

Structural budget balances in EU Member States

Structural budget balances play an important role in the fiscal policy frameworks of the EU both as part of the application of the Stability and Growth Pact (SGP) and in the implementation of the balanced budget rule by the contracting parties of the intergovernmental Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the EMU (the fiscal section of the Treaty is called “Fiscal Compact”).

This document provides a short overview of the concept and application of the structural balance rule(s) in the EU. It will be regularly updated, in particular, the annex that shows progress made (based on the latest Commission forecast) by Member States in reaching their structural budget commitments under the preventive arm of the SGP.

The objective and role of structural budget positions

The structural budget positions (see definition in Box 1) are core elements of the surveillance of the budgetary policies of the Member States of the EU. Structural budget positions are used in:

- The medium term objectives (MTO) and related fiscal efforts (and assessments) under the preventive arm of the SGP;
- The fiscal effort recommendations and assessments under the Excessive Deficit Procedure (EDP);
- The balanced budget rule included in the so-called “Fiscal Compact” (see Box 2).

This document focuses on the role of the MTO, as it represents the country-specific budgetary objective defined in **structural terms** that each Member State should achieve in accordance with the preventive arm of the SGP. In particular, these provisions (included in [Regulation](#)

Box 1: Structural budget balances

The structural budget balance is a **nominal budget balance adjusted by the cyclical component and net of one-off and temporary measures**. In line with the methodology used in the SGP, the cyclical component of the budget is subtracted from the actual budget balance. The cyclical component is calculated as the product of the output gap (difference between actual and potential GDP as percent of potential GDP) and a parameter reflecting the automatic reaction of the government balance to an output gap change.

This cyclically adjusted budget balance corresponds to a budget balance prevailing if the economy was running at its full potential.

As it is based on estimates of the potential output, the structural balance is vulnerable to uncertainty and revisions (see separate [EGOV note](#)).



[1466/97](#) and the [Code of Conduct](#) on the implementation of the SGP) stipulate that each Member State must **have a differentiated MTO for its budgetary position** which shall fulfil the following criteria:

- ensure safety margin so that the nominal 3 % of GDP deficit target would not be triggered in bad economic times;
- ensure the sustainability of public finances (taking into account among other issues any increase in age related expenditure), while allowing room for budgetary manoeuvre, in particular for public investment; it also means that it should be consistent with the so-called debt reduction benchmark, if the debt ratio is higher than 60% of GDP.
- be close to balance or in surplus ([Euro Area](#) and [ERM2](#) Member States must have a MTO that corresponds to at least -1% of potential GDP and signatories of the TSCG of a least -0,5 % of potential GDP (see Box 2).

Box 2: The Fiscal Compact

The [Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the EMU](#) includes a requirement on the contracting parties to enshrine a balanced budget rule (similarly to the “Medium-term objective” in EU law) with 0,5% GDP as the lowest limit of structural deficit (if public debt is significantly lower than 60% of GDP, this lower limit is set at 1% of GDP) into national law, preferably at constitutional level. Member States may bring proceedings against other Member States before the Court of Justice of the EU in case non-transposition. The Contracting Parties shall ensure rapid convergence towards their respective MTO. Article 3 of the Treaty also stipulates that “*progress towards, and respect of, the medium-term objective shall be evaluated on the basis of an overall assessment with the structural balance as a reference, including an analysis of expenditure net of discretionary revenue measures, in line with the revised SGP*”.

The Commission provides in this respect regularly to the Member States so-called “minimum MTOs” on the basis of the above criteria and the methodology detailed in [Code of Conduct](#) on the SGP implementation (see also below section on the updates of MTOs) in order that Member States take these into account when they prepare their stability and convergence Programmes.

By setting a budgetary target in structural terms (i.e. a MTO) in the preventive arm of the SGP (and in the balanced budget rule of the “Fiscal Compact”), the main objective is to ensure that the underlying fiscal position of Member States is **conducive to fiscal sustainability, while allowing for the free operation of the automatic stabilisers** over the economic cycle (see also Box 1).

Member States, which have not yet achieved their MTO, should **improve their structural balance by 0.5% of potential GDP per year as a benchmark** (more in ‘good times’ and less in ‘bad times’). The Commission has specified in a Communication of January 2015 entitled ‘[Making the best use of flexibility within the existing rules of the SGP](#)’ that it applies a matrix specifying the ‘good times’ and ‘bad times’ and the corresponding appropriate fiscal adjustments.

Regulation (EC) 1466/97 specifies how a **deviation** from the MTO or the adjustment path towards it will be measured. More specifically, the Regulation states that: “*A deviation from the MTO or from the appropriate path towards it shall be evaluated on the basis of an overall assessment with the structural balance as the reference, including an analysis of the expenditure net of discretionary revenue measures*”.

Temporary deviations from the MTO or the adjustment path towards the MTO may be allowed in cases of:

1. *major structural reforms* (e.g. pension reforms), including certain public investments (see above mentioned Communication on the flexibility in the SGP);
2. an *unusual event outside the control of the Member State concerned* which has a major impact on the financial position of the government: and/or
3. in periods of severe economic downturn for the euro area or the Union as a whole.

The current SGP rules also include an **expenditure benchmark**, notably in the preventive arm, according to which growth of public expenditure (net of discretionary revenue measures and other factors) has to be lower than medium-term potential GDP growth for countries that have not reached their MTO. It serves as a second indicator to measure the fiscal effort taken by the Member States in respect of their obligations under the SGP. Today, the assessment (in judging progress towards or remaining at the MTO) by the Commission is based on both the structural budget balance and the expenditure benchmark. The table in the annex of this document focuses only on the **projected structural balance** developments **vis-à-vis the latest Council recommendations under the SGP** issued to the Member States in the preventive arm.

The assessment by the Commission of the SCPs during each spring (and also of the Draft Budgetary Plans for euro area Member States during the autumn) evaluates the overall compliance of the Member State with the latest Council recommendations. Based on these assessments, the Commission may reach a conclusion of compliance, (some) deviation or significant deviation. For the ex ante assessment, the latter refers to a risk of a significant deviation based on the Member State's plans and the Commission forecast; for the ex post assessment (which is based on observed data as available in spring of year t+1), it triggers the procedural steps set out under Article 121(4) TFEU (hereafter Significant Deviation Procedure).

As defined in Articles 6(3) and 10(3) of Regulation (EC) 1466/97, the assessment of whether the deviation from the MTO or the adjustment towards the MTO is significant shall, in particular, include the following criteria:

- (a) for a Member State that has not reached the MTO: A significant deviation is defined as a deviation of at least 0.5% of GDP in a single year or at least 0.25% of GDP on average per year in two consecutive years;
- (b) when assessing expenditure developments net of discretionary revenue measures: The deviation is significant if it has a total impact on the government balance of at least 0.5% of GDP in a single year or cumulatively in two consecutive years.

Where a conclusion of overall significant deviation is reached based on an overall assessment and on validated data, it triggers a Significant Deviation Procedure, which starts with a Commission warning to the Member State in question and can lead to an interest-bearing deposit being required, for euro area Member States. On 16 June 2017 the Council adopted a [recommendation](#) with a view to correcting the significant observed deviation from the adjustment path toward the MTO in Romania.

It may also be noted that those countries that are signatories of the TSCG and bound by the Fiscal Compact must implement automatic correction mechanisms in the national legal orders which will operate in the event of significant observed deviations.

For further information on the above elements, see [Vade Mecum on the SGP](#) (2017 Edition).

Updates and progress on the MTOs

The [preventive arm of the SGP](#) stipulates that Member States shall update every three years their MTOs. For this purpose, the Commission submits to Member States so-called "[minimum MTOs](#)" based on the criteria included in the regulation governing the preventive arm (see beginning of this briefing). The Member States provide their updated MTOs in their forthcoming Stability and Convergence Programmes based on these lower bounds as proposed by the Commission or a more ambitious target if, in their view, circumstances are deemed to warrant it. Countries undertaking structural reforms with a major impact on the sustainability of the public finances may revise their MTOs on a case-by-case basis, in agreement with the Commission. In particular, the introduction of major pension reforms having an impact on long-term fiscal sustainability could result in a revision of the MTOs.

The **country specific recommendations** (CSRs) adopted annually by the Council include in most cases budgetary recommendations ('fiscal effort in structural terms') for the Member States under the preventive arm of the SGP in order for them to make progress towards or remain at their MTO. Contrary to earlier CSRs adopted by the Council under the preventive arm of the SGP, the CSRs adopted by the Council in July 2017 included an explicit or quantitative fiscal target in structural terms only in the recitals of the recommendations.

The overleaf annex presents the fiscal targets based on the 2016 and 2017 CSRs adopted by the Council, as well as the estimated or projected progress on structural budget positions for 2017 and 2018 by the concerned Member States on the basis of the spring 2017 forecast by the Commission. It will be regularly updated, in particular once new decisions/recommendations under the SGP have been adopted by the Council.

Disclaimer and Copyright

The content of this document is the sole responsibility of the author and any opinions expressed therein do not necessarily represent the official position of the European Parliament. It is addressed to the Members and staff of the EP for their parliamentary work. Reproduction and translation for non-commercial purposes are authorised, provided the source is acknowledged and the European Parliament is given prior notice and sent a copy.

© European Union, 2018.

Contact: egov@ep.europa.eu

This document is available on the Internet at: www.europarl.europa.eu/supporting-analyses

Annex: Structural budgetary efforts for 2017 and 2018 as requested by the Council (in 2016 and 2017 Country Specific Recommendations)

Member State	MTO (structural budget position = sbp)	Recommended annual structural effort (percentage points=pp) (to adjust towards or remain at the MTO)		Projections on the structural budget balance (Commission Autumn 2017 forecast)			
				pp	sbp	pp	sbp
		In 2017 (based on 2016 CSR)	In 2018 (based on 2017 CSR)	In 2017		In 2018	
BE	0.0 sbp	0.6 pp	0.6 pp	0.6 pp	-1.5 sbp	0.0 pp	-1.5 sbp
DE	-0.5 sbp	In line with its MTO	In line with its MTO	0.0 pp	0.9 sbp	0.0 pp	0.9 sbp
EE	-0.5 sbp	In line with its MTO	In line with its MTO	-0.7 pp	-1.1 sbp	-0.3 pp	-1,4 sbp
IE	-0.5 sbp	0.6 pp	0.6 pp	0.6 pp	-1.3 sbp	0,8 pp	-0.5 sbp
IT	0.0 sbp	0.6 pp	0.6 pp	-0.4 pp	- 2.1 sbp	0.1 pp	-2.0 sbp
CY	0.0 sbp	In line with its MTO	0.2 pp	-0.7 pp	0.4 sbp	-0.4 pp	0.0 sbp
LV	-1.0 sbp	In line with its MTO	-0.3	-1.2 pp	-1.8 sbp	0.0 pp	-1.8 sbp
LT	-1.0 sbp	In line with its MTO	In line with its MTO	-0.7 pp	-0.9 sbp	0.0 pp	-0.9 sbp
LU	-0.5 sbp	In line with its MTO	In line with its MTO	-1.4 pp	0.6 sbp	-0.3 pp	0.3 sbp
MT	0.0 sbp	0.6 pp	In line with its MTO	-0.2 pp	0.6 sbp	-0.5 pp	0.1 sbp
NL	-0.5 sbp	0.6 pp	In line with its MTO	-0.6 pp	0.3 sbp	-0.5 pp	-0.2 sbp
AT	-0.5 sbp	0.3 pp	0.3 pp	0.1 pp	-0.9 sbp	-0.1 pp	-1.0 sbp
PT	0.25 sbp	0.6 pp	0.6 pp	0.2 pp	-1.8 sbp	0.0 pp	-1.8 sbp
SI ²	0.25 sbp	0.6 pp	1.0 pp	-0.1 pp	-1.6 sbp	0.0 pp	-1.6 sbp
SK	-0.5 sbp	0.5 pp	0.5 pp	0.4 pp	-1.6 sbp	0.4 pp	-1.2 sbp
FI	-0.5 sbp	0.6 pp	0.1 pp	-0.6 pp	-1.0 sbp	-0.4 pp	-1.4 sbp
BG	-1.0 sbp	0.5 pp	In line with its MTO	-0.1 pp	0.0 sbp	-0.2 pp	-0.2 sbp
CZ	-1.0 sbp	In line with its MTO	In line with its MTO	-0.1 pp	0.8 sbp	-0.4 pp	0.4 sbp
DK	-0.5 sbp	0.25 pp	In line with its MTO	-0.7 pp	-0.5 sbp	-0.1 pp	-0.6 sbp
HR	-1.75 sbp	0.6 pp	In line with its MTO	-0.6 pp	-0.9 sbp	-1.0 pp	-1.9 sbp
HU	-1.5 sbp	0.6 pp	1.0 pp	-1.2 pp	-3.2 sbp	-0.4 pp	-3.6 sbp
PL	-1.0 sbp	0.5 pp	0.5 pp	0.1 pp	-2.1 sbp	-0.2 pp	-2.3 sbp
RO ³	-1.0 sbp	0.5 pp	0.5 pp	-1.1 pp	-3.3 sbp	-1.0 pp	-4.3 sbp
SE	-1.0 sbp	In line with its MTO	In line with its MTO	-0.3 pp	0.8 sbp	-0.2 pp	0.6 sbp

Sources: [COM Autumn 2017 forecast](#) for the estimated and projected structural budget balances; country specific recommendations (CSRs) adopted by the Council in July under the preventive arm of the SGP (the country specific MTO and the quantitative fiscal effort requested by the Council are included in the recitals of the CSRs).

Notes: In the case a Member States does not have a quantitative fiscal effort request for 2017 and/or 2018, it is indicated in the table as being “in line with its MTO” (this may cover cases (1) where the actual structural budget balance is above the target or (2) below the target due to temporarily flexibility allowed in the preventive arm or (3) only with a minor deviation below the target). For other Member States (which have not reached their MTO), the Council has requested specific fiscal efforts in quantitative years (these specific requests for 2018 are included in the recitals of the 2017 Country Specific Recommendations, CSRs). This table does not prejudice the assessment of “effective action” by the Commission, which follows an [EU methodology](#) that takes into account more aspects than the change in the structural balance; ²The MTO of 0,0 sbp proposed by Slovenia in its stability programme does not respect the requirements of the SGP, therefore the MTO of 0,25 has been included based on Commission assessment; ³ On 16 June 2017, the Council adopted a specific [recommendation](#) with a view to correcting the significant observed deviation from the adjustment path toward the medium-term budgetary objective in Romania.