance of the EMU under all circumstances. There are good reasons to believe that this assumption is incorrect.

Elsewhere, we have argued that the quality of economic policy in the EMU could be greatly improved by the creation of an *Economic Policy Council*, an improved version of the Euro Group. With an appropriate institutional design, such a council would enhance policy coordination by developing judgments about policy trade-offs and the distribution of adjustment costs. It would be a significant step to overcome one of the most critical shortcomings of the current framework for economic policymaking in EMU.

IV.3. Ability to Commit

Effective policy coordination requires the possibility to commit the participants to some joint program of action or common policies. However, the current set-up for cooperative policies in the EMU relies essentially on peer pressure and persuasion. This is a direct result of the fact that the EMU member states were unwilling to give up further sovereignty over their economic policies or a lack of consensus (Collignon, 2001).

Experience with this approach in the EMU and in other contexts suggests that the responsiveness of governments to peer pressure is not the same in all countries. Large countries in particular are less likely to react to peer pressure in the desired way, as the wish to be “good European” typically plays a much weaker role in their domestic politics

than in smaller countries.²³ The slippage in fiscal discipline observed in 1999 and 2000 and the fact that France and Germany undertook significant tax measures without referring to them in their Stability programs (European Commission, 2000) support the impression that the effectiveness of peer pressure to secure commitment is limited.

Furthermore, the procedures for cooperative policymaking do not always involve the relevant actors at the national level. This implies that negotiations in the individual processes often can lead to no more than statements of good intentions to persuade the other actors relevant at the national level. Experience suggests that these good intentions do not always lead to good results.

The institutional preconditions are another relevant issue here. Recent empirical studies of fiscal practices in the EU states show a large degree of variation in the implementation of fiscal rules (Hallerberg, Strauch and von Hagen, 2001; Fischer and Reitano, 2001). In some states, the fiscal targets formulated in the context of the Stability Programmes are translated into detailed targets at the level of individual ministries, and the governments have developed a detailed framework enabling them to keep their budgetary aggregates close to the stated targets when revenue or expenditure shocks occur. In other states, the connection between the targets stated in the Stability Programmes and the annual budget process is loose and rules for shocks do not exist. This suggests that the effectiveness of the EDP and SGP as a framework for policy coordination varies across countries. On the other hand, the political economy of fiscal policy shows that the suitability of fiscal targets and multiannual programs to guide a government's fiscal choices and serve as a commitment device depends on political factors such as the organization of government and electoral systems (Hallerberg and von Hagen, 1998). Given the variance of these factors across EU member states, the strong reliance of the EMU on this approach is questionable.

This is also true for the connection between national decision making processes and the processes at the European level. The writing of the Stability and Growth Programs does not typically coincide with the annual budget cycle in the member states. Member states are required to supply their programs before March 1 but agreed to submit these programs before the end of the year. In all countries except the UK, the annual budget cycles start in the fall with the final budget being adopted by the Parliament towards the end of the year or early the following year. How can objectives in the programs and the Council opinions feed back into the national budgetary process and implementation? A late submission, after the adoption by the parliament, may not incorporate the relevance of

²³ It is interesting in this context to note that, during the convergence process to EMU in the 1990s, the small EU countries were much more responsive to the pressures for adjustment of budgetary

the budget on EMU level. This might reflect the strategic choice of that country to avoid a parallel debate at EU and national level but is inefficient with respect to our club good. Given that the aggregated fiscal stance is relevant for the assessment of the macroeconomic policy stance within the euro area, the missing link in the two debate favors the national positions.

IV.3. Quality of Analysis

Policy coordination requires a common framework of analysis showing how macroeconomic developments respond to various types of shocks and to the use of policy instruments at the national and the European level. With regard to the macro economy of the euro area, the sheer fact that EMU is a new entity explains the current lack of such a framework. Researchers at the ECB, the Commission and elsewhere are developing such models. It should be noted, however, that the existing procedures for policy coordination also involve a large amount of analysis of the effectiveness of economic policies at the national level, e.g., active labor market policies in the context of the Luxembourg process. Currently, such analysis is mainly provided by the national governments, and seems to be driven by considerations of political opportunity rather than value of information. There is clearly a need for improvement in this context.

The surveillance of national economic policies and the formulation of credible recommendations require high quality of the relevant statistical information. For example, the effective monitoring of the public finance positions requires information on an on-going basis during the year (Jaquet and Pisani Ferry ,2000). Or, an improved data set on active labor market policies may allow identifying successful labor market strategies across countries within the Luxembourg process. There is still a need for improving the quality and availability of data needed in the existing processes.

The acceptance of peer pressure by member states relies on the methods of analysis used to formulate recommendations. For example, the set of relevant fiscal indicators have to be broadened in order to allow a qualitative assessment of the respective policy stance. A better quality information is also needed to assess the member states performance in conducting structural reforms. Finally, the criteria for the selection of “best practices” particularly in the Luxembourg and Cardiff Processes, which are used as benchmarks for the member states’ own practices are far from obvious. These criteria should be spelled out explicitly to assure that the selected cases of “best practice” are adequate for guiding the member states policies.

policies than the large countries. See von Hagen, Hughes-Hallett and Strauch 2000.

V. Conclusions

EMU has created a new environment for economic policy in Europe. It is characterized by the existence of multiple club goods. In this paper, we have explored the implications of this new setup for economic policymaking in Europe, and reviewed the current processes for policy coordination.

The existing framework is a half-finished house at best. Its greatest vulnerability stems from the lack of an explicit recognition that EMU involves trade-offs both at the aggregate level and between aggregate and national goals of economic policy. These trade-offs require policy choices and create distributional conflicts regarding the cost of adjustment at the national level to ensure a proper functioning of the EMU as a whole.

One might argue that this lack of a more developed framework for policy coordination does not matter much in times of benign economic circumstances and that the member states will find and adopt a solution when times become more difficult in the future. But such an approach bears significant risks: Experience shows that governments want to see quick results in times of crises and that policies adopted under time pressure often turn out to be costly but hard to reverse in the long run. Ultimately, therefore, a wait-and-see attitude is not in the interest of the member states.

It is advisable, therefore, to use the current, favorable circumstances to develop a more complete framework for cooperative policymaking in the EMU. The relevant agenda includes assigning responsibilities and strengthening commitment at the national level, developing a framework for presenting and making the relevant policy choices, improving the quality and the transparency of the processes and the analysis, and developing rules for responding to shocks. Given the reluctance of the national governments to engage in that process, the European Commission should have an interest to take the initiative in this regard. One must recognize, however, that the evaluation of policy trade-offs and distributional conflicts is inherently a political task. The Commission, in its role as a guardian of the proper functioning of the EU and a promoter of further integration should call upon governments to engage in this process and its development. As a non-elected body, however, it is ultimately not in the position to make the necessary decisions itself.

VI References

- Barro, Robert F., and David B. Gordon (1983), "Rules and Discretion in a Model of Monetary Policy", *Journal of Political Economy*, 18:101-125.
- Bini Smaghi L. and Casini C. (2000), "Monetary and Fiscal Policy Co-operation: Institutions and Procedures in EMU", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38 (3): 375-391.
- Buti, Marco, and André Sapir (1998), *Economic Policy in EMU*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Calmfors, L. (1998): "Macroeconomic Policy, Wage Setting and Employment - What Difference Does the EMU Make?," *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 3:125-151.
- Collignon, Stefan (2001): Economic Policy Coordination in EMU: Institutional and Political Requirements, Paper presented at the Center for European Studies (CES), Harvard University
- Dixit, Avinash, and Lusia Lambertini (2000), "Monetary – Fiscal Policy Interactions and Commitment Versus Discretion in a Monetary Union." Working paper, Princeton University and UCLA.
- European Commission (2000), "Public Finances in EMU".
- Fisher, Jonas, and Elena Reitano (2001), "EU Budgetary Surveillance and National Budgetary Rules and Procedures: Interactions and Incentives." Paper presented at the Banca d'Italia 3rd Workshop on Public Finance, Perugia.
- Fratianni, Michael, Jürgen von Hagen, and Chris Waller (1997), "Central Banking as a Political Principal Agent Problem", *Economic Inquiry*, 35:378-94.
- Hallerberg, Mark and Jürgen von Hagen (1998), "Electorate Institutions and Budget Process" in Kiichiro Eukasaku and Ricardo Hausmann (eds.), *Democracy, Decentralisation and Deficits in Latin America*, Paris: OECD Development Center:65-94.
- Hallerberg, Mark, Rolf R. Strauch and Jürgen von Hagen (2001), "The Use and Effectiveness of Budgetary Rules and Norms in EU Member States." mimeo, ZEI University of Bonn.
- Hamada, Koichi, and Masahiro Kawai (1997), "International Economic Policy Coordination: Theory and Implications." In: Michele Fratianni, Dominick Salvatore, and Jürgen von Hagen (eds), *Macroeconomic Policies in Open Economies*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Harden, Ian, and Jürgen von Hagen (1997), "The European Constitutional Framework for Member States' Public Finances." In: Mads Adenas, Lawrence Gormley, Christos Hadjiemmanuil, and Ian Harden (eds.), *European Economic and Monetary Union: The Institutional Framework*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Law International.
- Italianer, Alexander (1997), "The Excessive Deficit Procedure: A Legal Description." In: Mads Adenas, Lawrence Gormley, Christos Hadjiemmanuil, and Ian Harden (eds.), *European Economic and Monetary Union: The Institutional Framework*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Law International.
- Italianer, Alexander (1999), "The Euro and Internal Economic Policy Coordination." *Empirica*, 26:201-16.
- Jacquet, Pierre, and Jean Pisani-Ferry (2000), "La Coordination des Politiques Economiques Dans la Zone Euro: Bilan et Propositions." In: Conseil d'Analyse economique, *Questions Europeennes*. Paris: La documentation francaise.
- Kenen Peter (1990), "The coordination of macroeconomic policies" in W.H. Branson, J.A. Frenkel, and Moris Goldstein (eds), *International Policy Coordination and Exchange Rate Fluctuations*, University of Chicago Press.

- McKibbin, Warwick J. (1997), "Empirical Evidence on International Economic Policy Coordination." In: Michele Fratianni, Dominick Salvatore, and Jürgen von Hagen (eds), *Macroeconomic Policies in Open Economies*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Milner, Helen (1997), "The Political Economy of International Policy Coordination." In: Michele Fratianni, Dominick Salvatore, and Jürgen von Hagen (eds), *Macroeconomic Policies in Open Economies*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Oates, Wallace E., and Robert M. Schwab (1988), "Economic Competition among Jurisdictions: Efficiency Enhancing or Distortion Inducing?" *Journal of Public Economics*, 35:333-54.
- OECD (1996), *OECD Employment Outlook*. Paris.
- Olson, Mancur (1965), *The Logic of Collective Action*, Harvard Economic Studies Vol CXXIV, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Padoa-Schioppa, Tommaso (1999), "Europe's New Economic Policy Constitution." In: David Currie, Alan Donnelly, Heiner Flassbeck, Ben Hall, Jean Lemierre, Tommaso Padoa-Schioppa, and Nigel Wicks, *Will EMU Lead to a European Economic Government?* London: Center for European Reform.
- Pisani-Ferry (2001), *The EMU's Economic Policy Principles: Words and Facts*. Paper presented at the ECFIN workshop 'The Early Years of EMU', European Commission, March 2001.
- Perotti, Roberto, Rolf Strauch and Jürgen von Hagen (1998), "Sustainable Public Finances", CEPR.
- Saint-Paul G. and S. Bentolila (2000), "Will EMU increase Euroscleosis?", CEPR Discussion Paper No 2423.
- Sibert, Anne, and Alan Sutherland (1997), "Monetary Regimes and Labor Market Reform." CEPR Discussion Paper No1731, London.
- Sinn, Hans-Werner (1997), "The Selection Principle and Market Failure in Systems Competition." *Journal of Public Economics*, 66:247-74.
- Von Hagen, Jürgen (1993), "Monetary Policy Coordination in the European Monetary System." In: Michele Fratianni and Dominick Salvatore (eds.), *Monetary Policy in Developed Economies*, Westport: Greenwood.
- Von Hagen, Jürgen (1997), "Monetary Policy and Institutions in the EMU." *Swedish Economic Policy Review*, 4:51-116.
- Von Hagen, Jürgen, (1999a), "Co-ordination of Economic Policies and Employment." In: Alexandre Lamfalussy, Luc D. Bernard, and Antonio Cabral (eds.), *The Euro-Zone: A New Economic Entity?*: Bruylant, Brussels.
- Von Hagen, Jürgen (1999b), "Macroeconomic Consequences of the EMU." *Empirica*, 26:359-74.
- Von Hagen, Jürgen, Andrew Hughes-Hallett, and Rolf R. Strauch (2000), "Budgetary Consolidation in EMU." Forthcoming *Economic Policy Paper*, European Commission.
- Wylosz Charles (1999) Towards a more perfect EMU, CEPR Discussion Paper 2252.

2008		
B01-08	Euro-Diplomatie durch gemeinsame „Wirtschaftsregierung“	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
2007		
B03-07	Löhne und Steuern im Systemwettbewerb der Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B02-07	Konsolidierung und Reform der Europäischen Union	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B01-07	The Ratification of European Treaties - Legal and Constitutional Basis of a European Referendum.	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
2006		
B03-06	Financial Frictions, Capital Reallocation, and Aggregate Fluctuations	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Haiping Zhang</i>
B02-06	Financial Openness and Macroeconomic Volatility	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Haiping Zhang</i>
B01-06	A Welfare Analysis of Capital Account Liberalization	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Haiping Zhang</i>
2005		
B11-05	Das Kompetenz- und Entscheidungssystem des Vertrages von Rom im Wandel seiner Funktion und Verfassung	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B10-05	Die Schutzklauseln der Beitrittsverträge	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B09-05	Measuring Tax Burdens in Europe	<i>Guntram B. Wolff</i>
B08-05	Remittances as Investment in the Absence of Altruism	<i>Gabriel González-König</i>
B07-05	Economic Integration in a Multicore World?	<i>Christian Volpe Martincus, Jennifer Pédussel Wu</i>
B06-05	Banking Sector (Under?)Development in Central and Eastern Europe	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Valeriya Dinger</i>
B05-05	Regulatory Standards Can Lead to Predation	<i>Stefan Lutz</i>
B04-05	Währungspolitik als Sozialpolitik	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B03-05	Public Education in an Integrated Europe: Studying to Migrate and Teaching to Stay?	<i>Panu Poutvaara</i>
B02-05	Voice of the Diaspora: An Analysis of Migrant Voting Behavior	<i>Jan Fidrmuc, Orla Doyle</i>
B01-05	Macroeconomic Adjustment in the New EU Member States	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Iulia Traistaru</i>
2004		
B33-04	The Effects of Transition and Political Instability On Foreign Direct Investment Inflows: Central Europe and the Balkans	<i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan, Tanner M. Yigit</i>
B32-04	The Choice of Exchange Rate Regimes in Developing Countries: A Multinomial Panel Analysis	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Jizhong Zhou</i>
B31-04	Fear of Floating and Fear of Pegging: An Empirical Analysis of De Facto Exchange Rate Regimes in Developing Countries	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Jizhong Zhou</i>
B30-04	Der Vollzug von Gemeinschaftsrecht über die Mitgliedstaaten und seine Rolle für die EU und den Beitrittsprozess	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B29-04	Deutschlands Wirtschaft, seine Schulden und die Unzulänglichkeiten der einheitlichen Geldpolitik im Eurosystem	<i>Dieter Spethmann, Otto Steiger</i>
B28-04	Fiscal Crises in U.S. Cities: Structural and Non-structural Causes	<i>Guntram B. Wolff</i>
B27-04	Firm Performance and Privatization in Ukraine	<i>Galyna Grygorenko, Stefan Lutz</i>
B26-04	Analyzing Trade Opening in Ukraine: Effects of a Customs Union with the EU	<i>Oksana Harbuzyuk, Stefan Lutz</i>
B25-04	Exchange Rate Risk and Convergence to the Euro	<i>Lucjan T. Orłowski</i>
B24-04	The Endogeneity of Money and the Eurosystem	<i>Otto Steiger</i>
B23-04	Which Lender of Last Resort for the Eurosystem?	<i>Otto Steiger</i>
B22-04	Non-Discretionary Monetary Policy: The Answer for Transition Economies?	<i>Elham-Mafi Kreft, Steven F. Kreft</i>
B21-04	The Effectiveness of Subsidies Revisited: Accounting for Wage and Employment Effects in Business R+D	<i>Volker Reinthaler, Guntram B. Wolff</i>
B20-04	Money Market Pressure and the Determinants of Banking Crises	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Tai-kuang Ho</i>
B19-04	Die Stellung der Europäischen Zentralbank nach dem Verfassungsvertrag	<i>Martin Seidel</i>

B18-04	Transmission Channels of Business Cycles Synchronization in an Enlarged EMU	<i>Iulia Traistaru</i>
B17-04	Foreign Exchange Regime, the Real Exchange Rate and Current Account Sustainability: The Case of Turkey	<i>Sübidey Togan, Hasan Ersel</i>
B16-04	Does It Matter Where Immigrants Work? Traded Goods, Non-traded Goods, and Sector Specific Employment	<i>Harry P. Bowen, Jennifer Pédussel Wu</i>
B15-04	Do Economic Integration and Fiscal Competition Help to Explain Local Patterns?	<i>Christian Volpe Martincus</i>
B14-04	Euro Adoption and Maastricht Criteria: Rules or Discretion?	<i>Jiri Jonas</i>
B13-04	The Role of Electoral and Party Systems in the Development of Fiscal Institutions in the Central and Eastern European Countries	<i>Sami Yläoutinen</i>
B12-04	Measuring and Explaining Levels of Regional Economic Integration	<i>Jennifer Pédussel Wu</i>
B11-04	Economic Integration and Location of Manufacturing Activities: Evidence from MERCOSUR	<i>Pablo Sanguinetti, Iulia Traistaru, Christian Volpe Martincus</i>
B10-04	Economic Integration and Industry Location in Transition Countries	<i>Laura Resmini</i>
B09-04	Testing Creditor Moral Hazard in Sovereign Bond Markets: A Unified Theoretical Approach and Empirical Evidence	<i>Ayse Y. Evrensel, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B08-04	European Integration, Productivity Growth and Real Convergence	<i>Taner M. Yigit, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B07-04	The Contribution of Income, Social Capital, and Institutions to Human Well-being in Africa	<i>Mina Balamoune-Lutz, Stefan H. Lutz</i>
B06-04	Rural Urban Inequality in Africa: A Panel Study of the Effects of Trade Liberalization and Financial Deepening	<i>Mina Balamoune-Lutz, Stefan H. Lutz</i>
B05-04	Money Rules for the Eurozone Candidate Countries	<i>Lucjan T. Orłowski</i>
B04-04	Who is in Favor of Enlargement? Determinants of Support for EU Membership in the Candidate Countries' Referenda	<i>Orla Doyle, Jan Fidrmuc</i>
B03-04	Over- and Underbidding in Central Bank Open Market Operations Conducted as Fixed Rate Tender	<i>Ulrich Bindseil</i>
B02-04	Total Factor Productivity and Economic Freedom Implications for EU Enlargement	<i>Ronald L. Moomaw, Euy Seok Yang</i>
B01-04	Die neuen Schutzklauseln der Artikel 38 und 39 des Beitrittsvertrages: Schutz der alten Mitgliedstaaten vor Störungen durch die neuen Mitgliedstaaten	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
2003		
B29-03	Macroeconomic Implications of Low Inflation in the Euro Area	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Boris Hofmann</i>
B28-03	The Effects of Transition and Political Instability on Foreign Direct Investment: Central Europe and the Balkans	<i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan, Taner M. Yigit</i>
B27-03	The Performance of the Euribor Futures Market: Efficiency and the Impact of ECB Policy Announcements (Electronic Version of International Finance)	<i>Kerstin Bernoth, Juergen von Hagen</i>
B26-03	Sovereign Risk Premia in the European Government Bond Market (überarbeitete Version zum Herunterladen)	<i>Kerstin Bernoth, Juergen von Hagen, Ludger Schulknecht</i>
B25-03	How Flexible are Wages in EU Accession Countries?	<i>Anna Iara, Iulia Traistaru</i>
B24-03	Monetary Policy Reaction Functions: ECB versus Bundesbank	<i>Bernd Hayo, Boris Hofmann</i>
B23-03	Economic Integration and Manufacturing Concentration Patterns: Evidence from Mercosur	<i>Iulia Traistaru, Christian Volpe Martincus</i>
B22-03	Reformzwänge innerhalb der EU angesichts der Osterweiterung	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B21-03	Reputation Flows: Contractual Disputes and the Channels for Inter-Firm Communication	<i>William Pyle</i>
B20-03	Urban Primacy, Gigantism, and International Trade: Evidence from Asia and the Americas	<i>Ronald L. Moomaw, Mohammed A. Alwosabi</i>
B19-03	An Empirical Analysis of Competing Explanations of Urban Primacy Evidence from Asia and the Americas	<i>Ronald L. Moomaw, Mohammed A. Alwosabi</i>

B18-03	The Effects of Regional and Industry-Wide FDI Spillovers on Export of Ukrainian Firms	<i>Stefan H. Lutz, Oleksandr Talavera, Sang-Min Park</i>
B17-03	Determinants of Inter-Regional Migration in the Baltic States	<i>Mihails Hazans</i>
B16-03	South-East Europe: Economic Performance, Perspectives, and Policy Challenges	<i>Iulia Traistaru, Jürgen von Hagen</i>
B15-03	Employed and Unemployed Search: The Marginal Willingness to Pay for Attributes in Lithuania, the US and the Netherlands	<i>Jos van Ommeren, Mihails Hazans</i>
B14-03	FCIs and Economic Activity: Some International Evidence	<i>Charles Goodhart, Boris Hofmann</i>
B13-03	The IS Curve and the Transmission of Monetary Policy: Is there a Puzzle?	<i>Charles Goodhart, Boris Hofmann</i>
B12-03	What Makes Regions in Eastern Europe Catching Up? The Role of Foreign Investment, Human Resources, and Geography	<i>Gabriele Tondl, Goran Vuksic</i>
B11-03	Die Weisungs- und Herrschaftsmacht der Europäischen Zentralbank im europäischen System der Zentralbanken - eine rechtliche Analyse	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B10-03	Foreign Direct Investment and Perceptions of Vulnerability to Foreign Exchange Crises: Evidence from Transition Economies	<i>Josef C. Brada, Vladimír Tomsík</i>
B09-03	The European Central Bank and the Eurosystem: An Analysis of the Missing Central Monetary Institution in European Monetary Union	<i>Gunnar Heinsohn, Otto Steiger</i>
B08-03	The Determination of Capital Controls: Which Role Do Exchange Rate Regimes Play?	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Jizhong Zhou</i>
B07-03	Nach Nizza und Stockholm: Stand des Binnenmarktes und Prioritäten für die Zukunft	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B06-03	Fiscal Discipline and Growth in Euroland. Experiences with the Stability and Growth Pact	<i>Jürgen von Hagen</i>
B05-03	Reconsidering the Evidence: Are Eurozone Business Cycles Converging?	<i>Michael Massmann, James Mitchell</i>
B04-03	Do Ukrainian Firms Benefit from FDI?	<i>Stefan H. Lutz, Oleksandr Talavera</i>
B03-03	Europäische Steuerkoordination und die Schweiz	<i>Stefan H. Lutz</i>
B02-03	Commuting in the Baltic States: Patterns, Determinants, and Gains	<i>Mihails Hazans</i>
B01-03	Die Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion im rechtlichen und politischen Gefüge der Europäischen Union	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
2002		
B30-02	An Adverse Selection Model of Optimal Unemployment Assurance	<i>Marcus Hagedorn, Ashok Kaul, Tim Mennel</i>
B29B-02	Trade Agreements as Self-protection	<i>Jennifer Pédussel Wu</i>
B29A-02	Growth and Business Cycles with Imperfect Credit Markets	<i>Debajyoti Chakrabarty</i>
B28-02	Inequality, Politics and Economic Growth	<i>Debajyoti Chakrabarty</i>
B27-02	Poverty Traps and Growth in a Model of Endogenous Time Preference	<i>Debajyoti Chakrabarty</i>
B26-02	Monetary Convergence and Risk Premiums in the EU Candidate Countries	<i>Lucjan T. Orlowski</i>
B25-02	Trade Policy: Institutional Vs. Economic Factors	<i>Stefan Lutz</i>
B24-02	The Effects of Quotas on Vertical Intra-industry Trade	<i>Stefan Lutz</i>
B23-02	Legal Aspects of European Economic and Monetary Union	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B22-02	Der Staat als Lender of Last Resort - oder: Die Achillesverse des Eurosystems	<i>Otto Steiger</i>
B21-02	Nominal and Real Stochastic Convergence Within the Transition Economies and to the European Union: Evidence from Panel Data	<i>Ali M. Kutan, Taner M. Yigit</i>
B20-02	The Impact of News, Oil Prices, and International Spillovers on Russian Financial Markets	<i>Bernd Hayo, Ali M. Kutan</i>

B19-02	East Germany: Transition with Unification, Experiments and Experiences	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Rolf R. Strauch, Guntram B. Wolff</i>
B18-02	Regional Specialization and Employment Dynamics in Transition Countries	<i>Iulia Traistaru, Guntram B. Wolff</i>
B17-02	Specialization and Growth Patterns in Border Regions of Accession Countries	<i>Laura Resmini</i>
B16-02	Regional Specialization and Concentration of Industrial Activity in Accession Countries	<i>Iulia Traistaru, Peter Nijkamp, Simonetta Longhi</i>
B15-02	Does Broad Money Matter for Interest Rate Policy?	<i>Matthias Brückner, Andreas Schaber</i>
B14-02	The Long and Short of It: Global Liberalization, Poverty and Inequality	<i>Christian E. Weller, Adam Hersch</i>
B13-02	De Facto and Official Exchange Rate Regimes in Transition Economies	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Jizhong Zhou</i>
B12-02	Argentina: The Anatomy of A Crisis	<i>Jiri Jonas</i>
B11-02	The Eurosystem and the Art of Central Banking	<i>Gunnar Heinsohn, Otto Steiger</i>
B10-02	National Origins of European Law: Towards an Autonomous System of European Law?	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B09-02	Monetary Policy in the Euro Area - Lessons from the First Years	<i>Volker Clausen, Bernd Hayo</i>
B08-02	Has the Link Between the Spot and Forward Exchange Rates Broken Down? Evidence From Rolling Cointegration Tests	<i>Ali M. Kutan, Su Zhou</i>
B07-02	Perspektiven der Erweiterung der Europäischen Union	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B06-02	Is There Asymmetry in Forward Exchange Rate Bias? Multi-Country Evidence	<i>Su Zhou, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B05-02	Real and Monetary Convergence Within the European Union and Between the European Union and Candidate Countries: A Rolling Cointegration Approach	<i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan, Su Zhou</i>
B04-02	Asymmetric Monetary Policy Effects in EMU	<i>Volker Clausen, Bernd Hayo</i>
B03-02	The Choice of Exchange Rate Regimes: An Empirical Analysis for Transition Economies	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Jizhong Zhou</i>
B02-02	The Euro System and the Federal Reserve System Compared: Facts and Challenges	<i>Karlheinz Ruckriegel, Franz Seitz</i>
B01-02	Does Inflation Targeting Matter?	<i>Manfred J. M. Neumann, Jürgen von Hagen</i>
2001		
B29-01	Is Kazakhstan Vulnerable to the Dutch Disease?	<i>Karlygash Kuralbayeva, Ali M. Kutan, Michael L. Wyzan</i>
B28-01	Political Economy of the Nice Treaty: Rebalancing the EU Council. The Future of European Agricultural Policies	<i>Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum</i>
B27-01	Investor Panic, IMF Actions, and Emerging Stock Market Returns and Volatility: A Panel Investigation	<i>Bernd Hayo, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B26-01	Regional Effects of Terrorism on Tourism: Evidence from Three Mediterranean Countries	<i>Konstantinos Drakos, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B25-01	Monetary Convergence of the EU Candidates to the Euro: A Theoretical Framework and Policy Implications	<i>Lucjan T. Orłowski</i>
B24-01	Disintegration and Trade	<i>Jarko and Jan Fidrmuc</i>
B23-01	Migration and Adjustment to Shocks in Transition Economies	<i>Jan Fidrmuc</i>
B22-01	Strategic Delegation and International Capital Taxation	<i>Matthias Brückner</i>
B21-01	Balkan and Mediterranean Candidates for European Union Membership: The Convergence of Their Monetary Policy With That of the European Central Bank	<i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B20-01	An Empirical Inquiry of the Efficiency of Intergovernmental Transfers for Water Projects Based on the WRDA Data	<i>Anna Rubinchik-Pessach</i>
B19-01	Detrending and the Money-Output Link: International Evidence	<i>R.W. Hafer, Ali M. Kutan</i>

B18-01	Monetary Policy in Unknown Territory. The European Central Bank in the Early Years	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Matthias Brückner</i>
B17-01	Executive Authority, the Personal Vote, and Budget Discipline in Latin American and Caribbean Countries	<i>Mark Hallerberg, Patrick Marier</i>
B16-01	Sources of Inflation and Output Fluctuations in Poland and Hungary: Implications for Full Membership in the European Union	<i>Selahattin Dibooglu, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B15-01	Programs Without Alternative: Public Pensions in the OECD	<i>Christian E. Weller</i>
B14-01	Formal Fiscal Restraints and Budget Processes As Solutions to a Deficit and Spending Bias in Public Finances - U.S. Experience and Possible Lessons for EMU	<i>Rolf R. Strauch, Jürgen von Hagen</i>
B13-01	German Public Finances: Recent Experiences and Future Challenges	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Rolf R. Strauch</i>
B12-01	The Impact of Eastern Enlargement On EU-Labour Markets. Pensions Reform Between Economic and Political Problems	<i>Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum</i>
B11-01	Inflationary Performance in a Monetary Union With Large Wage Setters	<i>Lilia Cavallar</i>
B10-01	Integration of the Baltic States into the EU and Institutions of Fiscal Convergence: A Critical Evaluation of Key Issues and Empirical Evidence	<i>Ali M. Kutan, Niina Pautola-Mol</i>
B09-01	Democracy in Transition Economies: Grease or Sand in the Wheels of Growth?	<i>Jan Fidrmuc</i>
B08-01	The Functioning of Economic Policy Coordination	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Susanne Mundschenk</i>
B07-01	The Convergence of Monetary Policy Between Candidate Countries and the European Union	<i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B06-01	Opposites Attract: The Case of Greek and Turkish Financial Markets	<i>Konstantinos Drakos, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B05-01	Trade Rules and Global Governance: A Long Term Agenda. The Future of Banking.	<i>Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum</i>
B04-01	The Determination of Unemployment Benefits	<i>Rafael di Tella, Robert J. McCulloch</i>
B03-01	Preferences Over Inflation and Unemployment: Evidence from Surveys of Happiness	<i>Rafael di Tella, Robert J. McCulloch, Andrew J. Oswald</i>
B02-01	The Konstanz Seminar on Monetary Theory and Policy at Thirty	<i>Michele Fratianni, Jürgen von Hagen</i>
B01-01	Divided Boards: Partisanship Through Delegated Monetary Policy	<i>Etienne Farvaque, Gael Lagadec</i>
2000		
B20-00	Breakin-up a Nation, From the Inside	<i>Etienne Farvaque</i>
B19-00	Income Dynamics and Stability in the Transition Process, general Reflections applied to the Czech Republic	<i>Jens Hölscher</i>
B18-00	Budget Processes: Theory and Experimental Evidence	<i>Karl-Martin Ehrhart, Roy Gardner, Jürgen von Hagen, Claudia Keser</i>
B17-00	Rückführung der Landwirtschaftspolitik in die Verantwortung der Mitgliedsstaaten? - Rechts- und Verfassungsfragen des Gemeinschaftsrechts	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B16-00	The European Central Bank: Independence and Accountability	<i>Christa Randzio-Plath, Tomasso Padoa-Schioppa</i>
B15-00	Regional Risk Sharing and Redistribution in the German Federation	<i>Jürgen von Hagen, Ralf Hepp</i>
B14-00	Sources of Real Exchange Rate Fluctuations in Transition Economies: The Case of Poland and Hungary	<i>Selahattin Dibooglu, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B13-00	Back to the Future: The Growth Prospects of Transition Economies Reconsidered	<i>Nauro F. Campos</i>

B12-00	Rechtsetzung und Rechtsangleichung als Folge der Einheitlichen Europäischen Wahrung	<i>Martin Seidel</i>
B11-00	A Dynamic Approach to Inflation Targeting in Transition Economies	<i>Lucjan T. Orlowski</i>
B10-00	The Importance of Domestic Political Institutions: Why and How Belgium Qualified for EMU	<i>Marc Hallerberg</i>
B09-00	Rational Institutions Yield Hysteresis	<i>Rafael Di Tella, Robert MacCulloch</i>
B08-00	The Effectiveness of Self-Protection Policies for Safeguarding Emerging Market Economies from Crises	<i>Kenneth Kletzer</i>
B07-00	Financial Supervision and Policy Coordination in The EMU	<i>Deutsch-Franzosisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum</i>
B06-00	The Demand for Money in Austria	<i>Bernd Hayo</i>
B05-00	Liberalization, Democracy and Economic Performance during Transition	<i>Jan Fidrmuc</i>
B04-00	A New Political Culture in The EU - Democratic Accountability of the ECB	<i>Christa Randzio-Plath</i>
B03-00	Integration, Disintegration and Trade in Europe: Evolution of Trade Relations during the 1990's	<i>Jarko Fidrmuc, Jan Fidrmuc</i>
B02-00	Inflation Bias and Productivity Shocks in Transition Economies: The Case of the Czech Republic	<i>Josef C. Brada, Arthur E. King, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B01-00	Monetary Union and Fiscal Federalism	<i>Kenneth Kletzer, Jurgen von Hagen</i>
1999		
B26-99	Skills, Labour Costs, and Vertically Differentiated Industries: A General Equilibrium Analysis	<i>Stefan Lutz, Alessandro Turrini</i>
B25-99	Micro and Macro Determinants of Public Support for Market Reforms in Eastern Europe	<i>Bernd Hayo</i>
B24-99	What Makes a Revolution?	<i>Robert MacCulloch</i>
B23-99	Informal Family Insurance and the Design of the Welfare State	<i>Rafael Di Tella, Robert MacCulloch</i>
B22-99	Partisan Social Happiness	<i>Rafael Di Tella, Robert MacCulloch</i>
B21-99	The End of Moderate Inflation in Three Transition Economies?	<i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan</i>
B20-99	Subnational Government Bailouts in Germany	<i>Helmut Seitz</i>
B19-99	The Evolution of Monetary Policy in Transition Economies	<i>Ali M. Kutan, Josef C. Brada</i>
B18-99	Why are Eastern Europe's Banks not failing when everybody else's are?	<i>Christian E. Weller, Bernard Morzuch</i>
B17-99	Stability of Monetary Unions: Lessons from the Break-Up of Czechoslovakia	<i>Jan Fidrmuc, Julius Horvath and Jarko Fidrmuc</i>
B16-99	Multinational Banks and Development Finance	<i>Christian E. Weller and Mark J. Scher</i>
B15-99	Financial Crises after Financial Liberalization: Exceptional Circumstances or Structural Weakness?	<i>Christian E. Weller</i>
B14-99	Industry Effects of Monetary Policy in Germany	<i>Bernd Hayo and Birgit Uhlenbrock</i>
B13-99	Financial Fragility or What Went Right and What Could Go Wrong in Central European Banking?	<i>Christian E. Weller and Jurgen von Hagen</i>
B12-99	Size Distortions of Tests of the Null Hypothesis of Stationarity: Evidence and Implications for Applied Work	<i>Mehmet Caner and Lutz Kilian</i>
B11-99	Financial Supervision and Policy Coordination in the EMU	<i>Deutsch-Franzosisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum</i>
B10-99	Financial Liberalization, Multinational Banks and Credit Supply: The Case of Poland	<i>Christian Weller</i>
B09-99	Monetary Policy, Parameter Uncertainty and Optimal Learning	<i>Volker Wieland</i>
B08-99	The Connection between more Multinational Banks and less Real Credit in Transition Economies	<i>Christian Weller</i>

- B07-99 **Comovement and Catch-up in Productivity across Sectors: Evidence from the OECD** *Christopher M. Cornwell and Jens-Uwe Wächter*
- B06-99 **Productivity Convergence and Economic Growth: A Frontier Production Function Approach** *Christopher M. Cornwell and Jens-Uwe Wächter*
- B05-99 **Tumbling Giant: Germany's Experience with the Maastricht Fiscal Criteria** *Jürgen von Hagen and Rolf Strauch*
- B04-99 **The Finance-Investment Link in a Transition Economy: Evidence for Poland from Panel Data** *Christian Weller*
- B03-99 **The Macroeconomics of Happiness** *Rafael Di Tella, Robert McCulloch and Andrew J. Oswald*
- B02-99 **The Consequences of Labour Market Flexibility: Panel Evidence Based on Survey Data** *Rafael Di Tella and Robert McCulloch*
- B01-99 **The Excess Volatility of Foreign Exchange Rates: Statistical Puzzle or Theoretical Artifact?** *Robert B.H. Hauswald*
- 1998**
- B16-98 **Labour Market + Tax Policy in the EMU** *Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum*
- B15-98 **Can Taxing Foreign Competition Harm the Domestic Industry?** *Stefan Lutz*
- B14-98 **Free Trade and Arms Races: Some Thoughts Regarding EU-Russian Trade** *Rafael Reuveny and John Maxwell*
- B13-98 **Fiscal Policy and Intranational Risk-Sharing** *Jürgen von Hagen*
- B12-98 **Price Stability and Monetary Policy Effectiveness when Nominal Interest Rates are Bounded at Zero** *Athanasios Orphanides and Volker Wieland*
- B11A-98 **Die Bewertung der "dauerhaft tragbaren öffentlichen Finanzlage" der EU Mitgliedstaaten beim Übergang zur dritten Stufe der EWWU** *Rolf Strauch*
- B11-98 **Exchange Rate Regimes in the Transition Economies: Case Study of the Czech Republic: 1990-1997** *Julius Horvath and Jiri Jonas*
- B10-98 **Der Wettbewerb der Rechts- und politischen Systeme in der Europäischen Union** *Martin Seidel*
- B09-98 **U.S. Monetary Policy and Monetary Policy and the ESCB** *Robert L. Hetzel*
- B08-98 **Money-Output Granger Causality Revisited: An Empirical Analysis of EU Countries (überarbeitete Version zum Herunterladen)** *Bernd Hayo*
- B07-98 **Designing Voluntary Environmental Agreements in Europe: Some Lessons from the U.S. EPA's 33/50 Program** *John W. Maxwell*
- B06-98 **Monetary Union, Asymmetric Productivity Shocks and Fiscal Insurance: an Analytical Discussion of Welfare Issues** *Kenneth Kletzer*
- B05-98 **Estimating a European Demand for Money (überarbeitete Version zum Herunterladen)** *Bernd Hayo*
- B04-98 **The EMU's Exchange Rate Policy** *Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum*
- B03-98 **Central Bank Policy in a More Perfect Financial System** *Jürgen von Hagen / Ingo Fender*
- B02-98 **Trade with Low-Wage Countries and Wage Inequality** *Jaleel Ahmad*
- B01-98 **Budgeting Institutions for Aggregate Fiscal Discipline** *Jürgen von Hagen*
- 1997**
- B04-97 **Macroeconomic Stabilization with a Common Currency: Does European Monetary Unification Create a Need for Fiscal Insurance or Federalism?** *Kenneth Kletzer*
- B-03-97 **Liberalising European Markets for Energy and Telecommunications: Some Lessons from the US Electric Utility Industry** *Tom Lyon / John Mayo*
- B02-97 **Employment and EMU** *Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum*
- B01-97 **A Stability Pact for Europe** *(a Forum organized by ZEI)*

ISSN 1436 - 6053

Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung
Center for European Integration Studies
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

Walter-Flex-Strasse 3
D-53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49-228-73-1732
Fax: +49-228-73-1809
www.zei.de