UNIVERSITA' CATTOLICA DEL SACRO CUORE MILANO

Dottorato di ricerca in Modelli Quantitativi per la Politica Economica ciclo XIX

S.S.D: SECS-P/01, SECS-P/02, SECS-P/06

LINKING CGE AND MICROSIMULATION MODELS: METHODOLOGICAL AND APPLIED ISSUES

Tesi di Dottorato di: Giulia Colombo

Matricola: 3280098

Anno Accademico 2006/2007



UNIVERSITA' CATTOLICA DEL SACRO CUORE MILANO

Dottorato di ricerca in Modelli Quantitativi per la Politica Economica ciclo XIX S.S.D: SECS-P/01, SECS-P/02, SECS-P/06

LINKING CGE AND MICROSIMULATION MODELS: METHODOLOGICAL AND APPLIED ISSUES

Coordinatore: Ch.mo Prof. Maurizio BAUSSOLA

Firma:_____

Tesi di Dottorato di: Giulia Colombo Matricola: 3280098

Anno Accademico 2006/2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| List of Figures | page viii |
|-----------------|-----------|
| List of Tables | page ix |

| Abstract | page xiii |
|-----------|-----------|
| Riassunto | page xv |

| Acknowledgementspage xv | [,] ii |
|-------------------------|-----------------|
|-------------------------|-----------------|

| INTRODUCTION | page 1 |
|--------------|--------|

CHAPTER 1 - CGE MODELS AND MICROSIMULATION TECHNIQUES

| page 9 | 1. INTRODUCTION |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| LATION MODELSpage 13 | 2. INTRODUCTION TO MICROSIN |
| page 26 | 2.1. Behavioural Models |
| page 39 | 2.2. Static vs Dynamic Models. |
| page 42 | 2.3. Conclusions |

| 3. LINKING MICROSIMULATION AND CGE MODELSpage 43 |
|---|
| 3.1. The Integrated Approachpage 44 |
| 3.2. The Top-Down Approachpage 54 |
| 3.3. The Top-Down/Bottom-Up (TD/BU) Approachpage 60 |
| 3.4. Conclusionspage 65 |
| 4. CONCLUSIONpage 68 |

CHAPTER 2 - LINKING CGE AND MICROSIMULATION MODELS: A COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT APPROACHES

| 1. INTRODUCTION | page 73 |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| 2. THE INTEGRATED APPROACH | page 75 |
| 3. THE TOP-DOWN APPROACH | page 77 |
| 3.1. The Microsimulation Model | page 78 |
| 3.2. The CGE Model | page 88 |
| 3.3. Linking the Models | page 93 |
| 4. THE TOP-DOWN/BOTTOM-UP APPROACH | page 96 |
| 5. SIMULATION | page 97 |
| 5.1. More on the TD/BU Approach | page 101 |
| 6. CONCLUSION | page 109 |

CHAPTER 3 - THE EFFECTS OF DR-CAFTA IN NICARAGUA: A CGE-MS MODEL FOR POVERTY AND INEQUALITY ANALYSIS

| 1. INTRODUCTIONpage 117 |
|--|
| 2. THE MODELpage 120 |
| 2.1. The Microsimulation Modelpage 120 |
| 2.2. The CGE Modelpage 130 |
| 2.3. Linking The Two Modelspage 131 |
| 3. SIMULATION AND RESULTSpage 133 |
| 4. CONCLUSIONpage 149 |

| | CONCLUSIONpage 1 | 151 |
|--|------------------|-----|
|--|------------------|-----|

APPENDICES

| Appendix A - Some Inequality and Poverty Indices | .page 161 |
|---|-----------|
| Appendix B – Structure of Production and Foreign Sector | .page 167 |

| BIBLIOGRAPHYpage 16 | 59 |
|---------------------|----|
|---------------------|----|

List of Figures

Chapter 1

| 2. | Figure 1 – An Arithmetical Model of a Tax-Benefit Systempag | ge 15 |
|------|---|-------|
| 2. | Figure 2 – Stratification and Samplingpag | ge 19 |
| 3.1. | Figure 3 – Integrated CGE-MS Modelspag | ge 45 |
| 1.1. | Figure 4 – The Top-Down Approachpag | ge 55 |
| 1.2. | Figure 5 – The Top-Down/Bottom-Up Approachpag | ge 61 |
| 1.3. | Figure 6 – The Top-Down/Bottom-Up Approachpag | ge 62 |

Conclusion

| Figure 1 – CGE and Microsimulation Models | page | 152 |
|--|------|-----|
| Figure 2 – Linking CGE and MS Models: Three Different Approaches | page | 155 |

Appendix A

| Figure A.1 – Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficientpage | 162 |
|--|-----|
|--|-----|

Appendix B

| Figure B.1 | – The Structure of | f Production and | the Foreign | Sector | 167 |
|------------|---|------------------|-------------|--------|---------|
| | 1110 0010000000000000000000000000000000 | | | | 101 |

List of Tables

Chapter 1

| 3. | Table 1 – Stratification and Sampling: an Examplepage 18 |
|------|--|
| 3.1. | Table 2 – Household Survey, an Examplepage 48 |
| 3.1. | Table 3 – Adult Equivalents and Sample Weightspage 48 |
| 3.1. | Table 4 – Per-capita Per-Adult Equivalent Valuepage 48 |
| 3.1. | Table 5 – Weighted (Population Values) Household Surveypage 48 |
| 3.1. | Table 6 – Original SAM of the Economypage 49 |
| 3.1. | Table 7 – Re-Balanced SAM with Five Householdspage 50 |
| 3.1. | Table 8 – CGE Model Equationspage 52 |
| 3.2. | Table 9 – MS Model Equationspage 57 |
| 3.4. | Table 10 – Changes in Some Macroeconomic Variablespage 67 |
| 3.4. | Table 11 – Some Inequality Indices on Disposable Incomepage 67 |

Chapter 2

| 3.1. | Table 1 – Direct Income Tax Ratespage 82 |
|------|--|
| 3.1. | Table 2 – Heckman Selection Model, Two-Step Estimatespage 85 |
| 3.1. | Table 3 – Binary Logit Model for Labour Status' Choicepage 87 |
| 3.2. | Table 4 – SAM of the Economypage 89 |
| 3.2. | Table 5 – Values of Parameters for CGE Modelpage 90 |
| 3.2. | Table 6 – Equations for the CGE Modelpage 91 |
| 5. | Table 7 – Simulation Results: Percentage Changes (CGE Model)page 99 |
| 5. | Table 8 – Simulation Results: Percentage Changes (CGE Model)page 99 |
| 5. | Table 9 – Inequality Indices on Disposable Income (MS Model)page 101 |
| 5. | Table 10 – Poverty Indices on Disposable Income (MS Model)page 101 |
| 5.1. | Table 11 – SAM of the Economy consistent with the Household Surveypage 102 |
| 5.1. | Table 12 – Simulation Results with Consistent Data: Percentage Changespage 103 |
| 5.1. | Table 13 – Simulation Results with Consistent Data: Percentage Changespage 104 |
| 5.1. | Table 14 – TD/BU-C&LS approach with consistent data (CGE Model)page 105 |

| page 107 | Table 15 – Simulation Results TD/BU Approach (CGE Model) | 5.1. |
|----------|---|------|
| page 108 | Table 16 – Simulation Results TD/BU Approach (CGE Model). | 5.1. |
| page 108 | Table 17 – Simulation Results TD/BU Approach (MS Model) | 5.1. |
| page 109 | Table 18 – Inequality Indices on Disposable Income (MS Model) | 5.1. |
| page 109 | Table 19 – Poverty Indices on Disposable Income (MS Model) | 5.1. |

Chapter 3

| 2.1. Table 1 - Estimation results, Heckman selection model for labour income (low- |
|---|
| skilled wage workers, women)page 124 |
| 2.1. Table 2 - Estimation results, Heckman selection model for labour income (high- |
| skilled self-employed, men)page 125 |
| 2.1. Table 3 – Estimation results, multinomial model, household heads (RRR)page 127 |
| 2.1. Table 4 – Estimation results, multinomial model, spouses (RRR)page 128 |
| 2.1. Table 5 – Estimation results, multinomial model, other members (RRR)page 129 |
| 3. Table 6 - Tariff change in the first five years after the introduction of DR- |
| CAFTApage 134 |
| 3. Table 7 - Simulation results, macroeconomic variables, elasticity of substitution for |
| labour inputs 0.3page 135 |
| 3. Table 8 - Simulation results, sectoral changes (elasticity of substitution for labour |
| inputs 0.3)page 136 |
| 3. Table 9 - Simulation results, employment and wage rate changes, household income |
| and consumption levels, elasticity of substitution for labour inputs |
| 0.3page 137 |
| 3. Table 10 - Simulation results, macroeconomic changes (elasticity of substitution for |
| labour inputs 0.7)page 138 |
| 3. Table 11 - Simulation results, sectoral changes (elasticity of substitution for labour |
| inputs 0.7)page 139 |
| 3. Table 12 - Simulation results, employment and wage rate changes, household income |
| and consumption levels, elasticity of substitution for labour inputs |
| 0.7page 140 |

- 3. Table 13 Simulation results, macroeconomic variables, elasticity of substitution for labour inputs equal to value added aggregation sectoral elasticities......page 141
- Table 14 Simulation results, sectoral changes, elasticity of substitution for labour inputs equal to value added aggregation sectoral elasticities......page 142
- 3. Table 15 Simulation results, employment and wage rate changes, household income and consumption levels, elasticity of substitution for labour inputs equal to value added aggregation sectoral elasticities......page 143
- 3. Table 16 Microeconomic results, income distribution and poverty changes (elasticity of substitution for labour inputs 0.3).....page 144
- 3. Table 17 Microeconomic results, income distribution and poverty changes (elasticity of substitution for labour inputs 0.7).....page 145
- Table 18 Microeconomic results, income distribution and poverty changes (elasticity of substitution for labour inputs equal to value added aggregation sectoral elasticities)......page 146

ABSTRACT

After an introduction to CGE (Computable General Equilibrium) models and to Microsimulation techniques, this thesis wants to give an assessment and a detailed description of how CGE and MS models can be linked together, taking inspiration from the current literature, with a special focus concerning the literature on developing countries. The main goal for which these two models are linked together is to try to take into account full agents' heterogeneity and the complexity of income distribution, while being able at the same time to consider the macroeconomic effects of the policy reforms. In current literature there are two main trends in the approach to linking: one that tries to

fully integrate the two models, or better the CGE model and a micro dataset or survey (integrated model), while the other develops separately the CGE and the microsimulation models and then links them together through a set of equations and parameters (layered models). We will make a detailed comparison of the two approaches.

In the last chapter, we build a CGE-microsimulation model for the economy of Nicaragua, following the Top-Down approach (see Bourguignon *et al.*, 2003), that is, the reform is simulated first at the macro level with the CGE model, and then it is passed onto the microsimulation model through a vector of changes in some chosen variables, such as prices, wage rates, and unemployment levels. The main reason for this choice is that with such an approach, one can develop the two models (CGE and microsimulation) separately, thus being able to make use of behavioural micro-econometric equations, which are instead of more difficult introduction into a fully integrated model. Moreover, the so called top-down approach appears to be particularly suited to the policy reform we are willing to simulate with the model: the Free Trade Agreement of Central America with the USA is mainly a macroeconomic reform, which on the other hand can have important effects on the distribution of income deriving from the Free Trade Agreement with USA. Our analysis finds only small changes both in the main macroeconomic variables and in the distribution of income and poverty indices.

RIASSUNTO

Dopo aver introdotto i modelli CGE (Computable General Equilibrium, Equilibrio Generale Computazionale) e le tecniche di microsimulazione, questa tesi offre una descrizione dettagliata di come i modelli CGE ed i modelli di microsimulazione possano essere utilizzati congiuntamente, partendo dalla letteratura piú recente sull'argomento, e focalizzando in particolare l'attenzione sulla letteratura riguardante i paesi in via di sviluppo. Lo scopo principale dell'utilizzo di questi due modelli in maniera congiunta é quello di voler tenere in considerazione l'eterogeneitá degli agenti economici e la complessitá della distribuzione del reddito, e di essere in grado allo stesso tempo di valutare gli effetti macroeconomici delle riforme.

Nella letteratura attuale troviamo due tendenze principali: la prima cerca di integrare completamente i due modelli, o meglio il modello CGE ed il dataset microeconomico (modello integrato), mentre la seconda sviluppa separatamente i due modelli per poi collegarli attraverso un insieme di equazioni e di parametri (modelli stratificati). Eseguiremo un confronto dettagliato dei due approcci sopra descritti.

Nell'ultimo capitolo costruiremo un modello CGE-microsimulazione per l'economia del Nicaragua, seguendo l'approccio cosiddetto Top-Down (si veda Bourguinon et al., 2003) che simula la riforma dapprima ad un livello macro con il modello CGE, e poi passa i risultati di questo al modello di microsimulazione attraverso un vettore di variazioni di prezzi, salari e livello di disoccupazione. La ragione principale per la quale è stato scelto questo approccio è che grazie ad esso è possibile sviluppare i due modelli separatamente, potendo cosí fare libero uso di equazioni comportamentali che sarebbero invece di difficile implementazione in un modello pienamente integrato. Inoltre, l'approccio Top-Down è particolarmente adatto alla riforma di politica economica che vogliamo simulare con il modello: l'accordo di libero scambio commerciale tra i paesi dell'America Centrale e gli Stati Uniti è una riforma di tipo macroeconomico, che potrebbe tuttavia avere effetti significativi sulla distribuzione del reddito. Con questo modello proveremo infatti ad analizzare gli effetti derivanti dall'accordo commerciale con gli Stati Uniti sulla distribuzione del reddito. I risultati dell'analisi dimostreranno che tale accordo commerciale porterá soltanto a piccole variazioni sia delle principali variabili macroeconomiche che della distribuzione del reddito e degli indici di povertá.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the Catholic University of Milan for financing my Ph.D. studies, of which this thesis is the main result, and also the Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW) of Mannheim for giving me the opportunity to ultimate my work.

I am also grateful to all my colleagues at the ZEW for their nice support, in particular to Stefan Boeters (CPB, Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis, The Hague) for his invaluable help and sound advice and to Nicole Guertzgen (ZEW) for her precious suggestions.

Acknowledgements are due in particular to ma supervisor Marco Missaglia, to whom I owe a lot for his constant encouragement and patient supervision, and to all the Professors who held the courses in Piacenza during the first Ph.D. year, for making their expertise available.

Sincere thanks also to Paola, Vega, Laura, Lisa and Raffaele for having shared these years of intense but constructive work, life, fun and friendship.

I would also like to express my gratitude to all the colleagues who participated at the 16th IIOA Conference in Istanbul, those who attended the 1st IMA Conference in Vienna and the ones who were in Toulouse at the 4th ESSA Conference for their helpful comments.

I am particularly indebted to Marco Vinicio Sánchez Cantillo (United Nations, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, Social Development Unit, ECLAC Subregional Headquarters in Mexico) and Rob Vos (United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division of Politics and Development Analysis, and Affiliated Professor of Finance and Development at the Institute of Social Studies, The Hague), who kindly supplied me with the Social Accounting Matrix for Nicaragua for the year 2000, and to the "Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos" of Nicaragua and The World Bank (Poverty and Human Resources Development Research Group, LSMS Data) for making the household survey of Nicaragua ("Encuesta Nacional de Hogares sobre Medición de Nivel de Vida", EMNV 2001) available.

Special thanks go also to my family: Fabio, mamma, papá, nonna, my brothers Luigi and Matteo and "sister" Valeria for their never-ending support.

Without the help of all these people I would have never managed neither to finish nor to start this thesis. All the mistakes and errors that eventually appear in this work are just my responsibility.

Giulia Colombo

INTRODUCTION

Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) models are multi-sector numerical models based on concepts associated with Walrasian general equilibrium theory. They are designed to analyze the effects of policy reforms or of economic shocks on the economy in a national, multi-national or global economy. Major fields of application include fiscal policy and optimal taxation, trade policy and international trade regimes, income distribution, sector development, and the economic impact of technological change. In addition, CGE models have been fruitfully used for analyses of environmental and natural resource problems and policies¹. CGE models have proved to be useful instruments for studying the effects of a reform or of a shock on the whole economy, especially when a simultaneous change of more than one parameter is necessary. Anyway, one of the limits of CGE models is that, as they generally follow the representative household approach, they are often unable to capture within-group inequality and some specific individual agents' behaviour. This is particularly important when we want to carry on income inequality and poverty analysis².

¹ The earliest CGE models of developing countries were designed to examine issues of income distribution. Adelman and Robinson (1978) analysed the case of South Korea, and Lysy and Taylor (1980) built a model for Brazil. For applications concerning optimal taxation, see for instance Ballard *et al.* (1985) and Ballard and Medema (1993). CGE models about trade policies are very numerous. For example, on the occasion of the negotiations for the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) among the United States, Canada and Mexico (1993), there appeared several studies relying on CGE models, surveyed by Brown (1992). CGE on environmental issues include measurements of intergenerational and multisectoral effects of policies such as cutting tolerated toxic emissions levels, raising green taxes, etc. See for example Bohringer and Rutherford (1997), Rutherford (2000) and Bohringer *et al.* (2000 and 2003).

² After Mookherjee and Shorrocks' (1982) study of UK, there are now other examples of "within/between" decomposition analysis of changes in inequality that indicate that changes in overall inequality are usually due at least as much to changes in within-group inequality as to changes in the between-group component. Among the applications to developing countries, see Ahuja *et al.* (1997), who applied this decomposition analysis to the case of Thailand, and Ferreira and Litchfield (2001) for Brazil.

Microsimulation (MS) models are instead tools that allow the simulation of the effects of a policy on a sample of economic agents (individual, households, firms) at the individual level. Usually, MS models are based on two fundamental elements: a micro dataset containing the economic and socio-demographic characteristics of a sample of individuals or households (household surveys), and the rules of the policies to be simulated, and especially their impact on the budget constraint faced by each agent. Their field of application ranges among the ones included in the broader area of redistribution policies: indirect and direct taxation, social security system reforms, etc.

Microsimulation (MS) techniques are accurate instruments for studying the effects on individual behaviour (such as labour supply or consumption) of a change in the taxbenefit system at a very detailed level. In this respect, microsimulation models are very useful and precise when studying income distribution and poverty issues, as they work at the level of the individual or of the single household. However, the main drawback of these models is that they are just a partial equilibrium analysis, and they are not able to capture the general equilibrium impact of a reform. However this could be significant in the case we are analysing a reform or a shock that could have important effects on the structure of the economy under study.

In principle, the idea of linking CGE and MS models looks as the best solution to overcome the limits of both models, as they are somehow complementary. The CGE model will provide the macro structure of the economy, while the MS model is providing a detailed micro dataset at the individual and household level. This way, the new modelling tool resulting from the link of the two models should be able to consider full agents' heterogeneity and general equilibrium effects at the same time. In particular, recent literature has focused on the possibility of combining these two types of models in order to account simultaneously for structural changes of the economy, general equilibrium effects of economic policies, and for their impacts on households' welfare, income distribution and poverty³. This way, the modeller will be able to implement

³ The literature that follows this approach is quite flourishing in recent years: there are, among others, the important contributions by Decaluwé *et al.* (1999a) and (1999b), Cogneau and Robilliard (2000), Agénor *et al.* (2001), Cockburn (2001), Cogneau (2001), Bourguignon, Robilliard and Robinson (2003), Boccanfuso *et al.* (2003a) and Savard (2003).

structural or macroeconomic policies/shocks while taking into account their effects on microeconomic behaviour (at the individual or household level).

This thesis wants to give an assessment and a detailed description of how CGE and MS models can be linked together, taking inspiration from the current literature (with a special focus concerning the literature on developing countries).

In particular, one could think of introducing thousands of individuals/households taken from a household survey directly into the CGE model. We will call this an integrated approach. Another way would be to develop the two models separately, and then link them in a layered fashion through a vector of changes in some important variables (prices and/or quantities). Of course the main disadvantage or drawback of this approach is that it requires much more time and effort in the building of the entire model, as one has to go through two completely different modelling techniques and two different databases, the national accounts and the household survey.

But a question arises at this point: in which direction should go the link? Or better, should the link be in one direction only (for instance, from the macro onto the micro level of analysis), or the feedback effects (from the micro to the macro level) are also important for the final general equilibrium results?

In this work we will make a first attempt in trying to answer to some of these questions, and we will compare the three main approaches used in the literature to link CGE and MS models: the integrated approach, which uses thousands of households as agents in a standard CGE framework; the so called Top-Down approach, which imposes the results of a CGE model onto the microsimulation model, and draws from the latter poverty and inequality analysis; the Top-Down/Bottom-Up (TD/BU) approach, as it was developed by Savard (2003). This approach, after the injection of macroeconomic changes from the CGE onto the MS model, tries to take into account also the feedback effects from the micro to the macro level of analysis.

In linking these two types of models we encounter several difficulties, one of which is of course the problem of data inconsistency between the two datasets. This problem is openly faced by modellers that build integrated models, through the so-called "data reconciliation process", but has not been treated so far in the other two approaches. This will be of particular relevance for the TD/BU approach.

In general, however, when building such models one has also to take into account other possible advantages and drawbacks of the various approaches: for instance, the layered approach requires time and effort in the building of the entire model, as one has to go through two different modelling techniques and two different databases. On the other side, one of the main advantages of the integrated approach is its simplicity and easiness of implementation. Its easiness allows what is instead still missing in the framework of a layered approach: dynamics. Indeed, while with integrated models dynamics is already introduced in a few examples⁴, one of the main things still missing up to now in a layered framework is a dynamic featuring, which in the future will need further effort⁵.

The work is organized as follows.

In the **first chapter**, after an introduction to microsimulation techniques, we will give a technical and detailed overview on how to link CGE to microsimulation models, describing in detail the practical implementation of the three main approaches cited above.

In the **second chapter** we investigate further the three approaches, and build three models for the same economy to compare and investigate results from the three different models. We will go in special detail with the TD/BU approach and draw some conclusions on its possible drawbacks. We will also propose an alternative way of taking into account feedback effects from the micro to the macro level of analysis.

Finally, in the **last chapter**, we will apply the technique to a real economy: we will study the effects that the introduction of the Free Trade Agreement of Central America with USA will have on poverty and inequality in Nicaragua. For this we have built a CGE-MS model for the Nicaraguan economy using a Top-Down approach. We will analyse both the macroeconomic effects and the changes in poverty and inequality that will take place after the introduction of the Treaty in Nicaragua.

⁴ See for instance the integrated dynamic model of Annabi *et al.* (2005) for Senegal, and the model for Philippines developed by Corong (2005). Other information about this approach can be found in Cockburn and Decaluwé (2006).

⁵ A first attempt in this direction was made by Bibi and Chatti (2006) with their dynamic layered model for Tunisia.