

# *On Efficient Distribution with Private Information*

Andrew Atkeson and Robert E. Lucas Jr.

## Objectives and Results

---

- Characterize efficient distribution of consumption when agents have private idiosyncratic taste shocks in a closed economy.
- Examine whether decentralization of the efficient allocation is possible in this setting

### Results

- Immiseration result of Thomas and Worrall (1990) carries over to closed economy
- Full decentralization not possible, however, a "component planners" decentralization is achievable.

## Environment

**Demographics** Continuum of consumers, indexed by their initial expected utility entitlements,  $w$ .

**Preferences**  $E(1 - \beta) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t V(c_t) \theta_t$   
 $V : R \rightarrow D$  continuous with  $V' > 0, V'' < 0$

**Individual Taste Shocks**  $\theta_t \in \Theta = \{\theta^1 \dots \theta^n\}$ ,  $\theta$  iid  
 $\mu(\theta_t) > 0 \forall \theta_t$  and  $E(\theta) = 1$   
 $\Theta^t, \mu^t$ : relevant product space and probability measure

**Utility Cost**  $C : D \rightarrow R$ ,  $C(v)$  consumption needed to deliver utility  $(1 - \beta)v$ , before taste shock.

## Strategies and Plans

- A **reporting strategy** is a sequence of functions,  $z = \{z_t(\theta^t)\}$ , where  $z_t(\theta^t)$  is an agent's report of his taste shock at  $t$
- A **truthful reporting strategy** is  $z_t^*(\theta^t) = \theta_t$
- A **plan** is a sequence of functions,  $\{u_t(w, z^t)\}$  which deliver time  $t$  utility  $(1 - \beta)u_t(w, z^t)\theta_t$  to an agent  $w$  with reporting strategy,  $z_t(\theta^t)$
- Let  $U(w, u, z) = (1 - \beta)E \sum \beta^t u_t[w, z^t(\theta^t)]\theta_t$

## Allocations and Attainability

- An **allocation** is a plan that satisfies:
  1.  $U(w, u, z^*) \geq U(w, u, z) \quad \forall w, z$  (IC)
  2.  $U(w, u, z^*) = w$  (PK)

Let  $\psi$  be a distribution of promised utilities.

- An allocation **attains**  $\psi$  **with resources**  $y$  if

$$\int_{D \times \Theta^t} C[u_t(w, \theta^t)] d\mu^t d\psi \leq y \quad \forall t$$

## Planning Problem

- For a given  $\psi$ , find  $\varphi^*(\psi)$ , the minimum constant resources needed to attain that distribution with some (incentive compatible) allocation:

$$\varphi^*(\psi) = \inf\{y : \exists \text{ allocation } u \text{ that attains } \psi \text{ with resources } y\}$$

- An allocation is **efficient** if it attains a distribution,  $\psi$ , with resources,  $\varphi(\psi)$

## Equivalent Recursive Representation

- An **allocation rule** is a sequence of pairs of functions,  $\{f_t, g_t\}$  that give current utility and a future promised value as functions of current promised value  $w$ , and report,  $z_t$ :

$$u_t = f_t(w_t, z_t)$$

$$w_{t+1} = g_t(w_t, z_t)$$

such that:

1.  $(1 - \beta)f_t(w, \theta)\theta + \beta g_t(w, \theta) \geq (1 - \beta)f_t(w, \hat{\theta})\theta + \beta g_t(w, \hat{\theta})$   
 $\forall \hat{\theta} \in \Theta$  (IC)
  2.  $\int_{\theta} [(1 - \beta)f_t(w, \theta)\theta + \beta g_t(w, \theta)] d\mu = w$  (PK)
- Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2:  $\exists$  an allocation,  $u$ , that attains  $\psi$  with resources,  $y$  iff  $\exists$  an allocation rule,  $f, g$ , that attains  $\psi$  with resources  $y$
  - Let  $S_g\psi$  be distribution of  $w$  induced by  $g$ .

## A Bellman Equation

$$\varphi^{f,g}(\psi) = \max \left\{ \int_{D \times \Theta} C[f(w, \theta)] d\mu d\psi \quad ; \quad \varphi^{f,g}(S_g \psi) \right\}$$

$$\varphi^*(\psi) = \inf_{f,g} \max \left\{ \int_{D \times \Theta} C[f(w, \theta)] d\mu d\psi \quad ; \quad \varphi^*(S_g \psi) \right\}$$

subject to (IC) and (PK)

**Lemma 4.2: a strategy for finding a solution** If there exists two functions,  $\varphi_c$ , and  $\varphi_a$ , such that for all  $\psi$ :

1.  $\varphi_c \leq \varphi^* \leq \varphi_a$
2.  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T^n \varphi_c = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T^n \varphi_a = \varphi$

then  $\varphi^* = \varphi$



# Upper and Lower Bounds

---

## Autarky

- constant consumption level regardless of taste shock, such that utility  $w$  is delivered:

$$\varphi_a(\psi) = \int_w C(w) d\psi$$

- trivially incentive compatible so  $\varphi_a(\psi) \geq \varphi^*(\psi) \quad \forall \psi$

## Full Insurance

- constant utility level regardless of taste shock, so that agent is fully insured.
- not incentive compatible but the IC allocation that gives  $\varphi^*$  is feasible for this problem so  $\varphi_c(\psi) \leq \varphi^*(\psi) \quad \forall \psi$

## Solution

- Solutions only characterized for log, CARA and CRRA utility.
- With  $V(c) = \log c$ , solution has the form:

$$f(w, \theta) = r(\theta) + w$$

$$g(w, \theta) = h(\theta) + w$$

- Iterating yields

$$w_{t+1} = w_t + h(\theta)$$

$$\text{Var}(u_t) = \text{Var}(w_0) + (t - 1)\text{Var}(h(\theta)) + \text{Var}(r(\theta))$$

## Immiseration

---

- $E(h(\theta)) < 0 \rightarrow E[w_t + 1|w_t] < w_t$ :
- Sub-martingale convergence theorem, utility drifts towards  $-\infty$
- Expected consumption remains constant, variance of consumption is increasing without bound, concave utility must imply that expected utility is decreasing without bound
- Result holds for log of utility in CRRA and CARA case.

## Possibilities for Decentralization

---

1. A Component Planner Decentralization:
  - 1 planner per initial utility level  $w_0$
  - Planners take price sequence  $q_t$  as given
  - Each planner delivers an incentive compatible sequence of utilities to his agent to minimize cost given prices
  - Total resources is  $\varphi^*(\psi_0)$  i.e. allocation is efficient
2. Full Decentralization with unmonitored bond trading is not possible