# Econ712 - PS7

Consider a two period economy with an unit measure of households. In period 1, households are endowed with  $w_1$  units of consumption. In period 2, each household either receives endowment  $w_h$  with idiosyncratic probability  $\pi$ , or  $w_l$  with probability  $1 - \pi$ . Assume  $w_1 > w_h > w_l$ . There is a perfect savings technology (s units of goods saved today return s units of goods tomorrow). Households have log preferences over consumption and do not discount future consumption:  $U(c_1, c_2) = \log c_1 + \log c_2$ . Households maximize their expected utility.

#### 1 Planner's problem

- 1. Setup the planner's problem, assuming the planner weighs everyone equally
- 2. Solve for the planner's optimal allocation. Are the allocation realization dependent, i.e. do they differ depending on households' period 2 endowments?

## 2 Complete markets

Assume that households can trade an asset q that pays out only if their second period endowment is  $w_h$ . That is, if they buy one unit of the asset at price p in period 1, they get one unit of goods in period 2 iff their endowment is  $w_h$ .

- 1. Setup and solve for the household problem
- 2. Define and solve for the competitive equilibrium
- 3. Compare the allocation you just found to the planner's allocation. Give intuition as to why they are similar/different
- 4. How would your answers to this part change if, instead of the asset only paying out if second period endowment is  $w_h$ , the asset only pays out if second period endowment is  $w_l$ ?

### 3 Incomplete markets

Assume that households cannot make contracts with each other.

- 1. Setup and solve for the household problem
- 2. Compare the allocation you just found to the planner's allocation. Give intuition as to why they are similar/different
- 3. Suppose there was a government that could impose taxes/transfers to agents at different rates. That is, they could impose taxes/transfers  $T_h, T_l$  to agents with  $w_h, w_l$  respectively. Can the planner's allocation be implemented in this environment?

### 4 Private information

Now suppose that the government in (3.3) above is the sole agent with access to the savings technology (hence they could also impose taxes/transfers  $T_1$  in period 1). However, the government cannot observe which households have  $w_h$  and which have  $w_l$ , and have to rely on households' statement of their income. That is, if a household declare that they have  $w_h$  ( $w_l$ ) in period 2, they get  $T_h$  ( $T_l$ ).

- 1. Suppose that households are really morally strict and can only tell the truth. Can the planner's allocation be implemented in this environment? If so derive the taxes/transfers scheme
- 2. Suppose that households can lie (ie declare  $w_h$  even when they have  $w_l$ )
  - (a) What are the incentive compatibility constraints in this case? (Hint: In words, the constraint states that telling the truth gives higher utility than lying)
  - (b) Does scheme in (4.1) satisfy the incentive compatibility constraints?