

Rausch, Sebastian; Rutherford, Thomas F.

Working Paper

Computation of Equilibria in OLG Models with Many Heterogeneous Households

Ruhr Economic Papers, No. 15

Provided in Cooperation with:

RWI – Leibniz-Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, Essen

Suggested Citation: Rausch, Sebastian; Rutherford, Thomas F. (2007) : Computation of Equilibria in OLG Models with Many Heterogeneous Households, Ruhr Economic Papers, No. 15, ISBN 978-3-86788-009-1, Rheinisch-Westfälisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (RWI), Essen

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/26780>

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.

Sebastian Rausch and Thomas F. Rutherford

Computation of Equilibria in OLG Models with Many Heterogeneous Households

#15



UNIVERSITÄT
DUISBURG
ESSEN

Ruhr Economic Papers

Published by

Ruhr-Universität Bochum (RUB), Department of Economics
Universitätsstraße 150, 44801 Bochum, Germany

Universität Dortmund, Department of Economic and Social Sciences
Vogelpothsweg 87, 44227 Dortmund, Germany

Universität Duisburg-Essen, Department of Economics
Universitätsstraße 12, 45117 Essen, Germany

Rheinisch-Westfälisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (RWI Essen)
Hohenzollernstrasse 1/3, 45128 Essen, Germany

Editors:

Prof. Dr. Justus Haucap
RUB, Department of Economics
Competition Policy and Industrial Economics
Phone: +49 (0) 234/32 253 36, e-mail: justus.haucap@rub.de

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Leininger
University of Dortmund, Department of Economic and Social Sciences
Economics – Microeconomics
Phone: +49 (0) 231 /7 55-32 97, email: W.Leininger@wiso.uni-dortmund.de

Prof. Dr. Volker Clausen
University of Duisburg-Essen, Department of Economics
International Economics
Phone: +49 (0) 201/1 83-36 55, e-mail: vclausen@vwl.uni-due.de

Prof. Dr. Christoph M. Schmidt
RWI Essen
Phone: +49 (0) 201/81 49-227, e-mail: schmidt@rwi-essen.de

Editorial Office:

Joachim Schmidt
RWI Essen, Phone: +49 (0) 201/81 49-292, e-mail: schmidtj@rwi-essen.de

Ruhr Economic Papers #15

Responsible Editor: Volker Clausen

All rights reserved. Bochum, Dortmund, Duisburg, Essen, Germany, 2007
ISSN 1864-4872 (online) – ISBN 978-3-86788-009-1

The working papers published in the Series constitute work in progress circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comments. Views expressed represent exclusively the authors' own opinions and do not necessarily reflect those of the editors.

Ruhr Economic Papers

#15

Sebastian Rausch and Thomas F. Rutherford

Computation of Equilibria in OLG Models with Many Heterogeneous Households



Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

ISSN 1864-4872 (online)
ISBN 978-3-86788-009-1

Sebastian Rausch and Thomas F. Rutherford*

Computation of Equilibria in OLG Models with Many Heterogeneous Households

Abstract

This paper develops a decomposition algorithm by which a market economy with many households may be solved through the computation of equilibria for a sequence of representative agent economies. The paper examines local and global convergence properties of the sequential recalibration (SR) algorithm. SR is then demonstrated to efficiently solve Auerbach-Kotlikoff OLG models with a large number of heterogeneous households. We approximate equilibria in OLG models by solving a sequence of related Ramsey optimal growth problems. This approach can provide improvements in both efficiency and robustness as compared with simultaneous solution-methods.

JEL Classification: C68, C81, D61, D91

Keywords: Computable general equilibrium, overlapping generations, micro-simulation, sequential recalibration

June 2007

*Sebastian Rausch, Ruhr Graduate School in Economics and University of Duisburg-Essen; Thomas F. Rutherford, Ann Arbor, MI, U.S.A. – Without implication, we would like to thank Volker Clausen for helpful comments and discussion. Financial support by the Alfried Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach Foundation and the Ruhr Graduate School in Economics is gratefully acknowledged. – All correspondence to: Sebastian Rausch, Department of Economics, University of Duisburg-Essen, Universitaetsstr. 12, 45117 Essen, Germany, e-mail: rausch@vwl.uni-due.de.

1 Introduction

Over the past twenty years infinite horizon general equilibrium models with overlapping generations (OLG) have become an important tool for policy analysis, and these have been fruitfully applied in fields such as macroeconomics or public finance (see, e.g., [Auerbach and Kotlikoff \[1987\]](#), and [Kotlikoff \[2000\]](#) for an overview). OLG models naturally involve a large number of variables and equations that describe the equilibrium behavior of economic agents. As a consequence, the development of large-scale OLG models is often limited by the computational capacity of available numerical solution methods. In particular, models that exhibit a rich household side including a variety of household-specific effects, a large number of heterogeneous households, and realistic agent lifetimes typically require “customized solution methods” which may be both costly to implement and difficult to validate.

In this paper we develop a decomposition algorithm based on “off the shelf numerical tools”¹ for solving general equilibrium models with many households, of which OLG models are a special case. Our approach is primarily appropriate for computing equilibria in models in which the number of agents is so large that simultaneous solution methods that operate directly on the equilibrium system of equations are infeasible due to the high dimensionality related to income and household-specific effects. The “sequential recalibration” (SR) algorithm presented here is based on the solution of a sequence of nonlinear complementarity problems², although in special cases the same procedure may be implemented by solving a sequence of convex nonlinear programming problems. The main idea of our decomposition approach is to solve a market economy with many households through the computation for equilibria for a sequence of representative agent economies. Typically, the sequence of prices and quantities converges to the true equilibrium allocation.

The close connection between the allocation of a competitive market economy and the optimal solution to a representative agent’s planning problem is well known and widely cited in the economic literature. The use of an optimization problem to characterize equilibrium allocations in a general equilibrium framework goes back to [Negishi \[1960\]](#). Negishi’s original paper was primarily concerned with optimization as a means of proving existence. [Dixon \[1975\]](#) developed

¹ GAMS code for our applications is available online at <http://mpsge.org>.

² [Rutherford \[1995b\]](#) and [Mathiesen \[1985\]](#) have shown that a complementary-based approach is convenient, robust, and efficient. A characteristic of many economic models is that they can be cast as a complementary problem. The complementarity format embodies weak inequalities and complementary slackness, relevant features for models that contain bounds on specific variables, e.g. activity levels which cannot a priori be assumed to operate at positive intensity. Such features are not easily handled with alternative solution methods.

the theory and computational effectiveness of “joint maximization algorithms” for multi-country trade models. Rutherford [1999] presented the “sequential joint maximization algorithm” (SJM) which provides a simple recursive version of Negishi’s method. There are similarities between the SR and SJM algorithms. Both approaches solve subproblems representing relaxations of the equilibrium conditions. The SJM algorithm ignores consumer budget constraints but retains details of consumer demand systems. The SR algorithm employs a yet looser representation of individual consumer’s demand systems by omitting both income constraints and global properties of the individual utility functions. The omission of global characteristics of preferences simplifies the model but can hinder convergence. The appropriateness of our proposed solution method therefore depends on the characteristics of the underlying model.

Our decomposition approach can be useful for the computation of equilibria in large-scale general equilibrium models with many households. There are many economic questions for which heterogeneous agent models have to be used to provide answers, and an increasing amount of research employs frameworks that allow for intra-cohort heterogeneity in an OLG setup.³ We believe that our approach can be beneficial for a wide range of economic applications, in particular within the class of OLG models, due to the following reasons. First, by significantly reducing the computational overhead of the numerical problem at hand our method facilitates the development of OLG models which feature a complex and rich household side. This strengthens the microfoundation of the models in general and allows to analyze in detail intra- and intergenerational distributive consequences of economic policy. Second, our approach enables to solve OLG models that include a “realistic” number of households within each age group in the sense that the number of households in the model (more closely) corresponds to the number of observational units available from household survey data. This avoids relying on some ad-hoc aggregation of household groups, and thereby helps to enhance the empirical basis of the model. Third, and more generally, our method can also be effectively applied to OLG models which display a high dimensionality that stems from sources other than the household side. Potential applications may here include multi-sectoral and multi-country models, or models which incorporate a detailed government sector.

³ For instance, Conesa and Krueger [1999], Kotlikoff, Smetters, and Walliser [1999], and Huggett and Ventura [1999] investigate the intra-cohort distributive and welfare consequences of social security reform. Fehr [2000] looks at pension reform during the demographic transition in the case of Germany. Ventura [1999] explores the general equilibrium impact and associated distributional consequences of a revenue neutral tax reform, and Jensen and Rutherford [2002] analyze the intra- and intergenerational welfare effects of fiscal consolidation via debt reduction. This paper concentrates on applications within the Auerbach-Kotlikoff OLG framework. For a general discussion of economies with heterogeneous agents, see, e.g., Rios-Rull [1995].

In addition, our contribution adds to the recent and growing body of research that deals with the integration of macro and microsimulation models, the “micro-macro” approach to modeling [Bourguignon and Spadaro, 2006]. This strand of literature aims to combine the strengths of both the computable general equilibrium (CGE) paradigm and microsimulation models. While CGE models have become standard tools of quantitative policy assessment over the last twenty years, one major critique is their reliance on the concept of the “representative agent” and their usage of unclear aggregation procedures. The virtue of the microsimulation approach, on the other hand, is to replace representative agents with “real households” as observed in standard household surveys. This, however, is typically achieved at the cost of ignoring general equilibrium effects that are essential for policy analysis. The simplest link between economy-wide modeling and the microsimulation approach proceeds top down, i.e. simulated policy changes obtained from an aggregate representation of the economy are passed down to a microsimulation module, as, e.g., in Bourguignon, Robilliard, and Robinson [2005] and Bourguignon and Spadaro [2006]. The principal weakness of the top down approach is of course the absence of feedback effects from the micro to the macro level. Relatively few studies have attempted to fully integrate both approaches, most of them by means of employing an iterative strategy between the microsimulation and the CGE model (Cockburn and Cororotona [2007], Savard [2003, 2005], Arntz et al. [2006]). Also belonging to this class of models, Rutherford, Tarr, and Shepotylo [2005] applied the SR algorithm to a large-scale, static general equilibrium model with 25 sectors and 53,000 households to assess the poverty effects of Russia’s WTO accession. All of these studies, however, are concerned with applications in a static framework. Clearly, covering complex behavioral responses and potential general equilibrium and macroeconomic effects in a *dynamic* setup is essential for many policy issues.⁴

The present paper develops a computational technique that allows to fully integrate a comprehensive system of OLG households, that exhibits a substantial degree of intra-cohort heterogeneity, into a generic Auerbach-Kotlikoff model. We show that the positive experience of the SR algorithm for large-scale static models carries over to dynamic applications and demonstrate its effectiveness for solving OLG models with a large number of heterogeneous households. To find the equilibrium transition path of the OLG economy, our algorithm solves a sequence of “related” Ramsey optimal growth problems where the system of overlapping generations is replaced by an

⁴ Available models tend to concentrate on some specific behavior, abstracting from other important components of the demo-economic life cycle. For instance, Townsend [2002], Townsend and Ueda [2003] concentrate on saving/investment behavior under uncertainty and in different financial market environments.

infinitely-lived representative agent. We employ an iterative procedure between the macro and micro model that is based on the successive recalibration of preferences of the artificial representative agent.

In order to characterize limitations of the algorithm, we develop local convergence theory for a simple exchange economy due to Scarf [1960], and carry out numerical analyses to examine global conditions under which the SR algorithm may fail to converge. We show that conditions for local stability of our adjustment process reduce to those of a Walrasian price tâtonnement process, thus SR belongs to a large class of algorithms commonly used in computational economics which are robust, efficient and yet fail to provide global convergence. Our counterexample illustrates that the SR algorithm may be ill-suited for applications in which there are significant income effects.

After having characterized limitations of the technique, we proceed to explore the algorithm's performance applied to large-scale OLG models. We consider a prototype Auerbach-Kotlikoff model which includes up to 2000 heterogeneous households *within* each generation which differ with respect to labor productivity over the life cycle and other behavioral parameters. We compare the performance of the SR algorithm with simultaneous solution methods as suggested by Rasmussen and Rutherford [2004]. We find that SR can provide improvements in both efficiency and robustness. We demonstrate that the decomposition algorithm can routinely solve high-dimensional OLG models which are infeasible for conventional solution methods. One theoretical drawback of our method is that it fails to approximate equilibria in OLG economies that are generically Pareto-inferior.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the SR algorithm for the case of a static economy and illustrates its basic logic by means of graphical analysis. Section 3 investigates a model where convergence of the SR algorithm fails if income effects are relatively strong. Section 4 demonstrates that our algorithm can be effectively applied to solve Auerbach-Kotlikoff OLG models. A central issue here is to demonstrate how the behavior of the overlapping generations households with finite lifetimes can be portrayed using a single infinitely-lived representative agent. Furthermore, we compare the performance of our algorithm with computational experience from conventional simultaneous solution methods. Section 5 concludes.

2 CGE with many households: a decomposition approach

This section presents our decomposition method by which a market economy with many heterogeneous households may be solved through the computation for equilibria for a sequence of representative agent economies. While the primary interest is in dynamic models, it is advantageous

to introduce the algorithm for the case of a two-sector static economy in which we can provide a graphical description that serves to illustrate its basic logic.

2.1 A static economy

Consider the following static economy which is populated by a large number of heterogeneous households $h = 1, \dots, H$ each of whom is endowed with K^h and L^h units of capital and labor, respectively. Households earn income $M^h = rK^h + wL^h$ from supplying their factor endowments inelastically at respective market prices r and w . Household $h = 1, \dots, H$ solve:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{c_1^h, c_2^h} U^h(\mathbf{c}^h) &= \left[\sum_{i=1}^2 \theta_i^h \left(\frac{c_i^h}{\bar{c}_i^h} \right)^{\rho^h} \right]^{1/\rho^h} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^2 p_i c_i^h &= M^h. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the utility function is written in calibrated share form.⁵ θ_i^h and \bar{c}_i^h denote the benchmark value share and the benchmark consumption of good i for household h . Households are heterogeneous with respect to θ_i^h , ρ^h , K^h , and L^h .

Furthermore, there is a single representative firm which uses capital and labor services to produce two consumption goods X_i , $i, j = 1, 2$, according to a constant returns to scale production function $X_i = f_i(K, L)$. All goods and factor markets are perfectly competitive.

2.2 A decomposition algorithm

The main challenge for computing equilibria in a setup where H is very large is dimensionality. Typically, conventional simultaneous solution methods that operate directly on the equilibrium system of equations are infeasible. Our proposed algorithm decomposes the corresponding numerical problem into two parts and thereby effectively manages to reduce its dimensionality. We approximate the general equilibrium of the underlying economic model by computing equilibria for a sequence of representative agent economies. In each iteration, we first solve a general equilibrium representation of the underlying economic model in which the household side is replaced by a single representative agent (RA). The second subproblem then consists of solving a partial equilibrium relaxation of the original model that retains the full structure of the household demand

⁵ The appendix briefly reviews some fundamental aspects of calibration which underly most CGE models and which play an important role in our algorithm.

system. Given equilibrium prices from the previous solution of the RA economy, we compute optimal choices for each of the “real” households. In a next step, and to create a basis for successive iterations, the preferences of the “artificial” RA are recalibrated such that *given candidate equilibrium prices* the RA choices replicate aggregate household choices.

The key departure from the routine use of calibration in our algorithm is the idea that the calibration of preferences occurs more than once. The first iteration of the algorithm is based on observable benchmark data, but in subsequent iterations the preferences of the RA are sequentially recalibrated to values determined in the iterative process. For the case of the static economy as described above, the SR algorithm involves the following steps:

Step 0: Initialize the representative agent economy

In the computation of equilibria we will portray the choices of H households using a single representative agent. To construct an RA economy of the underlying economic model, replace (1) by:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{C_1, C_2} U^k(\mathbf{C}) &= \left[\sum_{i=1}^2 \Theta_i^k \left(\frac{C_i}{\bar{C}_i^k} \right)^\rho \right]^{1/\rho} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^2 p_i C_i &= w \sum_{h=1}^H L^h + r \sum_{h=1}^H K^h \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where k is an iteration index. Factor endowments of the RA equal the sum of respective factor endowments across all households. To initialize the RA economy at a consistent data point, we have constructed the data set such that the RA model and the household model share the same optimal consumption quantities in the initial benchmark. This is achieved by setting:

$$\bar{C}_i^0 = \sum_{h=1}^H \bar{c}_i^h \quad (3)$$

$$\Theta_i^0 = \frac{\bar{p}_i \bar{C}_i^0}{\sum_{i'} \bar{p}_{i'} \bar{C}_{i'}^0}, \quad i \neq i' \quad (4)$$

where \bar{C}_i^0 and Θ_i^0 denote initial consumption by the RA and the aggregate value share for good i in iteration $k = 0$, respectively.

This initial consumption point of the RA in the benchmark equilibrium is represented by point A in Figure 1 where initial goods prices are denoted by P^0 . Benchmark prices and an arbitrary elasticity are used to extrapolate preferences in the neighborhood of the benchmark point to the global




FIGURE 1: SOLUTION TO THE INITIAL REPRESENTATIVE AGENT MODEL (STEP 0 AND STEP 1)

preferences of the RA, as indicated by the indifference curve which is tangent to the benchmark budget constraint at point A. The key limitation of the RA model on the demand side is that the “community indifference curve” represented by this indifference curve does not truthfully portray the response of household demand to a comprehensive change in both goods and factor prices.

Step 1: Solve for a general equilibrium of the RA economy

We illustrate the solution to the RA model in the first iteration of our algorithm in Figure 1. As depicted here, the assumed exogenous policy shock has led to an increase in factor earnings, and a reduction in the relative price of X_1 as compared with X_2 . This new price situation is denoted by P^1 . The RA model, based on the assumed community indifference curve and the associated change in factor and commodity prices returns point B as the optimal consumption point.

Step 2: Evaluate household demand functions

In our solution program we read equilibrium prices from the RA model and evaluate the household demand vector. This produces a different point on the same budget constraint (see Figure 2). The household demand model is based on compensated demand functions so the aggregate budget constraint for the household demand system is equivalent to the budget constraint which applies to the RA. Point C corresponds to the aggregate demand which results from solving the individual household optimization problems. The extent to which C differs from B depends on both the difference in implicit substitution elasticities and differences in income effects.




FIGURE 2: EVALUATING HOUSEHOLD DEMANDS AT NEW PRICES (STEP 2)

Step 3: Recalibrate preferences of the representative agent

The next step in the algorithm consists of specifying a different set of preferences for the RA model. The algorithm is termed “sequential recalibration” on the basis of this idea. After having solved one RA model we construct a new RA model based on a set of preferences which are locally calibrated to the aggregate consumption quantities at point C and the associated relative prices. This ensures that given prices P^1 the optimal consumption point of the new RA, point C in Figure 3, is consistent with the aggregated choices by households. Preferences of the RA in iteration k , $U^k(\mathbf{C})$ in (2), are based on household demands at the prices returned in iteration $k - 1$:

$$\bar{C}_i^k = \sum_h c_i^h(\mathbf{p}^{k-1}, M_h^{k-1}) \quad (5)$$

in which $c_i^h(\mathbf{p}^{k-1})$ is the demand for good i by household h evaluated at the candidate price vector from the previous iteration $k - 1$, and where factor income of household h in iteration k , $M_h^k(\mathbf{p}^k)$, is a function of prices in iteration k . Likewise, value shares in $U^k(\mathbf{C})$ are updated to:

$$\Theta_i^k = \frac{p_i^{k-1} \sum_h c_i^h(\mathbf{p}^{k-1}, M_h^{k-1})}{\sum_j p_j^{k-1} \sum_h c_j^h(\mathbf{p}^{k-1}, M_h^{k-1})} \quad (6)$$

where θ_i^k is the aggregate value share of good i at iteration $k - 1$. The indifference curves tangent at A and B are based on identical preferences, but the indifference curve tangent at point C is based on a new set of community indifference curves, hence it may intersect the indifference curves based on RA utility in the previous iteration of the algorithm. Note that the preferences of the “real” households remain unchanged throughout the entire iteration process..




FIGURE 3: RECALIBRATION OF PREFERENCES (STEP 3)

Iterative adjustment

When the RA model is recalibrated at point C, both the representative agent and all households are in equilibrium at C with prices P^1 , but at these prices firms will only supply quantities given by point B. Hence, due to inconsistency with the supply side of the model there is a general disequilibrium. To illustrate this idea, it is convenient to portray the supply side of the economy by a production possibility frontier (PPF). Assume that the policy shock produces an expansion in the PPF (to PPF') and a substantial change in relative prices from point A to B. The next step in the solution program is to resolve for a general equilibrium of the new RA model with recalibrated preferences at point C. Point C in Figure 4 becomes therefore interpreted as point A in the next iteration. The solution of this RA model is then characterized by a new optimal consumption point, here depicted by point D, and prices P^2 .

Subsequent iterations involve carrying out Steps 1 to Steps 3 (Step 0 initializes the solution procedure). We stop if some convergence metric, e.g., the 1-norm of the difference between the price vectors from one iteration to the next, is satisfied. Note that subsequent iterations of the algorithm only involve refinements of the demand system and result in much smaller changes in relative prices, as indicated here by the change from C to D as compared with A to B.




FIGURE 4: ITERATIVE ADJUSTMENT

3 Convergence theory

This section evaluates the performance of our algorithm for an economy in which the exact equilibrium is known and where the computed allocation can be compared to the true equilibrium allocation. We develop local convergence theory for the proposed algorithm and also examine conditions under which the adjustment process may fail to converge.

The example is due to Scarf [1960] who considers a pure exchange economy with an equal number of n consumers and goods. Consumer h is endowed with one unit of good h and demands only goods h and $h+1$. Let $d_{i,h}$ denote demand for good i by consumer h . Preferences are represented by CES utility functions with the following structure:

$$U_h(d) = \left(\theta d_{h,h}^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}} + (1-\theta) d_{h+1,h}^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}}. \quad (7)$$

Scarf [1960] demonstrates that this economy has a unique equilibrium in which all prices are equal to unity.⁶

3.1 Local convergence

As explained in Section 2.2, the sequential recalibration algorithm iteratively adjusts the baseline level parameter \bar{C}_i (and $\Theta_i(\bar{C}_i)$) in the utility function of the representative agent. These may be

⁶ See Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 [Scarf, 1960, p.164]. The parameters of this utility function correspond to Scarf's parameters a and b [Scarf, 1960, p.168] as: $\sigma = \frac{1}{1+a}$ and $\theta = \frac{b}{1+b}$.

normalized so that $\sum_i \bar{C}_i = n$. Market clearing commodity prices for the RA economy are determined given the baseline level parameters. Let $p_i(\bar{C})$ denote the price of good i consistent with $\bar{C} = (\bar{C}_1, \dots, \bar{C}_n)$. In this exchange economy, let $\zeta_i(p(\bar{C}))$ denote the market excess demand function for good i that is obtained from evaluating household demand functions. Given the special structure of preferences and endowments, this function has the form:

$$\zeta_i(p(\bar{C})) = d_{i,i} + d_{i,i-1} - 1. \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, let $\xi_i(\bar{C})$ denote the value of market excess demand for good i at prices $p_i(\bar{C})$:

$$\xi_i(\bar{C}) = p_i(\bar{C}) \zeta_i(p(\bar{C})). \quad (9)$$

Of course, in equilibrium it must be true that $\xi_i(\bar{C}^*) = 0, \forall i$. Let the initial estimate \bar{C}^0 be selected on the n -simplex, i.e. $\sum_i \bar{C}_i^0 = n$. Walras' law ensures that the adjustment process $\frac{d\bar{C}_i}{dt} = \xi_i(\bar{C})$ remains on the n -simplex: $\frac{d\sum_i \bar{C}_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_i p_i(\bar{C}(t)) \zeta_i(p(\bar{C}(t))) = 0$.

Local convergence concerns properties of the Jacobian matrix evaluated at the equilibrium point, $\nabla \xi(\bar{C}^*) = [\xi_{ij}]$. This Jacobian has entries defined as follows:

$$\xi_{ij} \equiv \frac{\partial \xi_i}{\partial \bar{C}_j} = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial \zeta_i(p(\bar{C}))}{\partial \bar{C}_i} & i = j \\ \frac{\partial \zeta_i(p(\bar{C}))}{\partial \bar{C}_j} & i \neq j \end{cases}. \quad (10)$$

If all principal minors of $\nabla \xi(\bar{C}^*) = [\xi_{ij}]$ are negative, the adjustment process is locally convergent. If, however, $\frac{\partial \zeta_i(p(\bar{C}))}{\partial \bar{C}_i} > 0$, the process is locally unstable. When an equilibrium is unique and the process is uninterrupted, then local stability implies global instability.

For this model, the tâtonnement price adjustment process is unstable (in the case $n = 3$) when $\frac{\theta}{1-\theta} > \frac{1}{1-2\sigma}$ [Scarf, 1960]. In the following, we show that the same condition implies instability for the \bar{C} -adjustment process of the SR algorithm. Furthermore, it is shown (numerically) that while the tâtonnement and SR price adjustment processes are locally identical, they may be quite different at points in the price space far from the equilibrium.

Given the special structure of $\zeta_i(p(\bar{C}))$, we have:

$$\frac{\partial \zeta_i}{\partial p_i} = \frac{\partial d_{i,i}}{\partial p_i} + \frac{\partial d_{i,i-1}}{\partial p_i}, \quad \frac{\partial \zeta_i}{\partial p_{i-1}} = \frac{\partial d_{i,i-1}}{\partial p_{i-1}}, \quad \frac{\partial \zeta_i}{\partial p_{i+1}} = \frac{\partial d_{i,i}}{\partial p_{i+1}}. \quad (11)$$

Defining the “unit-utility” expenditure function for consumer i as:

$$e_i(p) = \left(\theta p_i^{1-\sigma} + (1-\theta) p_{i+1}^{1-\sigma} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \quad (12)$$

demand functions are given by:

$$d_{i,i} = \frac{\theta p_i}{e_i^{1-\sigma} p_i^\sigma}, \quad d_{i+1,i} = \frac{(1-\theta)p_i}{e_i^{1-\sigma} p_{i+1}^\sigma}. \quad (13)$$

Evaluating $\frac{\partial \zeta_i(p(\bar{C}))}{\partial \bar{C}_i}$ at $p^* = 1$, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \zeta_i(p(\bar{C}))}{\partial \bar{C}_i} &= \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial \bar{C}_i} \left((2\sigma - 2)\theta^2 + (3 - 2\sigma)\theta - 1 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial p_{i+1}}{\partial \bar{C}_i} (-\theta(1-\theta)(1-\sigma)) \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial p_{i-1}}{\partial \bar{C}_i} (-\theta(1-\theta)(1-\sigma) + 1 - \theta). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The function $p(\bar{C})$ is defined implicitly by the equation:

$$\tilde{\zeta}(p, \bar{C}) = 0 \quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{\zeta}(p, \bar{C})$ denotes the vector of market excess demand functions from the representative agent economy. Its i -th element is given by:

$$\tilde{\zeta}_i(p, \bar{C}) = \frac{\bar{C}_i}{\left(\sum_{i'} \alpha_{i'} p_{i'}^{1-\tilde{\sigma}} \right) p_i^{\tilde{\sigma}}} - 1 \quad (16)$$

with $\alpha_{i'} = \frac{\bar{C}_i}{\sum_{i'} \bar{C}_{i'}}$ and where $\tilde{\sigma}$ denotes the elasticity of substitution for the representative agent. In order to evaluate $\nabla_p \tilde{\zeta}$ at \bar{C}^* , we make a first-order Taylor series expansion:

$$\nabla_p \tilde{\zeta}(p, \bar{C}) d p + \nabla_{\bar{C}} \tilde{\zeta}(p, \bar{C}) d \bar{C} = 0 \quad (17)$$

which gives:

$$\frac{d p}{d \bar{C}} = -\nabla_p^{-1} \tilde{\zeta} \nabla_{\bar{C}} \tilde{\zeta}. \quad (18)$$

Evaluating gradients at $p^* = \bar{C}^* = 1$ yields:

$$\nabla_p \tilde{\zeta} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{-(2\tilde{\sigma}+1)}{3} & \frac{-(1-\tilde{\sigma})}{3} & \frac{-(1-\tilde{\sigma})}{3} \\ \frac{-(1-\tilde{\sigma})}{3} & \frac{-(2\tilde{\sigma}+1)}{3} & \frac{-(1-\tilde{\sigma})}{3} \\ \frac{-(1-\tilde{\sigma})}{3} & \frac{-(1-\tilde{\sigma})}{3} & \frac{-(2\tilde{\sigma}+1)}{3} \end{pmatrix} \quad (19)$$

$$-\nabla_p^{-1} \tilde{\zeta} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}+2}{3\tilde{\sigma}} & \frac{\tilde{\sigma}-1}{3\tilde{\sigma}} & \frac{\tilde{\sigma}-1}{3\tilde{\sigma}} \\ \frac{\tilde{\sigma}-1}{3\tilde{\sigma}} & \frac{\tilde{\sigma}+2}{3\tilde{\sigma}} & \frac{\tilde{\sigma}-1}{3\tilde{\sigma}} \\ \frac{\tilde{\sigma}-1}{3\tilde{\sigma}} & \frac{\tilde{\sigma}-1}{3\tilde{\sigma}} & \frac{\tilde{\sigma}+2}{3\tilde{\sigma}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (20)$$

$$\nabla_{\bar{C}} \tilde{\zeta} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

Hence, in the neighborhood of the equilibrium:

$$\frac{\partial p_i(\bar{C})}{\partial \bar{C}_i} = \frac{\tilde{\sigma} + 2}{3\tilde{\sigma}} > 0, \quad \frac{\partial p_i(\bar{C})}{\partial \bar{C}_j} = 0. \quad (22)$$

From (14) it therefore follows that the adjustment process in \bar{C} is locally unstable if:

$$(2\sigma - 2)\theta^2 + (3 - 2\sigma)\theta - 1 > 0 \quad (23)$$

which is equivalent to the condition for instability of a simple price tâtonnement adjustment process as demonstrated by Scarf [1960, p.169].

3.2 Global convergence

Although the local behavior of the price tâtonnement and the SR algorithm adjustment processes are identical, they produce different search directions away from a neighborhood of the equilibrium. This is apparent in Figure 5 where the two vector fields are superimposed. Only local to the equilibrium where price effects dominate income effects, do the two fields coincide exactly, as indicated by (23). As one moves further away from the center of the simplex, the vector fields become more divergent. We find that there are cases in which the SR algorithm does not converge even though the price tâtonnement is globally stable. This convergence failure is a manifestation of the simplifying nature of the adjustment process. By solving a sequence of representative agent economies the SR algorithm omits both income constraints and global properties of the individual utility functions. While the omission of global characteristics of preferences reduces the dimensionality of the model significantly, this may at the same time hinder convergence.

To assess the global convergence properties of the SR algorithm, we perform a grid search over the behavioral parameters σ and θ . We let the algorithm start from a disequilibrium point $p = (0.2, 0.2, 0.6)$ where local equilibrium dynamics are absent. Figure 6 reveals that convergence of the SR algorithm fails for combinations of small values for σ and high values for θ .⁷ For these parameter configurations, income effects are relatively strong vis-à-vis substitution effects. In cases

⁷ For both parameters, we choose a grid resolution of 0.05, set $\tilde{\sigma} = 1$, and allow for a maximum of 1000 iterations. The adjustment process is said to converge if the 1-norm of differences between a computed price vector and the equilibrium point drops below some metric δ , i.e. $\|p_i - p_i^*\|_1 < \delta$, where p_i^* denotes the analytical equilibrium solution. We set $\delta = 0.01$.




FIGURE 5: COMPARISON OF SR AND TÂTONNEMENT FIELDS

where convergence is achieved, the presence of significant income effects means that more iterations are required to find the true equilibrium. If, however, income effects are relatively weak, the SR algorithm only requires a modest number of iterations. The appropriateness of our solution method therefore depends on the characteristics of the underlying model.

One last remark is in order. To guarantee convergence of the SR algorithm, it is necessary to select a sufficiently large value for $\tilde{\sigma}$, the elasticity of substitution of the representative agent. If $\tilde{\sigma}$ is too low, convergence may fail even if income effects are relatively weak. Non-convergent behavior, however, that occurs in the bottom right corner of Figure 6 is robust with respect to $\tilde{\sigma}$. The choice of $\tilde{\sigma}$ is entirely innocuous since this parameter bears no economic significance for the behavior of “real” households in the underlying economic model. Computational experience suggests to use values of order $\tilde{\sigma} \geq 1$.




FIGURE 6: GLOBAL CONVERGENCE BEHAVIOR FOR DIFFERENT CONFIGURATIONS OF θ AND σ

4 OLG models with many households

This section presents a decomposition algorithm for solving overlapping generations models with many heterogeneous households. The proposed algorithm is an application of the SR approach with a few elaborations specific to the OLG context. As in the static setting, an equilibrium allocation is approximated by computing equilibria for a sequence of representative agent economies. In the case of OLG, the representative agent economies are Ramsey optimal growth problems where the system of overlapping generations is replaced by a single infinitely-lived agent.

The algorithm is demonstrated for a simple prototype Auerbach-Kotlikoff OLG economy with production activities, intra-cohort heterogeneity, a labor-leisure choice, and a government sector.⁸ We solve for the effects of a tax reform that is introduced unexpectedly in year zero, and then evaluate the performance of our algorithm against numerical solutions that are available from simultaneous solution methods.

4.1 A prototype Auerbach-Kotlikoff OLG model

4.1.1 Households

Time is discrete and extends from $t = 0, \dots, \infty$. There is no aggregate or household-specific uncertainty. The economy is populated by overlapping generations of heterogeneous agents. A house-

⁸ The example is an adapted version of the production model presented in Rasmussen and Rutherford [2004]. We consider a closed economy version of their model and allow for heterogeneity within one generation. While we investigate a single-sector here, the logic can be readily extended to a multisectoral framework.

hold of generation g and type $h = 1, \dots, H$ is born at the beginning of year $t = g$, lives for $N + 1$ years, and is endowed with $\omega_{g,h,t} = \omega(1 + \gamma)^g$ units of time in each period $g \leq t \leq g + N$, and $\pi_{g,h,t}$ is an index of labor productivity over the life cycle.⁹ γ denotes the exogenous steady-state growth rate of the economy. Leisure time, $\ell_{g,h,t}$, enters in a CES function with consumption, $c_{g,h,t}$, to create full consumption, $z_{g,h,t}$. Expressed with present value prices, the optimization problem is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{c_{g,h,t}, \ell_{g,h,t}} u_{g,h}(z_{g,h,t}) &= \sum_{t=g}^{g+N} \left(\frac{1}{1+\rho} \right)^{t-g} \frac{z_{g,h,t}^{1-1/\sigma_h}}{1-1/\sigma_h} \\
s.t. \quad z_{g,h,t} &= \left(\alpha c_{g,h,t}^\nu + (1-\alpha) \ell_{g,h,t}^\nu \right)^{\frac{1}{\nu}} \\
p_{c,t} c_{g,h,t} + p_{y,t} i_{g,h,t} &\leq p_{l,t} \pi_{g,h,t} (\omega_{g,h,t} - \ell_{g,h,t}) + p_{r,t} k_{g,h,t} + p_{y,t} \zeta_{g,h,t} \\
k_{g,h,t+1} &\leq (1-\delta) k_{g,h,t} + i_{g,h,t} \\
\ell_{g,h,t} &\leq \omega_{g,h,t} \\
c_{g,h,t}, \ell_{g,h,t} &\geq 0 \\
k_{g,h,g} &\leq \bar{k}_{g,h,g}, \quad i_{g,h,t+N} + (1-\delta) k_{g,h,t+N} \geq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where ρ is the utility discount factor, σ_h is the intertemporal elasticity of substitution for household h , $\sigma_\nu = 1/(1-\nu)$ is the uniform elasticity of substitution between consumption and leisure, α is a share parameter, and $p_{x,t}$, $x = \{y, c, l, r\}$, denotes the price for the single output good, the (after-tax) price for consumption, the wage rate, and the capital rental rate, respectively. Heterogeneity relates to intra-cohort differences in labor productivity and the intertemporal elasticity of substitution. Households have access to a storage technology: they can use one unit of the output good to obtain one unit of the capital good next period. We denote the investment into this technology by $i_{g,h,t}$. We do not restrict $i_{g,h,t}$, because we want to permit households to borrow against future labor income. Private capital $k_{g,h,t}$ depreciates at an annual rate of δ . $\bar{k}_{g,h,g}$ denotes the capital holdings of generation g at the beginning of life $t = g$. Initial old generations, i.e. generations born prior to period zero, are endowed with a non-zero amount of assets: $\bar{k}_{g,h,0} \neq 0$, $\forall g = -N, \dots, -1, \forall h$. The initial asset distribution for these generations is selected such that the economy is on a balanced growth path. We assume that newborn households enter with zero assets: $\bar{k}_{g,h,g} = 0$, $\forall g \geq 0, \forall h$. We furthermore rule out that households die in debt. In each period of the life cycle households receive $\zeta_{g,h,t}$ units of the output good as a lump-sum transfer from the

⁹ ω is a constant income scaling factor which is determined in the initial calibration procedure to reconcile household behavior with the aggregate benchmark data. For more details see [Rasmussen and Rutherford \[2004\]](#).

government. For simplicity, we assume that these transfers are allocated to each generation and type according to its share in the total population. We moreover assume that the government has no outstanding debt in the initial steady state and hence households' total assets in period zero are equal to the value of the capital stock, i.e. $\sum_{g=-N}^0 \sum_{h=1}^H \bar{k}_{g,h,t} = (1 + \bar{r}) K_0$, where \bar{r} is the steady state interest rate and K_0 is the initial aggregate capital stock.¹⁰

4.1.2 Firms

There is a single representative firm which in each period t uses capital and labor services to produce a single output good Y_t according to a linearly homogeneous production function $Y_t = F(K_t, L_t)$. All goods and factor markets are perfectly competitive.

4.1.3 Government

The government agent collects revenue from levying taxes on consumption, and on capital and labor income. Tax revenue is spent on government expenditure (G_t) and on total transfers to households ($T_t = \sum_{g=t-N}^t \sum_{h=1}^H \zeta_{g,h,t}$). We assume that the consumption tax rate (τ_t^c) adjusts such that the government budget is balanced on a period-by-period basis:

$$\tau_t^r p_{r,t} R_t + \tau_t^l p_{l,t} L_t + \tau_t^c p_{y,t} C_t = p_{y,t} G_t + p_{y,t} T_t \quad (25)$$

where τ_t^r and τ_t^l are the net tax rates on capital and labor income, respectively.

4.1.4 Aggregate economy restrictions

Given inter- and intragenerational heterogeneity, the following feasibility conditions must be satisfied:

$$L_t = \sum_{g=t-N}^t \sum_{h=1}^H \omega_{g,h,t} - \ell_{g,h,t} \quad (26)$$

$$I_t = \sum_{g=t-N}^t \sum_{h=1}^H i_{g,h,t} \quad (27)$$

$$K_t = \sum_{g=t-N}^t \sum_{h=1}^H k_{g,h,t} \quad (28)$$

$$C_t = \sum_{g=t-N}^t \sum_{h=1}^H c_{g,h,t} \quad (29)$$

¹⁰ We therefore implicitly assume that the government has no outstanding debt at period zero. A situation with non-zero initial government debt slightly complicates the calibration procedure but is conceptually straightforward (see Rasmussen and Rutherford [2004]).

The law of motion for the aggregate capital stock is given by:

$$K_{t+1} = (1 - \delta)K_t + I_t . \tag{30}$$

Finally, the single output good may be used for household consumption, investment, or government consumption implying the following condition for balance between aggregate supply and demand:

$$F(K_t, L_t) = C_t + I_t + G_t . \tag{31}$$

4.2 A decomposition algorithm for OLG models

We approximate the unknown equilibrium allocation of the OLG economy described by (24)-(31) by computing equilibria for a sequence of “related” Ramsey (optimal) growth problems. Figure 7 provides a schematic exposition of the steps involved in the decomposition procedure. Each




FIGURE 7: SOLVING OLG BY RAMSEY: STEPS IN THE DECOMPOSITION ALGORITHM

iteration comprises the following three steps. In the first step, we solve for the general equilibrium of the “related” Ramsey growth problem (Section 4.2.1) which retains the full structure of the production side of the model but replaces the system of OLG households by a representative infinitely-lived consumer agent. The second step computes optimal household behavior given the equilibrium prices from the Ramsey economy (Section 4.2.3). This step can be viewed as solving a partial equilibrium relaxation of the underlying economy that ignores general equilibrium interactions with the production side of the model but retains the full structure of the OLG demand

system. In the third step, we construct a new Ramsey optimal growth problem by recalibrating the preferences of the “artificial” Ramsey agent based on households’ choices from Step 2 (Section 4.2.4). Subsequent iterations proceed with analogous steps. Typically, the sequence of prices and quantities computed by our algorithm converges to the true equilibrium allocation. In what follows, we provide more details on each of the involved steps.

4.2.1 The “related” Ramsey growth problem

As the “related” Ramsey optimal growth problem, we define a model of the underlying OLG economy in which the system of overlapping generations is replaced by a single infinitely-lived representative agent, hereafter called the *Ramsey agent*. Apart from this modification, the entire economic structure of the OLG model including the behavior of other agents, market structure, the number of sectors etc. is unchanged. The Ramsey agent solves the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max_{C_t, \mathcal{L}_t} U(Z_t) &= \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \Theta_t^k \left(\frac{Z_t}{\bar{Z}_t^k} \right)^{1-1/\hat{\sigma}} \right]^{\frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\hat{\sigma}-1}} \\
 s.t. \quad Z_t &= \left(\Delta_t^k \left(\frac{C_t}{\bar{C}_t^k} \right)^v + (1-\Delta_t^k) \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}_t}{\bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^k} \right)^v \right)^{\frac{1}{v}} \\
 C_t + I_t + G_t &= F(K_t, \Omega_t^k - \mathcal{L}_t) \\
 K_{t+1} &\leq (1-\delta)K_t + I_t \\
 \mathcal{L}_t &\leq \Omega_t^k \\
 C_t, \mathcal{L}_t &\geq 0 \\
 K_0 &\leq \Psi \\
 K_{T+1} &= \hat{K}_{T+1}
 \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where C_t , \mathcal{L}_t , Z_t , K_t , I_t , and Ω_t^k now denote consumption, leisure time, full consumption, the capital stock, investment, and the time endowment by the Ramsey agent, respectively, and where $\hat{\sigma}$ is the intertemporal elasticity of substitution. k denotes an iteration index.¹¹

The initial capital stock in the Ramsey economy is given by the aggregate capital stock of the OLG economy in year zero:

¹¹ Note that the nested lifetime utility function $U(Z_t)$ is written in calibrated share form. We monotonically transform preferences in (24) to obtain a linear homogenous CES representation. This does not alter the underlying preference orderings and hence optimization yields the same demand functions.

$$\Psi = \sum_{g=-N}^0 \sum_{h=1}^H \bar{k}_{g,h,0}. \quad (33)$$

To approximate the infinite-horizon Ramsey economy by a finite-dimensional complementarity problem, we use the *state-variable targetting* method suggested by [Lau, Pahlke, and Rutherford \[2002\]](#) in which the *target* post-terminal capital stock (\hat{K}_{T+1}) is chosen at a level such that investments grow at the steady-state rate in the last period:

$$\frac{I_T}{I_{T-1}} = 1 + \gamma. \quad (34)$$

4.2.2 Initialization

In order to initialize the “related” Ramsey growth problem, it is first necessary to characterize a baseline reference path of the OLG economy. For simplicity, we assume that the economy is initially on a balanced growth path and employ a steady-state calibration procedure proposed by [Rasmussen and Rutherford \[2004\]](#) which proceeds in two steps. In the first step, the optimal profile of decision variables for a reference generation of type h is computed subject to given aggregate benchmark data in year zero. The second step involves extrapolating the results from the household calibration model, together with remaining elements in the aggregate dataset, to set up a baseline reference path.

Given this reference path, we choose an initial set of preferences for the representative agent such that the Ramsey growth problem endogenously reproduces the baseline reference path of the underlying OLG economy. This is accomplished by selecting appropriate reference levels and value share parameters for $U(Z_t)$ in (32):

$$\bar{C}_t^0 = \sum_{g=t-N}^t \sum_{h=1}^H \bar{c}_{g,h,t} \quad (35)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^0 = \sum_{g=t-N}^t \sum_{h=1}^H \bar{\ell}_{g,h,t} \quad (36)$$

$$\bar{Z}_t^0 = \bar{C}_t^0 + \bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^0 \quad (37)$$

$$\Delta_t^0 = \frac{\bar{p}_t \bar{C}_t^0}{\bar{p}_t \bar{C}_t^0 + \bar{p}_t \bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^0} \quad (38)$$

$$\Theta_t^0 = \frac{\bar{p}_t \bar{Z}_t^0}{\sum_{t'} \bar{p}_{t'} \bar{Z}_{t'}} \quad (39)$$

where \bar{p}_t , $t = 0, \dots, T$ and $\bar{x}_{g,h,t}$, $x = \{c, \ell\}$, denote benchmark prices and household quantity choices, respectively. The superscript “0” indicates starting values.

The Ramsey agent is endowed with units of “productive” time, Ω_t , that reflect households’ labor productivity in a given period:

$$\Omega_t^0 = \sum_{g=t-N}^t \sum_{h=1}^H \pi_{g,h,t} (\omega_{g,h,t} - \bar{\ell}_{g,h,t}) + \bar{\ell}_{g,h,t} \quad (40)$$

where $\bar{\ell}_{g,h,t}$ is benchmark leisure time by households.

The algorithm is started off by solving the initial Ramsey growth problem as defined by (25), and (32)-(40). If no policy change is implemented, the given specification of the Ramsey economy ensures that it can reproduce the initial steady state path of the underlying OLG economy as an equilibrium solution.

4.2.3 The partial equilibrium relaxation

The second step of the algorithm solves a partial equilibrium relaxation of the underlying OLG economy which retains full details of the household demand system but ignores general equilibrium effects. Hence, any interactions via commodity and factor markets and with the production side of the economy are suppressed. Given equilibrium prices from the previous solution of the “related” Ramsey growth problem, we evaluate demand functions for each generation and type that originate from the set of household problems in (24).

In order to obtain a good approximation of the underlying OLG economy, it is necessary to compute optimal household demand for all households and types in each period of the numerical model that runs from $t = 0, \dots, T$. This information then forms the basis for the recalibration of preferences of the Ramsey agent in the subsequent step of the algorithm. A complication arises for periods $T - N + 1 \leq t \leq T$ in which generations are born that live beyond T (hereafter called *terminal generations*). To compute the optimal decision profiles of these agents, it is essential to account for their behavior over the *full* life cycle. With the last cohort of households being born in period T , this means that there are N post-terminal periods that have to be included in the analysis, which we denote by $\hat{t} = T, \dots, T + N$. We resolve this issue by employing a steady-state closure rule which postulates that the economy has reached a steady state by period $T - N + 1$. This assumption imposes no additional restriction on the model if T is chosen sufficiently large.¹² Exploiting this fact, prices for post-terminal periods can be inferred from the following steady-state projection:

¹² The specific choice of T depends on the nature of the policy shock that is considered. In our numerical examples below we set $T = 150$.

$$x_i^k = \frac{x_T^k}{(1 + r_\infty)^{i-T}} \quad (41)$$

where $x_i^k = \{p_{g,h,i}^k, p_{y,i}^k, p_{l,i}^k\}$ denote the post-terminal price for full consumption, the output good, and the market wage all obtained in iteration k , respectively. Correspondingly, x_T^k refer to respective prices in the terminal period. The price for full consumption can be obtained as:

$$p_{g,h,t}^k = e_{g,h,t}(p_{c,t}^k, p_{l,t}^k) \quad (42)$$

where $e_{g,h,t}(\cdot)$ denotes the unit expenditure function for $z_{g,h,t}$. For future reference, let $\bar{p}_{g,h,t}$ denote respective benchmark prices. In (41), $r_\infty = p_{T-1}^c / p_T^c - 1$ defines the endogenous (steady-state) interest rate in the terminal period.

Finally, the lifetime income of generation g and type h , evaluated at candidate prices from iteration k , is given by:

$$M_{g,h}^k = \sum_{t=g}^{g+N} \pi_{g,h,t} p_{l,t}^k \omega_{g,h,t} + p_{y,t}^k \zeta_{g,h,t} + p_{r,0}^k \bar{k}_{g,h,g}. \quad (43)$$

A similar formula applies to the lifetime income of terminal generations where for post-terminal periods projected prices according to (41) are used. For future reference, let $\bar{M}_{g,h}$ denote the lifetime income at benchmark prices.

We are now in a position to compute the demand for of households in the model. In order to reduce computational complexity, we solve the dual problem making use of formulas (A-7)-(A-9) (see the Appendix). Let $e_{g,h}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k)$ denote the expenditure function for a unit of $u_{g,h}$ which—given the specific structure of preferences¹³— can be constructed using the vector of prices for the full consumption good, $\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k$ (including projected prices). Indirect utility can then be written as:

$$V_{g,h}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k, M_{g,h}^k) = \frac{M_{g,h}^k}{e_{g,h}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k) \bar{M}_{g,h}} \quad \text{for } \forall g, \forall h. \quad (44)$$

Applying Roy's identity, optimal household demand (in the context of the partial equilibrium relaxation) for full consumption, goods consumption and leisure, respectively, evaluated at the *candidate price vector* $\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k$, are updated in each iteration according to:

¹³ Note that in the given case of homothetic preferences, the unit expenditure function conveys all information concerning the underlying preferences.

$$z_{g,h,t}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k, M_{g,h}^k) = \bar{z}_{g,h,t} V_{g,h}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k, M_{g,h}^k) \left(\frac{e_{g,h}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k) \bar{p}_{g,h,t}}{p_{g,h,t}^k} \right)^{\sigma_h} \quad (45)$$

$$c_{g,h,t}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k, M_{g,h}^k) = \bar{c}_{g,h,t} z_{g,h,t}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k, M_{g,h}^k) \left(\frac{p_{g,h,t}^k \bar{p}_t}{p_{c,t}^k \bar{p}_{g,h,t}} \right)^{\sigma_v} \quad (46)$$

$$\ell_{g,h,t}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k, M_{g,h}^k) = \bar{\ell}_{g,h,t} z_{g,h,t}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k, M_{g,h}^k) \left(\frac{p_{g,h,t}^k \bar{p}_t}{p_{l,t}^k \pi_{g,h,t} \bar{p}_{g,h,t}} \right)^{\sigma_v}. \quad (47)$$

4.2.4 Recalibration of the Ramsey agent's preferences

The last step in each iteration is to construct a new Ramsey optimal growth problem by recalibrating the Ramsey agent's preferences based on optimal household choices from the previous step. This is accomplished by updating level parameters in (32) according to:

$$\bar{C}_t^{k+1} = \sum_{g=t-N}^t \sum_{h=1}^H c_{g,h,t}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k, M_{g,h}^k) \quad (48)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^{k+1} = \sum_{g=t-N}^t \sum_{h=1}^H \ell_{g,h,t}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k, M_{g,h}^k) \quad (49)$$

$$\bar{Z}_t^k = \bar{C}_t^k + \bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^k \quad (50)$$

and value share parameters in (32) according to:

$$\Delta_t^{k+1} = \frac{p_{c,t}^k \bar{C}_t^k}{p_{c,t}^k \bar{C}_t^k + p_{l,t}^k \bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^k} \quad (51)$$

$$\Theta_t^{k+1} = \frac{p_{c,t}^k \bar{C}_t^k + p_{l,t}^k \bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^k}{\sum_{t'} (p_{c,t'}^k \bar{C}_{t'}^k + p_{l,t'}^k \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{t'}^k)}. \quad (52)$$

With varying prices, households adjust their labor supply, and hence the composition of the labor force with respect to age and household type is altered. But since labor productivity depends on these two socio-economic characteristics, aggregate labor productivity in the underlying OLG economy also changes. We therefore adjust the time endowment of the Ramsey agent in each iteration according to:

$$\Omega_t^{k+1} = \sum_{g=t-N}^t \sum_{h=1}^H \pi_{g,h,t} (\omega_{g,h,t} - \ell_{g,h,t}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k, M_{g,h}^k)) + \ell_{g,h,t}(\mathbf{p}_{g,h}^k, M_{g,h}^k). \quad (53)$$

Thus, the newly constructed Ramsey optimal growth problem in iteration $k+1$ consists of solving (32) (subject to (33) and (34)) with updated preference parameters and time endowment as defined by (48)–(53). This completes the description of the algorithm.

4.3 Algorithmic performance

The OLG economy presented above has no analytical solution. In order to evaluate our algorithm, we therefore compare its performance to those of conventional simultaneous/direct solution methods. As a benchmark, we take a complementarity-based approach as suggested by Rasmussen and Rutherford [2004].

The base case parametrization of the economy is as follows. Households live for 51 years or $N = 50$. We set $\bar{r} = 0.05$, $\gamma = 0.01$, $\delta = 0.07$, $\nu_h = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.32$, and $\alpha = 0.8$. In our numerical analysis, we test the performance of our algorithm for a different number of household types H and also allow for various degrees of intra-cohort heterogeneity. For simplicity, we assume that σ_h , $h = 1, \dots, H$, are generated by random draws from a uniform distribution defined over $[\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}]$. Likewise, differences in labor productivity are modeled by randomly drawing $a_{g,h}$ from a uniform distribution with support $\underline{a} \leq a_{g,h} \leq \bar{a}$, where the parameter $a_{g,h}$ enters the labor productivity profile over the life cycle as: $\pi_{g,h,t} = \exp [4.47 + a_{g,h}(t - g) - 0.00067(t - g)^2]$. Furthermore, it is assumed that each type has equal size in the total population. The values for the aggregate data including tax payments in the initial benchmark are based on Input-Output tables for the U.S. economy in 1996 and are presented at the top of the corresponding computer programs. We solve the model for $T = 150$ years.

4.3.1 Solving for a policy shock: a fundamental tax reform

We now present an illustrative application of our decomposition algorithm by solving for the effects of a policy change that in year zero unexpectedly and permanently reduces the capital income tax and introduces a consumption tax to endogenously balance the government budget. The capital income tax is reduced from a benchmark value of 28.4% to 22.9%.

We start out by considering a case where $H = 1$, $\sigma_h = 1.2$, and $a_{g,h} = 0.04$. Figure 8 shows the sequence of time paths for investment that emerges from the iterative procedure of our algorithm. The true transition path to a new steady state of the OLG economy as computed by our benchmark simultaneous solution method is labeled "OLG". "Iteration 1" plots the impact of the tax reform scenario after the first iteration of our solution method. This is equivalent to what would be obtained from solving a Ramsey optimal growth model. Each subsequent iteration of the algorithm produces a new time path for investment that eventually converges to the true solution. We terminate the search process if $\|p_{c,t}^k - p_{c,t}^*\|_1 < 10^{-6}$. For the current model, this is achieved after 34 iterations. Figure 9 shows a similar picture for the welfare change experienced by each




FIGURE 8: SOLVING OLG BY RAMSEY: SEQUENCE OF INVESTMENT TIME PATHS

generation.¹⁴ Note that in terms of welfare changes, stopping after iteration 1 corresponds to a situation which would emerge from a pure top down approach that fails to take into account general equilibrium feedback effects from the micro to the macro level.

To assess the quality of the approximation, we use the following two measures. First, the approximation error e^k reports the 1-norm of differences between computed consumption prices and true equilibrium prices as calculated by our benchmark method: $e^k = \|p_{c,t}^k - p_{c,t}^*\|_1$. As e^k constitutes a summary statistic which is defined over the entire model horizon, it says little about whether price deviations of the computed from the true price path lie within a tolerable bandwidth. As a second measure, we therefore report the maximum distance error τ^k which is defined as: $\tau^k = \max\{|p_{c,t}^k - p_{c,t}^*|\}$.

Figure 10 plots e^k as a function of the number of iterations. The approximation error quickly decreases and then converges to zero. After the first few iterations our decomposition technique only involves refinements of the demand system, and consequently, subsequent changes in relative prices are small.

¹⁴ Kehoe and Levine [1985] have shown that the OLG framework may permit multiple equilibria for certain parameter values. In such cases, indeterminacy would manifest itself as sensitivity to the truncation date. None of the models presented here are sensitive to T, provided that it is sufficiently large. This and the general robustness of the models provide evidence that the equilibria are unique. Kotlikoff [2000] reaches the same conclusion regarding the uniqueness of equilibria in the OLG models he has been working with.




FIGURE 9: SOLVING OLG BY RAMSEY: SEQUENCE OF WELFARE CHANGES BY GENERATION




FIGURE 10: SOLVING OLG BY RAMSEY: APPROXIMATION ERROR e^k

4.3.2 Robustness and accuracy

In order to explore the capacity of our algorithm to solve large-scale OLG models, we examine its performance for a different number of household types and various degrees of intra-cohort heterogeneity. We look again at the effects of the tax reform scenario as described above. Given our simple specification for the source of intra-cohort differences, we vary the extent of heterogeneity,

TABLE 1: CONVERGENCE PERFORMANCE AND APPROXIMATION ERROR

H ($\Gamma = \Gamma_1$)	Number of iterations	Approx. error e^k (last iteration)	Max. distance τ^k (last iteration)	CPU computing time
1	37	10^{-6}	10^{-7}	0 min 13 s (3.78)
10	36	0.002	10^{-4}	0 min 21 s (1.17)
50	35	0.005	10^{-4}	1 min 10 s (0.18)
100	35	—	—	2 min 06 s (×)
500	34	—	—	6 min 14 s (×)
1000	34	—	—	10 min 48 s (×)
2000	29	—	—	30 min 31 s (×)

Note: Figures in parentheses denote running time of the decomposition algorithm expressed as a fraction of the running time as required by our benchmark simultaneous solution method. A “×” indicates infeasibility of the simultaneous solution method.

denoted by Γ , by changing the support for the distributions from which σ_h and $a_{g,h}$ are drawn.¹⁵

Table 1 reports results from a series of runs where the number of households within each generation is increased while holding fixed the degree of intra-cohort heterogeneity. The quality of approximation is excellent (τ_k is around 10^{-4}). As the number of household types increases, our proposed decomposition procedure become advantageous.¹⁶ Most importantly, it is shown that our algorithm can provide improvements in robustness as compared to the benchmark simultaneous solution method which quickly becomes infeasible for models in which $H \geq 100$.

To examine the performance of our algorithm in the presence of a substantial degree of heterogeneity among households, we report results for different configurations of Γ . We set $H = 50$ so that the benchmark solution method is feasible and the calculation of approximation errors is available. Not surprisingly, the approximation quality of our method is decreasing with the degree of heterogeneity. Overall, the quality of approximation is still very good: computed prices fall within a reasonably small interval around the true equilibrium price path (τ^k is around $10^{-5} - 10^{-3}$).

Motivated by the discussion of the potential convergence failure of the SR algorithm in the presence of significant income effects (Section 3), we conduct a number of sensitivity analyses for behavioral parameters governing intra-period and intertemporal substitution/income effects

¹⁵ We consider the following sets of choices for $\{(\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}), (\underline{a}, \bar{a})\}$ ordered by their implied degree of heterogeneity: $\Gamma_1 = \{(1.00, 1.50), (0.2, 0.3)\}$, $\Gamma_2 = \{(1.00, 1.50), (0.2, 0.4)\}$, $\Gamma_3 = \{(0.25, 0.75), (0.2, 0.3)\}$, $\Gamma_4 = \{(0.25, 0.75), (0.2, 0.4)\}$, $\Gamma_5 = \{(0.25, 1.25), (0.2, 0.3)\}$, $\Gamma_6 = \{(0.25, 1.25), (0.2, 0.4)\}$, $\Gamma_7 = \{(0.25, 2.00), (0.2, 0.3)\}$, $\Gamma_8 = \{(0.25, 2.00), (0.2, 0.4)\}$.

¹⁶ All reported running times refer to an implementation on a Dual Core 2 GHz processor machine.

TABLE 2: APPROXIMATION ERRORS FOR DIFFERENT Γ

Γ ($H = 50$)	Number of iterations	Approx. error e^k (last iteration)	Max. distance τ^k (last iteration)	CPU computing time
Γ_1	35	0.005	10^{-4}	1 min 10 s (0.18)
Γ_2	35	0.005	10^{-4}	0 min 56 s (1.14)
Γ_3	79	0.001	10^{-5}	2 min 14 s (0.39)
Γ_4	74	0.004	10^{-4}	2 min 23 s (0.42)
Γ_5	58	0.005	10^{-4}	6 min 14 s (0.29)
Γ_6	55	0.011	10^{-3}	1 min 44 s (0.26)
Γ_7	41	0.011	10^{-3}	1 min 10 s (0.18)
Γ_8	37	0.021	10^{-3}	1 min 15 s (0.22)

Note: Figures in parentheses denote running time of the decomposition algorithm expressed as a fraction of the running time as required by our benchmark simultaneous solution method.

TABLE 3: CONVERGENCE BEHAVIOR IN THE PRESENCE OF STRONG INCOME EFFECTS

ν, α ($H = 50$)	Number of iterations	Approx. error e^k (last iteration)	Max. distance τ^k (last iteration)	CPU computing time
0.50, 0.80	33	0.015	10^{-3}	1 min 06 s (0.17)
0.25, 0.80	30	0.035	10^{-3}	1 min 05 s (0.18)
0.80, 0.50	42	0.014	0.013	1 min 27 s (0.19)
0.80, 0.25	53	0.042	0.037	1 min 33 s (0.25)
0.50, 0.50	42	0.117	0.011	1 min 15 s (0.23)
0.25, 0.25	47	0.171	0.015	1 min 42 s (0.25)

Note: Figures in parentheses denote running time of the decomposition algorithm expressed as a fraction of the running time as required by our benchmark simultaneous solution method.

(see Table 3). Looking first at the intra-period dimension, we find that combinations of too small ν and α can pose serious problems for our decomposition approach. Although the search process is terminated within a modest number of iterations, both approximation measures indicate a rather poor quality of approximation for $\alpha \leq 0.5$. If α is small, the quantity of labor supplied is relatively insensitive to price changes which also means that income changes are more easily tolerated.

As for the role of intertemporal income effects, we do not experience problems of convergence or a poor quality of approximation (results not shown). However, the speed of convergence (in terms of the number of iterations required for convergence) is the slower, the larger is σ_h . This

finding indicates that income effects stemming from an intertemporal reallocation of resources do not cause problems of convergence.

4.3.3 *Dynamically inefficient equilibria*

Lastly, we want to emphasize that our decomposition method is inadequate for approximating equilibria in OLG economies that are generically *Pareto-inferior*, i.e. models in which the economy's growth rate exceeds the real interest rate (see, e.g., [Diamond \[1965\]](#) and [Phelps \[1961\]](#)). For the given model, this corresponds to a situation where population growth dominates discounting. In such circumstances there is no social planner's problem which "lines up" with the OLG demand system. Whether this significantly limits the relevance and scope of our approach is an empirical question. Empirical evidence suggests that the incapacity of our method to deal with dynamically inefficient equilibria is of minor practical significance.¹⁷

5 Concluding remarks

This paper develops a decomposition approach which can be applied to solve high-dimensional static and dynamic general equilibrium models with many households. We demonstrate its effectiveness for computing equilibria in high-dimensional OLG models which are infeasible for conventional simultaneous/direct methods. We find that the proposed algorithm provides an efficient and robust way to approximate general equilibrium in models with a large number of heterogeneous agents if income effects remain sufficiently weak. The appropriateness of our solution method therefore depends on the characteristics of the underlying model and the nature of the implemented policy shock.

We believe that our approach can be beneficial for a wide range of economic applications. In particular, it is advantageous for modeling tasks which necessitate to economize on the dimensionality of the corresponding numerical problem. Potential applications may include multi-country and multi-sectoral OLG models, and analyses of relevant policy issues —such as, e.g., population aging, trade policy, and poverty— which require detailed account of the distributional

¹⁷ [Abel, Mankiw, Summers, and Zeckhauser \[1989\]](#) find that for the US economy the condition for dynamic efficiency seems to be satisfied in practice. Similarly, under the weak assumption that rates of return are ergodic, [Barbie, Hagedorn, and Kaul \[2004\]](#) reach the conclusion that the US economy does not overaccumulate capital. By means of numerical analysis, [Larch \[1993\]](#) suggests that in the Auerbach-Kotlikoff framework rather implausible values of the pure rate of time preference, the intertemporal elasticity of substitution or the population growth rate are required to obtain non Pareto-optimal market solutions.

effects on a household level while at the same time taking into account general equilibrium effects. Moreover, our decomposition approach may prove useful for the further development of fully-integrated static and dynamic microsimulation models that incorporate the essential micro-macro linkages required for a comprehensive policy analysis.

Appendix

In order to facilitate the description of the algorithm and to clarify the algebraic forms used in the associated computer programs, this appendix reviews some fundamental aspects of calibration which underly most CGE models.

CES preferences

Calibration refers to the process of selecting values of model parameters which ensure that the model's reference equilibrium is consistent with given data. Such data are typically obtained in the form of a social accounting matrix for a given base year. CGE models are based on parametric forms which describe technology and preferences. The most common functional form used in empirical applications is the constant-elasticity-of-substitution (CES) function. A CES utility function can be written as:

$$U(\mathbf{C}) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i C_i^\rho \right)^{1/\rho} \quad (\text{A-1})$$

where \mathbf{C} denotes the vector of consumption goods C_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$. There are $n + 1$ parameters in this function, with n share parameters $\alpha_i > 0$ and a curvature parameter ρ . The latter is related to the Allen-Uzawa elasticity of substitution σ as: $\rho = 1 - 1/\sigma$ with $\rho < 1$ and $\sigma > 0$.

Consumers in CGE models are typically modeled as budget constrained utility-maximizers, so a model would incorporate the following behavioral subproblem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{c_1, \dots, c_n} U(\mathbf{C}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n p_i C_i = M \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-2})$$

where p_i is the price of consumption good i , and M is consumer income. We can solve the consumer problem in *closed-form*, obtaining demand functions:

$$C_i(\mathbf{p}, M) = \frac{\alpha_i^\sigma M p_i^{-\sigma}}{\sum_{i'} \alpha_{i'}^\sigma p_{i'}^{1-\sigma}} \quad (\text{A-3})$$

where \mathbf{p} denotes the price vector, and $i \neq i'$. The calibration of preferences involves inverting this demand function to express the function parameters in terms of an observed set of prices and demands. If a consumer chooses to consume quantities \bar{C}_i when commodity prices are \bar{p}_i , we may conclude that the share parameters must be given by:

$$\alpha_i = \lambda \bar{p}_i \bar{C}_i^{1-\rho} \quad (\text{A-4})$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is an arbitrary scale factor¹⁸, and the elasticity parameter, ρ , is exogenously specified. We tend to think of the share and scale parameters as calibrated values, determined by an agent's observed choices in a reference equilibrium, whereas the elasticity parameters are "free parameters" which are typically drawn from econometric estimates of the responsiveness of demand or supply to changes in relative prices. In traditional applied general equilibrium models, the reference quantities \bar{C}_i and prices \bar{p}_i are based on a benchmark equilibrium data set.

The calibrated share form

In applied work it may be convenient to work with a different yet equivalent form of the CES utility function [Rutherford, 1995a]. The *calibrated share form* is based on the observed quantities, prices and budget shares. In computational applications the calibrated form is preferable because it provides a simple parameter and functional check that is independent from second-order curvature. Normalizing the benchmark utility index to unity, the utility function can be written as:

$$U(\mathbf{C}) = \left[\sum_i \theta_i \left(\frac{C_i}{\bar{C}_i} \right)^\rho \right]^{1/\rho} \quad (\text{A-5})$$

in which we define:

$$\theta_i = \frac{\bar{p}_i \bar{C}_i}{\sum_{i'} \bar{p}_{i'} \bar{C}_{i'}} \quad (\text{A-6})$$

as the benchmark value share of good i . We can similarly express the unit expenditure function as:

$$e(\mathbf{p}) = \left[\sum_i \theta_i \left(\frac{p_i}{\bar{p}_i} \right)^{1-\sigma} \right]^{1/1-\sigma}, \quad (\text{A-7})$$

the indirect utility function as:

$$V(\mathbf{p}, M) = \frac{M}{e(\mathbf{p}) \bar{M}}, \quad (\text{A-8})$$

¹⁸ The consumer maximization problem is invariant with respect to positive scaling of U , hence the share parameters may only be determined up to a scale factor.

and by Roy's identity the demand function as:

$$C_i(\mathbf{p}, M) = \bar{C}_i \frac{M}{e(\mathbf{p})\bar{M}} \left(\frac{e(\mathbf{p})\bar{p}_i}{p_i} \right)^\sigma \quad (\text{A-9})$$

where $\bar{M} = \sum_i \bar{p}_i \bar{C}_i$.

We can think of the demand function given here as a second-order Taylor approximation to the “true” demand function based on an observation of the true function at the reference point. At that point, \bar{C}_i corresponds to a “zeroth order approximation” to the utility function, \bar{p}_i corresponds to the “first order approximation”, and the “free parameter” σ controls the second (and higher) order properties of preferences. The benchmark prices correspond to the marginal rate of substitution—the slope of the indifference curve—at $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$. As long as one remains in the neighborhood of $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$, the elasticity parameter σ only plays a minor role, and calibrated demand is determined largely by $\bar{\mathbf{C}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$.

References

- ABEL, A. B., G. N. MANKIW, L. H. SUMMERS, AND R. J. ZECKHAUSER (1989): “Assessing dynamic inefficiency: theory and evidence,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 56, 1–20.
- ARNTZ, M., S. BOETERS, N. GURTZGEN, AND S. SCHUBERT (2006): “Analysing welfare reform in a microsimulation-AGE model: the value of disaggregation,” Discussion Paper No. 06-076, Centre for European Economic Research.
- AUERBACH, A., AND L. KOTLIKOFF (1987): *Dynamic Fiscal Policy*. Cambridge University Press.
- BARBIE, M., M. HAGEDORN, AND A. KAUL (2004): “Assessing aggregate tests of efficiency for dynamic economies,” *Topics in Macroeconomics*, 4(1), Article 16.
- BOURGUIGNON, F., A.-S. ROBILLIARD, AND S. ROBINSON (2005): “Representative versus real households in the macroeconomic modeling of inequality,” in *Frontiers in Applied General Equilibrium Modeling*, ed. by T. J. Kehoe, T. N. Srinivasan, and J. Whalley. Cambridge University Press.
- BOURGUIGNON, F., AND A. SPADARO (2006): “Microsimulation as a tool for evaluating redistribution policies,” *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 4(1), 77–106.
- COCKBURN, J., AND C. B. CORORATONA (2007): “Trade reform and poverty—Lessons from the Philippines: A CGE-microsimulation analysis,” *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 29(1), 141–163.
- CONESA, J. C., AND D. KRUEGER (1999): “Social security with heterogeneous agents,” *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 2(4), 757–795.
- DIAMOND, P. A. (1965): “National debt in a neoclassical growth model,” *American Economic Review*, 55, 1126–1150.
- DIXON, P. J. (1975): *The theory of joint maximization*. North-Holland.
- FEHR, H. (2000): “Pension reform during the demographic transition,” *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 102(3), 419–443.
- HUGGETT, M., AND G. VENTURA (1999): “On the distributional effects of social security reform,” *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 2, 498–531.

- JENSEN, S. E. H., AND T. F. RUTHERFORD (2002): "Distributional effects of fiscal consolidation," *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 104(3), 471–493.
- KEHOE, T. J., AND D. K. LEVINE (1985): "Comparative statics and perfect foresight in infinite horizon economies," *Econometrica*, 53(2), 433–493.
- KOTLIKOFF, L. (2000): "The A-K OLG model: its past present and future," in *Using dynamic general equilibrium models for policy analysis*, ed. by W. Glenn, S. Jensen, L. Pedersen, and T. Rutherford. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- KOTLIKOFF, L., K. SMETTERS, AND J. WALLISER (1999): "Privatizing social security in the United States: comparing the options," *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 2(3), 532–574.
- LARCH, M. (1993): "Dynamically inefficient equilibria in the Auerbach-Kotlikoff model," *Empirical Economics*, 18, 159–172.
- LAU, M. I., A. PAHLKE, AND T. F. RUTHERFORD (2002): "Approximating infinite-horizon models in a complementarity format: a primer in dynamic general equilibrium analysis," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 26, 577–609.
- MATHIESEN, L. (1985): "Computation of economic equilibria by a sequence of linear complementarity problems," *Mathematical Programming Study*, 23, 144–162.
- NEGISHI, T. (1960): "Welfare economics and existence of an equilibrium for a competitive economy," *Metroeconomica*, 12, 92–97.
- PHELPS, E. S. (1961): "The Golden rule of accumulation: a fable for growthmen," *American Economic Review*, 51, 638–641.
- RASMUSSEN, T. N., AND T. F. RUTHERFORD (2004): "Modeling overlapping generations in a complementarity format," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 28, 1383–1409.
- RIOS-RULL, J. (1995): "Models with heterogeneous agents," in *Frontiers of Business Cycle Research*, ed. by T. F. Cooley. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- RUTHERFORD, T. F. (1995a): "CES preferences and technology: a practical introduction," mimeo, University of Colorado.
- (1995b): "Extension of GAMS for complementarity problems arising in applied economics," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 19(8), 1299–1324.
- (1999): "Sequential joint maximization," in *Energy and Environmental Policy Modeling*, ed. by J. Weyant, vol. 18 of *International Series in Operations Research and Management Science*. Kluwer.
- RUTHERFORD, T. F., D. TARR, AND O. SHEPOTYLO (2005): "Poverty Effects of Russia's WTO Accession: modeling "real" households and endogenous productivity effects," World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3473.
- SAVARD, L. (2003): "Poverty and income distribution in a CGE-household micro-simulation model: top-down/bottom up approach," unpublished, available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=485665>.
- (2005): "Poverty and inequality analysis within a CGE framework: a comparative analysis of the representative agent and microsimulation approaches," *Development Policy Review*, 23(3), 313–331.
- SCARF, H. (1960): "Some examples of global instability of the competitive equilibrium," *International Economic Review*, 1(3), 157–171.
- TOWNSEND, R. M. (2002): "Safety nets and financial institutions in the Asian crisis: the allocation of within-country risk," International Monetary Fund. Prepared for the IMF Conference on Macroeconomic Policies and Poverty Reduction, March 14-15, Washington, D.C., available at: <http://cier.uchicago.edu/papers/papers.htm>.
- TOWNSEND, R. M., AND K. UEDA (2003): "Financial deepening, inequality, and growth: a model-based quanti-

tative evaluation,” IMF Working Paper 03-193. International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C., available at: www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2003/wp03193.pdf.

VENTURA, G. (1999): “Flat tax reform: A quantitative exploration,” *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 23, 1424–1458.