Interpretive Policy Analysis – 11th International Conference Hull, 5-7 July 2016

Beyond national accounting figures: how quantification practices reshape the state

Damien PIRON F.R.S.-FNRS Research Fellow University of Liège – Belgium







Outline of the presentation

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Epistemological perspective and research questions
- 3. What is the "general government"?
- 4. Strategies implemented to circumvent these requirements and consequences?
- 5. Conclusions

1. Introduction



1. Introduction

- Figures and indicators as evidence on which public policies are based
- A large share of these figures are defined national accounts systems, such as the European System of National and Regional Accounts (ESA)
- Since 1992, this "calculative infrastructure" serves as a common reference framework in order to determine whether member states comply with the **budgetary targets** set in the Maastricht Treaty
- More precisely, the "net borrowing" (i.e. deficit) and "consolidated gross public debt" of the "general government" are limited to respectively 3% and 60% of GDP → Essential to determine which entities are included and which are not

2. Epistemological perspective and research questions

- Miller' and Desrosières's sociology of (national) accounting:
- Accounting categories are social artefacts;
- Foucaldian legacy: national accounts as tools of government aiming to shape the 'conduct of conducts'
- Two sets of research questions:
- I. What is the "general government"? In other words, what kind of institutions are submitted to these budgetary requirements?
- II. Which strategies have been implemented by member states to circumvent these requirements? And how has this category evolved as a consequence?

3. What is the "general government"?

- Under ESA 79 (in force in 1992), individual units (schools, banks, etc.) were allocated into an institutional sector according to the **type of activity** they performed
- General government units principally performed "the production of **non-market services** intended for collective consumption and/or in the redistribution of national income and wealth"
- Different from **public corporations**, which are institutions that are controlled by the government but do not belong to the general government sector since they produce market services
- Restricting "public" deficit and debt is a way of putting pressure on a very specific group of public institutions, namely **non market driven** ones

 \rightarrow EMU as a sectoral implementation of a wider "disciplinary neoliberalism" rationality aiming at reshaping the state "so that it operates in a more marketised way"

4. Strategies implemented to circumvent these requirements and consequences?

- National governments are reflexive subjects, responding to external pressure through the development of borderline practices (indirect privatization, retroactive accounting, etc.)
- Given ESA 79 lack of definitional precision, European has first started to create a "statistical case law"
- 1999: implementation of ESA 95:
 - Shift from "performed activity" to the "**nature of the producer**" as main classification criterion, reflecting the blurring of the boundaries between the respective spheres of action of public and private actors;
 - General government? Both "public" and "non-market";
 - Market? Production at economically significant prices, i.e. sales covering more than 50% of production costs ("quantitative criterion")

4. Strategies implemented to circumvent these requirements and consequences?

- Yet, considerable room for interpretation remained
- Moreover, diffusion of NPM paradigm: mushrooming of specialized agencies, PPPs and *sui generis* vehicles → further clarification needed:
- MGDD (complement to ESA) provides explanation and examples
- ESA 2010: hardening of the market-test:
 - Strengthening of the "quantitative criterion";
 - Introduction of a "qualitative criterion": a unit that "has no incentive to adjust supply to undertake a viable profit-making activity" will be reclassified into the general government sector
- \rightarrow Competition is needed to be considered a market unit

5. Conclusion

- Gradual extension of the general government sector as the result of a 'program'/'anti-program' tension between Eurostat and national government in the context of the EMU → Timeless categories or concepts do not exist: they are always embedded in material and political practices
- Suspecting member states of adopting opportunistic behaviours, Eurostat has **constantly refined and strengthened** the conditions according to which a public body could be considered a market unit, and therefore avoid budgetary requirements
- This **contingent definition** nonetheless exerts **far-reaching effects** on the object it aims at describing, as it clearly creates an incentive structure towards alternative, budgetary neutral or moderately priced modes of public service delivery

Interpretive Policy Analysis – 11th International Conference Hull, 5-7 July 2016

Beyond national accounting figures: how quantification practices reshape the state

Damien PIRON F.R.S.-FNRS Research Fellow University of Liège – Belgium <u>damien.piron@ulg.ac.be</u>





