
Jean PISANI-FERRY (jean.pisaniferry@sciencespo.fr) is a Senior Fellow at Bruegel, the Tommaso Padoa Schioppa chair at the European University Institute and a non-resident Senior Fellow at the Peterson Institute

This Policy Contribution is based on a talk given at a European Commission DG ECFIN webinar on 9 October 2020. I am grateful to Zsolt Darvas, Miguel Gil-Tertre, Mario Nava, Nicolas Véron, Jakob von Weizsäcker and Guntram Wolfrum for comments.

Executive summary

- **The European Union's plan** for aiding recovery in member states hit by the coronavirus crisis has been rightly hailed as a major breakthrough for the bloc. But there is much less clarity on the plan's economic aims, its priorities and the content of the contractual arrangements it should entail between the EU and member countries. The plan's main plank, the Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF) is widely seen as a short-term Keynesian stimulus. Although the EU debt is expected to be repaid through contributions from member states, the resulting transfers are often seen, including by national governments, as money from heaven. There has also been controversy over the conditions attached to grants and loans
- **fuzziness over** objectives and overloaded procedures can derail the RRF. The EU needs to provide clarity from the outset and put the plan on the right track. It should acknowledge and emphasise that the main goal of the RRF is not to contribute to immediate relief or a Keynesian stimulus, but to foster structural transformation, especially in less-advanced and harder-hit member states.
- **The EU should** hold back from trying to impose through overall policy conditionality its reform agenda on the member states. Support for digitalisation cannot be conditioned on pension reform. Instead, there should be a narrow-conditionality approach in which reforms that strongly complement intended investments should be identified and bundled with that investment. A grant aimed at encouraging decarbonisation in the transport sector, for example, would, be made conditional on the elimination of transport fuel subsidies. Therefore, in national recovery and resilience plans, each bundle of investments and reforms should be focused on the limited set of policy measures that need to be implemented to maximise the impact of EU-financed investment.
- **Meanwhile, complementarity across** objectives should be addressed through a dialogue with each member state on the sectoral allocation of EU funding and the overall architecture of their recovery and resilience plans. As the provider of the funds, the EU has the leverage and legitimacy to be demanding in this discussion.
-



Introduction

Because of its size, the way it will be financed and the fact that it involves outright cross-country transfers, the agreement reached by European Union leaders in July 2020 on the European Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF) was rightly hailed as a major breakthrough for the EU, perhaps even a ‘Hamiltonian moment’ in the process of fiscal federalisation.

But there is much less clarity on the economic aims of the RRF, its priorities and the content of the contractual arrangements it should entail between the EU and the member states. Despite the planned disbursement schedule, which would span five years, the RRF is widely seen as a short-term Keynesian stimulus. And despite the fact that the EU debt is expected to be repaid through contributions from member states, the resulting transfers are seen, including by national governments, as money from heaven. There has also been controversy over the conditions attached to grants and loans, and the resulting political compromise has been interpreted in various ways by the protagonists.

Clarity is needed, therefore, first and foremost to ensure effectiveness, but also if the RRF is meant to provide a template for future budgetary initiatives at EU level. While its contours have been settled, in particular by guidance from the European Commission on the preparation of national plans¹, much could still be done to dispel ambiguities and to define precisely the nature of the policy dialogue that will take place within the framework under construction.

My intention here is to contribute to this clarification through (1) evaluating the significance of the RRF from a macroeconomic standpoint; (2) analysing its stated aims; (3) discussing conditionality; and (4) making proposals on tackling the crucial challenges of interdependence across objectives and EU countries².

1 Macroeconomic aims

There is by now growing agreement that the pandemic shock can be characterised as a combination of *lockdown shock* affecting simultaneously supply and demand in specific sectors, a resulting *demand shock* affecting other sectors not directly hit by the crisis, and a *reallocation shock* that will gradually trigger a transfer of resources across sectors, regions and possibly countries (Blanchard, 2020; Barrero and Bloom, 2020). Discussions continue on the significance of the demand shock or the permanent character of the reallocation shock, but there is broad consensus on the overall characterisation.

The question is then: where will the EU programme help?

Let us start from the perspective of a country that has normal access to capital markets and is neither on the giving nor on the receiving end of the transfers involved in the RRF (assume that the present value of the expected transfers from the EU budget is equal to the present value of expected additional contributions to the EU budget). For such a country, the loans component of the programme will be immaterial (because it can borrow on the market on exactly the same terms), and even the grants component would be of secondary importance (because they will not change the intertemporal budget constraint). Nominally, the country’s deficit and debt will be lower in the short run, but its off-balance sheet liabilities will

¹ See https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/guidance-member-states-recovery-and-resilience-plans_en.

² The EU initiative, dubbed Next Generation EU, consists of a series of programmes, the most important of which is the Recovery and Resilience Facility. My focus here is on the €312.5 billion grant component of that facility. Additional grants will be provided through other programmes, especially the bridge programme ReactEU (€47.5 billion), bringing the total to €390 billion.

be higher – certainly not a first-order impact. Although the Maastricht indicators for deficit and debt will improve, markets will certainly notice that the underlying situation remains the same.

There are only two cases in which the RRF will provide a net gain. This is firstly if the EU agrees to finance the repayment through new own resources that genuinely broaden the aggregate tax base by tapping into revenue sources unavailable to national governments. Such resources do exist. To assume that they will be of an order of magnitude commensurate with the €390 billion EU debt repayment burden (plus interest) is a long shot, however³.

The second case is an inflation tax that would be a substitute for repayment if the European Central Bank were to monetise the debt – again, quite a long shot⁴. In practice, both possibilities exist, but are unlikely to materialise.

Figure 1: France, distribution over time of proposed measures and RRF funding, billion €, 2020-2025

Source: Bruegel based on the French government's RESF report (Direction générale du Trésor, 2020). For simplicity, it is assumed that the Plan de relance will be disbursed over three years (2021 to 2023). Faster disbursement, as planned by the government, would only strengthen the argument. It is assumed that the time profile of the RRF funding will follow that indicated in Giovannini et al (2020). Permanent tax cuts are excluded from the calculation.

France is a good approximation of this category of country: according to tentative ECB calculations (Giovannini *et al*, 2020), the grants it will receive, net of future repayments, should eventually amount to about minus 1 percent of GDP (meaning that it will be a net contributor)⁵. If cross-country spillovers are disregarded (more on this in section 4), France cannot expect the EU plan to make a positive medium-term contribution to its own economic performance, at least from a macroeconomic standpoint. It cannot expect much in the short term either. As apparent in Figure 1, which shows the distribution over time of the budgetary measures introduced in France and their partial funding by the RRF, the entirety of the short-term pandemic package and the bulk of the overall budgetary support will be financed by the national budget. The EU will finance only one-fourth of the total budgetary support (excluding permanent tax cuts) engineered in response to the shock.

³ See for details my recent report with Clemens Fuest to the informal Ecofin of September 2020 (Fuest and Pisani-

However the same reasoning does not apply to the countries that are major beneficiaries of the RRF. Gross transfers are expected to reach 16 percent of GNI for Bulgaria, 13.5 percent for Greece, 8 percent for Poland and Portugal, and 5 percent for Italy (Darvas, 2020). For many countries in southern and central-eastern Europe, *transfers net of expected repayments* should exceed by far the aid worth 2.6 percent of recipient's GDP that the United States granted to Europe under the Marshall Plan (Steil, 2019). In addition, these countries will benefit from being able to borrow on more favourable terms through the loan component of the RRF and other liquidity lines, because the EU will pass on to them the very favourable conditions it is expected to benefit from when tapping the bond market⁶.

It is through the combination of this structural transfer and this provision of liquidity on favourable terms that the RRF is expected to support a subset of EU countries in a significant way. Such amounts represent a major relief. If invested shrewdly, they could change the recipient countries' economic fates. They would also improve the overall outlook for the EU, indirectly benefiting countries that are net payers into the scheme.

The upshot is that a clear division of tasks is at work in the EU. States have shouldered most of the immediate response to the lockdown shock, with the help of the ECB's Pandemic Emergency Purchase Programme and, to some extent, of the EU's SURE facility⁷. They also remain in charge of coping with the ensuing demand shock, as the EU has not provided and will not provide meaningful Keynesian stimulus. But the RRF will contribute significantly to the response to the reallocation shock by supporting medium-term oriented measures in less-advanced and hard-hit countries. In these countries, it could be a major help in fostering economic transformation, addressing structural deficiencies, improving economic performance and preventing further divergence from the EU core⁸. For this to happen, the RRF must be designed appropriately.

2 Recover and resilience: a multi-purpose plan

The mechanics of grant allocation under the RRF are by now clear. Amounts available to

that “effective contribution to the green and digital transition shall also be a prerequisite for a positive assessment”. This is a long list in which priorities are not clearly defined. A previous Commission proposal (European Commission, 2020a) and further Commission documents (the Annual Sustainable Growth Strategy 2021 (European Commission, 2020b) and the guidance to member states for the preparation of recovery and resilience plans (European Commission, 2020c) list more or less the same objectives, although with variable categorisation and emphasis.

The 17 September guidance for the preparations of national recovery and resilience plans (European Commission, 2020c) lists four general objectives:

- Promoting the Union’s economic, social and territorial cohesion;
- Strengthening economic and social resilience;
- Mitigating the social and economic impact of the crisis;
- Supporting the green and digital transitions.

In more concrete terms, the guidance document indicates that member states should present plans consisting of a series of “coherent components” composed of reforms and investments. Each bundle of investment and reform will be assessed separately against three main criteria:

- Whether it tackles the country’s priority challenges as outlined in the EU’s country-specific recommendations;
- Whether it is conducive to the digital and green transitions;
- Whether it contributes effectively to the RRF’s overall goals⁹.

These national plans should also meet the requirement that a minimum of 37 percent of expenditure is related to climate and 20 percent to the digital transition.

By adopting this scheme, the EU has aimed to find a compromise between conflicting aims, both vertically and horizontally. Vertically, it intends to leave the initiative to the member states, while ensuring that money is spent in accordance with what is regarded as priority challenges. Horizontally, it intends to make progress towards overall objectives such as the green transition and digitalisation, while addressing country-specific challenges of high unemployment and dismal growth. It has also tried to balance the conflicting objectives of structural transformation and disbursement speed.

These are commendable goals. The question, however, is if the procedures in place give a good chance of reaching them. Clearly, the risk is that the whole process becomes a box-ticking exercise. Having negotiated the total amount of support they are entitled to receive, countries may well regard the EU template as a pointless bureaucratic hassle deprived of substantive content, and either paint their projects with the required colours, or pick and choose those of their existing programmes that have the best chance of meeting the EU criteria. By the same token, trade-offs between objectives may be overlooked and the pan-European dimension may end up being ignored.

⁹ Box on “overarching principles underpinning a component” in Section 1 of Part 2 (European Commission, 2020c).

digitalisation would be conditional on the introduction of coding courses in high school programmes. Let us call this approach *narrow conditionality*¹¹.

This type of conditionality does not start from a superior knowledge of what is good for a given country, but from the conditions that must be met so that money spent with certain goals actually achieves these goals. In this case, the legitimacy of setting conditions is simply that grants are means to aim for certain goals, and that the grant-giver has a responsibility for ensuring that these goals have a good chance of achievement.

The EU has apparently chosen to blend these two solutions. The bundling of EU-financed investments and banking reforms goes in the direction of narrow conditionality, while the reference to the often very macro country-specific recommendations and the requirement that each of the components be assessed against the whole list of EU objectives suggests that a much broader approach will prevail.

There is nothing wrong in trying to combine the two approaches, but this should be done on the basis of an unambiguous definition of where each of them applies. By not choosing between them, the EU is running the risk of relying on an ill-defined method that will complicate serious discussion on national reform plans and increase the risk of content-free box-ticking.

Moreover, the EU should not avoid hard choices. At this stage, because broad conditionality is a political non-starter, and because aggregate monetary entitlements have been defined already, the EU would be well-advised to embrace narrow conditionality explicitly. This would imply inviting member states to structure the components of their recovery and resilience plans around key investments and a parsimonious selection of complementary reforms. Policy dialogue between the EU and the member state would then focus on the composition of these components, that is, on the matching of reforms and investments.

As developed in the next section, such an approach should still leave room for dialogue between the EU and the member states on the overall architecture of the national recovery and resilience programme. But it would avoid overarching controversies over the conditions attached to financial support. To be clear, it would leave no room for making support for digitalisation conditional on a reform of the pension system.

4 Interdependence across objectives and member states

The downside of narrow conditionality is, however, that it risks leaving aside two issues. First, it could fail to address interdependence across objectives. It would not take cross derivatives into account and could therefore result in a suboptimal allocation of means. Concretely, investment and reform in a certain field, say product-market competition, may have significant effects on labour markets that will not be accounted for in an excessively granular approach that focuses on specific objectives and banking conditions¹². This could result in significant shortcomings and a less effective programme.

Second, narrow conditionality would equally miss interdependence across countries. It is well known that the existence of cross-country spillovers results in the suboptimality of

¹¹ The United States has a certain tradition in this respect that goes back at least to the New Deal: the federal government manages an array of *categorical grants* in its *conditionality* of

of EU budget funds to top up support given within the framework of the RRF to projects that have an explicit cross-border dimension. For example, the EU should encourage governments that have indicated an intention to foster the development of hydrogen to devise coordinated strategies, and should provide extra support to member states that engage in joint projects.

Both the cross-sectoral and cross-country aspects should be emphasised by the Commission in the discussion about recovery and resilience plans. These are not domains where the Commission should be afraid of issuing directions. In particular, the Commission has a legitimate role in taking care of the cross-border spillovers that member states naturally fail to consider.

5 Conclusions

Ensuring the success of the RRF is a high-stakes challenge for the EU. Success is by no means guaranteed and the cost of failure would be very high. If the plan succeeds, it will surely pave the way to further initiatives, and perhaps ultimately to a fiscal union alongside the monetary union established two decades ago. But if the RRF fails to deliver on stated goals, if political interests prevail over economic necessity, if the money is wasted, the very legitimacy of EU initiatives will be affected and, for sure, federal aspirations will be dashed for a generation.

Fuzziness over objectives and overloaded procedures can derail the process. But the EU still has time and the means to put things straight. It should:

- Acknowledge and emphasise that the main goal of the RRF is not to contribute to immediate relief or a Keynesian stimulus, but to foster structural transformation, especially in less-advanced and hard-hit member states;
- Abstain from trying to impose through overall policy conditionality its reform agenda on the member states;
- Endorse a narrow-conditionality approach to the design of national recovery and resilience plans and focus for each bundle of investments and reforms on the limited set of policy measures that need to be implemented to maximise the impact of EU-financed investments;
- Address complementarity across objectives through a dialogue with each member state on the sectoral allocation of EU funding and the overall architecture of their recovery and resilience plans;
- Emphasise when relevant the cross-border dimension of investment plans and encourage member states, including through financial incentives, to cooperate on the design and the implementation of their plans

References

- Barrero, J.M. and N. Bloom (2020) 'Economic Uncertainty and the Recovery', mimeo, available at https://nbloom.people.stanford.edu/sites/g/files/sbiybj4746/f/jh_nal.pdf
- Blanchard, O. (2020) 'The COVID economic crisis', in O. Blanchard, *Macroeconomics*, 8th edition, forthcoming
- Blanchard, O. and F. Giavazzi (2003) 'Macroeconomic Effects of Regulation and Deregulation in Goods and Labor Markets', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118 (3): 879-90, available at <https://doi.org/10.1162/00335530360698450>

- Blanchard, O. and J. Pisani-Ferry (2020) 'Monetisation: Do not panic,' *VOXEU*, 10 April, available at <https://voxeu.org/article/monetisation-do-not-panic>
- Congressional Research Service (2019) *Federal Grants to State and Local Governments: A Historical Perspective on Contemporary Issues*, May, available at <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40638.pdf>
- Darvas, Z. (2020) 'The EU's recovery fund proposals: crisis relief with massive redistribution,' *Bruegel Blog*, 17 June, available at <https://www.bruegel.org/2020/06/the-eus-recovery-fund-proposals-crisis-relief-with-massive-redistribution>
- Direction générale du Trésor (2020) *République française: Rapport économique, social et financier 2021*, available at <https://www.tresor.economie.gouv.fr/Articles/2020/10/05/publication-du-rapport-economique-social-et-financier-plf-pour-2021>
- European Commission (2020a) 'Proposal for a Regulation establishing a Recovery and Resilience Facility,' COM(2020) 408 final, available at <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52020PC0408&from=EN>
- European Commission (2020b) 'Annual Sustainable Growth Strategy 2021,' COM(2020) 575 final, available at <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0575&from=en>
- European Commission (2020c) 'Guidance to member states: recovery and resilience plans,' SWD(2020) 205 final, available at https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/3_en_document_travail_service_part1_v3_en_0.pdf
- European Council (2020a) 'Special meeting of the European Council (17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 July 2020) – Conclusions,' available at <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/45109/210720-euco-final-conclusions-en.pdf>
- European Council (2020b) 'Special meeting of the European Council (1 and 2 October 2020) – Conclusions,' available at <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/45910/021020-euco-final-conclusions.pdf>
- Fuest, C., J. Pisani-Ferry (2020) 'Financing the European Union: new context, new responses,' *Policy Contribution* 2020/16, Bruegel, available at <https://www.bruegel.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/PC-16-2020-110920.pdf>
- Giovannini, A., S. Hauptmeier, N. Leiner-Killinger and V. Valenta (2020) 'Fiscal implications of the EU's recovery package,' *ECB Economic Bulletin*, Issue 6/2020, European Central Bank, available at https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/economic-bulletin/focus/2020/html/ecb.ebbox202006_08~7f90a18630.en.html
- Hausmann, R., D. Rodrik and A. Velasco (2005) 'Growth Diagnostics,' mimeo, available at <https://growthlab.cid.harvard.edu/files/growthlab/files/growth-diagnostics.pdf>
- Steil, B. (2019) *The Marshall Plan: Dawn of the Cold War*, Simon & Schuster
- Tabellini, G. and C. Wyplosz (2006) 'Supply-side policy coordination in the European Union,' *Swedish Economic Policy Review* 13 (2006): 101-156, available at <https://www.regeringen.se/49bb57/contentassets/0059ab5b2bf44810ab276f05b5f3164b/guido-tabellini--charles-wyplosz-supply-side-policy-coordination-in-the-european-union>
- Wolpin, G.B. (2020) 'Without good governance, the EU borrowing mechanism to boost the recovery could fail,'
-