



RESEARCH PAPER SERIES NO. 2024-05

# Let's Get Fiscal: Extending the Small Macroeconometric Model of the Philippine Economy

Margarita Debuque-Gonzales  
John Paul P. Corpus



**Research Paper Series No. 2024-05**

# Let's Get Fiscal: Extending the Small Macroeconometric Model of the Philippine Economy

*Margarita Debuque-Gonzales  
and John Paul Corpus*



Philippine Institute for Development Studies  
*Surian sa mga Pag-aaral Pangkaunlaran ng Pilipinas*

Copyright 2024

Published by  
Philippine Institute for Development Studies

Printed in the Philippines. Some rights reserved.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of any individual or organization.

Please address all inquiries to:

Philippine Institute for Development Studies  
18th Floor, Three Cyberpod Centris - North Tower  
EDSA corner Quezon Avenue, 1100 Quezon City  
Telephone: (63-2) 8877-4000  
Fax: (63-2) 8877-4099  
E-mail: [publications@pids.gov.ph](mailto:publications@pids.gov.ph)  
Website: <https://www.pids.gov.ph>

This research paper is under the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License. It shall not be used for commercial purposes. Anyone can use, reuse, distribute, and build upon this material as long as proper attribution is made.

ISSN 1908-3297  
ISSN 2508-0830 (electronic)  
RP 06-24-600

Editorial and production team:

Sonny N. Domingo, Gizelle G. Manuel, and Wenilyn M. Asuncion

## Table of Contents

List of tables, figures, and appendices	iii
List of acronyms	v
Acknowledgment	vii
Abstract	ix
Introduction	1
Review of macroeconometric models and their fiscal block	1
Philippine models	1
Recent structural models	4
The expanded macroeconometric model	5
Estimation method and data	5
Model structure	8
Model evaluation	14
Impact analysis (analytic shocks)	19
World oil price shock	19
Exchange rate shock	22
Primary spending shock	25
Conclusion	25
References	29
Appendices	31
The Authors	51



## List of Tables, Figures, and Appendices

### Table

1	Key model equations and variables	7
2	Data summary	9
3	In-sample forecast accuracy, 2012 Q1–2019 Q4	17

### Figure

1	The Philippine macroeconometric model with a fiscal block	6
2	The fiscal block in detail	13
3	In-sample simulations	15
4	World oil price shock	20
5	Exchange rate shock	23
6	Primary spending shock	26

### Appendix

A	Results of unit root tests	31
B	Behavioral equations	35
C	Oil price shock simulation results	45
D	Exchange rate shock simulation results	47
E	Primary spending shock	49





## List of Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AMFM	Ateneo Macroeconomic and Forecasting Model
ARDL	autoregressive distributed lag
ARDL-ECM	autoregressive distributed lag and error-correction model
AS/AD	aggregate supply–aggregate demand
BSP	<i>Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas</i>
BTr	Bureau of Treasury
CPI	consumer price index
CUSUM	cumulative sum
DSGE	dynamic stochastic general equilibrium
GDP	gross domestic product
GNP	gross national product
IS-LM-BoP	investment - saving, liquidity preference - money supply, and balance of payments
MAE	mean absolute error
MAPE	mean absolute percentage error
MEM	macroeconometric model
NEDA	National Economic and Development Authority
PIDS	Philippine Institute for Development Studies
REER	real effective exchange rate
RER	real exchange rate
T-bill	Treasury bill
US	United States
UK	United Kingdom
VAR	vector autoregression



## **Acknowledgment**

The authors are grateful to the anonymous reviewer for the invaluable input to improve the clarity and organization of the paper. They also acknowledge Ms. Ramona Maria L. Miral and Mr. Mark Gerald C. Ruiz for their research assistance.



## **Abstract**

This study presents a small macroeconometric model with a fiscal sector, extending the model in Debuque-Gonzales and Corpus (2023). The model retains the original core blocks of domestic demand, international trade, employment, prices, and monetary sectors and adds a fiscal sector consisting of equations for government revenues, expenditures, and debt. Behavioral equations are estimated in error-correction form (using an autoregressive distributed lag or ARDL model ) on quarterly data from 2002 to 2019. In-sample simulations demonstrate acceptable levels of predictive accuracy for most macroeconomic variables, even when producing dynamic forecasts. The model also projects plausible outcomes on the fiscal side in response to shocks in world oil prices, the exchange rate, and primary expenditure, showing the expanded model's policy simulation capabilities. The next steps for developing the model include adding a detailed financial block, modeling the aggregate supply side, and incorporating expectations.



## Introduction

This paper extends the small macroeconometric model presented in Debuque-Gonzales and Corpus (2023) by adding a more detailed fiscal sector. As noted in the former study, there is a scarcity of working macroeconometric models that can be used for comprehensive policy analysis in the Philippines. This study contributes to filling the said gap.

A macroeconometric model that allows for fiscal policy analysis is particularly useful at a time when fiscal issues have become paramount. In 2021, the fiscal deficit reached 8.6 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) while the debt-to-GDP ratio rose to 60.4 percent, breaching the 60 percent indicative cap prescribed by economic authorities. In its Medium-Term Fiscal Framework, the current administration aims to reduce the fiscal deficit to 3 percent of GDP and bring the debt ratio below 60 percent by 2025.

Given the increased importance of the fiscal sector, the study incorporates an endogenous fiscal block that provides a better representation of the government sector. Its linkages with other sectors of the economy, particularly the monetary sector, are outlined. The inclusion of a fiscal block allows the researchers to conduct more realistic simulations that reveal responses to fiscal variables and outcomes for the public sector under different macroeconomic shocks, including fiscal policy shocks. This approach fosters a better understanding of how the domestic economy functions.

## Review of Macroeconometric Models and Their Fiscal Block

### *Philippine models*

The Philippine Institute for Development Studies' (PIDS) annual macroeconometric model (MEM) by Yap (2000) uses the same theoretical basis as the earlier annual MEM of the PIDS-National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), created in the late 1980s to provide a broad framework for the country's medium-term development plan.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Versions included those by Constantino and Yap (1988), Constantino et al. (1990), and Reyes and Yap (1993). The NEDA also built a quarterly macroeconometric model beginning in the late 1990s, with the last update chronicled in the late 2000s (Bautista et al. 2009). However, details of the model, particularly of the fiscal block, are not available.

In the fiscal block of this model, tax revenues were disaggregated into direct taxes and trade taxes, which were modeled as functions of nominal gross national product (GNP) and nominal goods imports, respectively. Estimates of total taxes were then combined with endogenous government spending (consumption and construction) to compute the government deficit. The fiscal sector was linked to the real sector primarily through the short-term interest rate. The 91-day Treasury bill (T-bill) rate was modeled as a function of the government deficit ratio and cast as correlates of (narrow and broad) money, which were, in turn, explanatory variables in production and demand equations.

The PIDS annual MEM was succeeded by the PIDS-*Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas* (BSP) Annual MEM (Reyes et al. 2020), which closely followed the PIDS-NEDA model (Reyes and Yap 1993) while also drawing from Yap (2000). However, it featured greater disaggregation of household consumption spending and an updated breakdown of traded goods and services to highlight subsectors that have gained importance over the years (i.e., the inclusion of computer services exports to capture the activity of business process outsourcing firms and tourism).

Similarly, fiscal sector accounts were also more finely disaggregated than in the earlier models, mirroring the general government income and outlay accounts of the Philippine System of National Accounts. Total revenues were divided into different streams and modeled separately, typically as a function of *both* the effective tax/contribution rate and revenue base. Government final consumption expenditures were taken as exogenous and linked to actual government spending through a bridge equation. The resulting model allowed for the calculation of the government deficit and debt stock.

The quarterly Ateneo Macroeconomic and Forecasting Model (AMFM) was created based on the short-run version of Australia's Murphy model (Rodriguez and Briones 2002). Its modeling strategy closely resembled that of many structural MEMs abroad, at least on the revenue side, where fiscal variables are disaggregated and some revenue streams computed as the product of an exogenous tax rate and an endogenous macroeconomic base. This approach was adopted for various tax sources, including income and profit taxes, indirect taxes, and import



taxes.<sup>2</sup> Expenditures were also disaggregated into national government outlays for maintenance and operations, investment, interest payments, transfers, and net lending. However, only interest payments were determined within the model, while the rest were considered exogenous. The AMFM's fiscal block consisted mostly of identity equations, with identities also used to compute the budget deficit and public debt within the model.

The last nongovernment structural MEM of the Philippine economy created was the small to medium-sized model put together by a team from the Asian Development Bank (ADB) (Cagas et al. 2006).<sup>3</sup> Extra effort was taken to develop the model's fiscal block by purposely linking it with other sectors (e.g., by including the debt-to-GDP ratio among the variables used to explain investment). Given the significant concern over fiscal sustainability during the period, particularly with national government debt at above 70 percent of nominal GDP in the mid-2000s, fiscal simulation experiments were conducted. These experiments involved setting upper bounds on deficits and the debt ratio while also ensuring a sustained increase in tax collections.

The ADB model adopted Hendry's dynamic specification approach and applied automatic econometric model selection to get the best model fit. In the resulting specification, the government's total revenues were simplified to a function of government tax revenues, which, in turn, were modeled as a function of GNP. Total government expenditures, on the other hand, were divided into two components: (1) interest payment on debt, modeled as a fraction of total debt that depends on the 91-day T-bill rate and the exchange rate, and (2) noninterest spending, formulated as a function of total government revenues, the debt-to-GDP ratio, and the unemployment rate.

Meanwhile, government debt was modeled as a behavioral equation due to the importance of nondeficit-financing factors during the period covered (i.e., debt arising from losses of state-owned enterprises in the late 1980s and early 1990s). Public debt was divided into domestic debt, modeled as a function of the government deficit and the 91-day T-bill rate;

---

<sup>2</sup> Other revenue streams (i.e., other taxes and nontax sources, comprising mostly transfers) were treated as exogenous variables.

<sup>3</sup> See Ducanes et al. (2005) for the full model.

and foreign debt, also formulated as a function of the government deficit, but which additionally depends on the interest differential between domestic and US lending rates and the exchange rate.

### *Recent structural models*

Structural MEMs continue to emerge in the empirical literature despite the dominance of other methods, especially microfounded<sup>4</sup> systems, with varied approaches taken in modeling the fiscal sector.<sup>5</sup> Bagnai et al. (2017), for instance, constructed a medium-sized MEM of the Italian economy based on a standard aggregate supply–aggregate demand (AS/AD) framework, which was common for models of similar size in Europe.<sup>6</sup>

The Italian model's fiscal block was typical of traditional structural MEMs, with revenue variables formulated as the nominal tax base multiplied by the relevant tax rate for direct and indirect taxes and nominal wages multiplied by the average social security contribution rate for social security contributions. Following other MEMs, only social security benefits were modeled through a behavioral function. The rest of the fiscal were block formulated as identities, including government deficits and debt, with the latter making use of standard equations for debt dynamics. Government deficit and debt ratios (in percent of GDP) influence the long-term interest rate in this model, ultimately linking the fiscal sector to the real economy through capital accumulation.

More recently, Akbar and Ahmad (2021) built a large structural MEM to analyze the impacts of exchange rate depreciation in Pakistan. They also adopted an AS/AD framework based on an IS-LM-BoP model for open economies, allowing them to simulate the effects of an important policy event in the context of a developing economy. The model's fiscal block closely resembles that of the PIDS MEMs, wherein revenues and expenditures were disaggregated, and various streams were modeled,

---

<sup>4</sup> Blanchard (2018) delves into different ways and purposes of macroeconomic modeling, including dynamic stochastic general equilibrium (DSGE) models and building them on microfoundations.

<sup>5</sup> See Debuque-Gonzales and Corpus (2023) for a review of developments in macroeconometric modeling.

<sup>6</sup> Bagnai et al. (2017) noted that such detailed policy scenarios would not have been possible using a vector autoregression (VAR), a popular alternative that addressed Sim's Critique of "incredible" identification restrictions imposed by MEMs, as VARs can be applied to a relatively limited number of variables.

with different behavioral functions assigned to each stream. Identities were likewise used for government deficit and debt computations. The unique feature was the use of balance-of-payments accounting to compute for foreign and domestic borrowing and subsequently work out the time paths of foreign and domestic debt stocks.

## **The Expanded Macroeconometric Model**

The model built in this paper extends the small macroeconomic model of the Philippine economy introduced in Debuque-Gonzales and Corpus (2023). The authors argued for a pragmatic approach, where the goal was to build a policy model suitably guided by economic theory yet able to fit the data reasonably well. A premium was applied on usability, tractability, and ease of maintenance, apart from model validity and robustness. The same philosophy holds for the current model.


The gray boxes in Figure 1 represent the original blocks of the macroeconomic model, while the red box represents the fiscal block. Table 1 summarizes the key equations and variables. This study continues to adopt a stylized framework where output is determined from the demand side, as in earlier Keynes-based models and some small macroeconomic models of more recent vintage (e.g., Kasimati and Dawson 2009; Hammersland and Tr ae 2014).

### *Estimation method and data*

The authors continue to follow an autoregressive distributed lag and error-correction model (ARDL-ECM), enabling the integration of economic theory and intuition in the equations, defining long-run equilibrium relationships, and capturing observed data dynamics through the short-run equations. They estimated the behavioral equations through EViews, with the Akaike Information Criterion used to optimally select lag lengths up to a maximum of 2. Meanwhile, cointegration between variables was tested using the bounds test by Pesaran et al.(2001).

Specifications were chosen such that coefficients of long-run variables display signs that conform with theory. Explanatory variables with coefficient signs that were inconsistent with theory or intuition were relegated to the short-run equation (if found to be significant) or dropped completely. In the absence of cointegration, behavioral equations were

**Figure 1. The Philippine macroeconomic model with a fiscal block**



CPI = consumer price index; US = United States; GDP = gross domestic product; gov't = government

Note: Orange boxes denote the exogenous variables in the model. Solid blue lines represent behavioral relationships, while broken lines represent identities.

Source: Authors' illustration

**Table 1. Key model equations and variables**

Equations	Variables
Domestic demand $\log C_t = f(\log(YD_t), emp_t, rr_t^{bl}, \pi_t)$ $\log(I_t) = f(\log(Y_t), \Delta rr_t^{bl}, \pi_t)$ $\log G_t = f(XP_t^{PR})$ $\log M_t = f(I_t, X_t)$ $Y_t \equiv C_t + I_t + G_t + X_t - M_t$ $YD_t \equiv Y_t - RV_t^{TXBIR}$ $\log(P_t^Y) = f(\log(CPI_t))$ $Y_t^N \equiv P_t^Y Y_t$	C = private consumption CPI = consumer price index CPI <sup>US</sup> = US consumer price index D = National government (NG) debt (nominal) D <sup>D</sup> = Domestic NG debt (nominal) D <sup>F</sup> = Foreign NG debt (nominal) emp = employment rate G = government consumption I = investment M = imports
Trade block $\log(X_t) = f(\log(Y_t^{WORLD}), \log(xrr_t))$ $\log(M_t) = f(\log(I_t), \log(X_t))$ $NX_t \equiv X_t - M_t$	NX = net exports p <sup>oil</sup> = world price of oil p <sup>rice</sup> = retail price of rice PB = Primary balance
Employment block $emp_t = f(Y_t)$	PY = GDP deflator r <sup>bl</sup> = bank lending rate
Price block $\Delta \log(CPI_t) = f(\Delta \log(oil_t), \Delta \log(p_t^{rice}), \Delta \log(DD_t), \Delta \log(xrr_t))$ $\pi_t \equiv 100 \left( \frac{CPI_t}{CPI_{t-4}} - 1 \right)$	r <sup>cb</sup> = Central bank policy rate r <sup>dd</sup> = Effective interest rate on domestic debt r <sup>df</sup> = Effective interest rate on foreign debt RES = Debt residual (nominal) rr <sup>bl</sup> = Real bank lending rate rr <sup>t10y</sup> = Real 10-year Treasury rate rr <sup>t91d</sup> = Real 91-day Treasury rate r <sup>t10y</sup> = 10-year Treasury rate r <sup>t10yUS</sup> = US 10-year Treasury rate r <sup>t91d</sup> = 91-day Treasury rate
Monetary block $r_t^{cb} = f(\pi_t - \pi_t^T)$ $r_t^{t91d} = f(r_t^{cb}, PB_t/Y_t, \pi_t)$ $r_t^{t10y} = f(r_t^{t91d}, \pi_t)$ $r_t^{bl} = f(r_t^{t10y}, \pi_t)$ $rr_t^{t91d} \equiv r_t^{t91d} - \pi_t$ $rr_t^{t10y} \equiv r_t^{t10y} - \pi_t$ $rr_t^{bl} \equiv r_t^{bl} - \pi_t$ $xrr_t = xr_t \left( \frac{CPI_t^{US}}{CPI_t} \right)$ $r_t^{dd} = f(r_t^{t10y})$ $r_t^{df} = f(r_t^{t10yUS}, DY_t)$	RV = Total revenues (nominal) RV <sup>N<sup>TX</sup></sup> = Nontax revenues (nominal) RV <sup>TX</sup> = Tax revenues (nominal) RV <sup>TXBIR</sup> = Internal tax revenues (nominal) RV <sup>TXBOC</sup> = Customs revenues (nominal) X = exports XP = Total expenditure (nominal) XP <sup>IND</sup> = Domestic interest payments (nominal) XP <sup>INF</sup> = Foreign interest payments (nominal) XP <sup>INT</sup> = Interest payments (nominal) XP <sup>PR</sup> = Primary expenditure (nominal) xr = nominal peso-dollar exchange rate xrr = real peso-dollar exchange rate Y = GDP YD = disposable income Y <sup>N</sup> = nominal GDP Y <sup>WORLD</sup> = World GDP
Fiscal block $\log(RV_t^{TXBIR}) = f(\log(Y_t^N))$ $\log(RV_t^{TXBOC}) = f(\log(P_t^Y M_t), \log(p_t^{oil}), \log(xrr_t))$ $\log(RV_t^{NTX}) = f(\log(Y_t^N))$ $RV_t^{TX} \equiv RV_t^{TXBIR} + RV_t^{TXBOC}$ $RV_t \equiv RV_t^{TX} + RV_t^{NTX}$ $\log(XP_t^{PR}) = f(DY_t)$ $XP_t^{INT} \equiv XP_t^{IND} + XP_t^{INF}$ $XP_t \equiv XP_t^{PR} + XP_t^{INT}$ $XP_t^{IND} \equiv r_t^{dd} \times D_{t-1}^D$ $XP_t^{INF} \equiv \left( \frac{xrr_t}{xrr_{t-1}} \right) r_t^{df} D_{t-1}^F$ $PB_t \equiv RV_t - XP_t^{PR}$ $D_t \equiv XP_t^{INT} + D_{t-1}^D + \left( \frac{xrr_t}{xrr_{t-1}} \right) D_{t-1}^F - PB_t + RES_t$ $D_t^D \equiv \alpha_t D_t$ $D_t^F \equiv (1 - \alpha_t) D_t$	α = Share of domestic debt in total π = inflation rate π <sup>T</sup> = inflation target (midpoint)

US = United States; GDP = gross domestic product

Source: Authors' specification

modeled as short-run ARDL models (i.e., in first differences). Residual diagnostic checks testing for homoskedasticity, serial correlation, and normality were performed. Cumulative sum (CUSUM) and CUSUM of squares tests were used to check parameter and variance stability, respectively. The system of behavioral equations and identities was solved in EViews using the Broyden solution algorithm. The model was then evaluated through forecast and impact simulations.

Quarterly data spanning from 2002 to 2019 were used to construct the model, 2 years longer than the data sample used in the original/small model (2002–2017). Data from the COVID-19 pandemic years (2020–2022) were excluded due to the unusual economic conditions during the period. All series were seasonally adjusted using the X-13 routine in EViews prior to estimation. Based on augmented Dickey-Fuller tests, most series were revealed to be of order  $I(1)$  or  $I(0)$  (see Appendix A). Table 2 summarizes the features of the data.

### *Model structure*

The structure of the expanded model is discussed in greater detail below. The first part describes the blocks of the original/small macroeconometric model of the Philippine economy (loosely labeled as the basic blocks). In contrast, the second part details the newly added fiscal block.

### **The basic blocks**

In the domestic demand block, private consumption is still formulated as a long-run function of disposable income (proxied by GDP net of internal revenue taxes), the employment rate, the real bank lending rate, and the consumer price index (CPI) inflation rate.<sup>7</sup> However, short-run consumption growth is now specified as a function of disposable income and employment rather than just its lag.<sup>8</sup> Investment also continues to be a function of GDP in the long run, in line with accelerator theory. However, short-term investment growth is now modeled as dependent on price changes to capture variations in cost, as well as on the real bank lending rate and GDP.

---

<sup>7</sup> As in Kasimati and Dawson (2009), inflation is included in the specification to capture wealth effects.

<sup>8</sup> The current model differs from the original small model mainly in the short-run specifications, with long-run equations remaining the same in most cases.

**Table 2. Data summary**

Variable	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
GDP	72	14.89	0.29	14.42	15.4
GDP growth	72	5.66	1.75	0.1	8.45
Household consumption	72	14.61	0.26	14.16	15.08
Investment	72	13.27	0.46	12.6	14.08
Government consumption	72	12.68	0.34	12.17	13.39
Imports	72	13.75	0.38	13.29	14.5
Exports	72	13.55	0.33	12.99	14.19
Disposable income	72	14.79	0.28	14.31	15.28
Domestic demand	72	14.95	0.31	14.5	15.51
Employment rate	59	93.23	0.89	91.88	95.35
Consumer price index	72	4.35	0.2	3.99	4.64
GDP deflator	72	4.4	0.17	4.05	4.62
US consumer price index	72	4.52	0.11	4.32	4.69
CPI inflation	72	3.75	2.02	-0.05	10.32
Deviation from inflation target	72	-0.25	1.92	-3.05	6.32
World oil price (USD per barrel)	72	4.09	0.47	3.02	4.77
Retail price of rice	61	6.48	0.25	5.88	6.81
PHP/USD exchange rate	72	3.88	0.09	3.71	4.03
Real PHP/USD exchange rate	72	4.05	0.16	3.83	4.36
Central bank policy rate	72	4.97	1.56	3	7.5
91-day Treasury rate	72	3.99	2.16	0.4	8.13
10-year Treasury rate	72	7.49	3.14	3.46	14.3
Bank lending rate	72	7.56	1.77	5.4	10.86
Real 91-day Treasury rate	72	0.24	2.13	-4.37	5.03
Real 10-year Treasury rate	72	3.74	2.99	-1.81	11.18
Real bank lending rate	72	3.81	1.94	-1.49	7.82
US 10-year Treasury rate	72	3.19	1.04	1.62	5.07
Nominal revenues	72	12.74	0.5	11.81	13.6
Nominal tax revenues	72	12.61	0.51	11.69	13.49
Nominal internal tax revenues	72	12.35	0.52	11.43	13.24
Nominal customs revenues	72	11.08	0.52	10	12.01
Nominal nontax revenues	72	10.58	0.44	9.66	11.55
Nominal NG expenditure	72	12.89	0.47	12.16	13.88
Nominal primary expenditure	72	12.67	0.55	11.84	13.8
Nominal interest payments	72	11.19	0.16	10.59	11.53
Nominal domestic interest payments	72	10.75	0.2	10.21	11.2
Nominal foreign interest payments	72	10.13	0.15	9.43	10.36
Effective domestic interest rate	72	1.77	0.41	1.22	2.67
Effective foreign interest rate	72	1.35	0.19	1.01	1.77
NG debt	72	15.36	0.28	14.72	15.88
Domestic NG debt	72	14.84	0.37	14.06	15.47
Foreign NG debt	72	14.46	0.17	13.98	14.78
Debt/GDP	72	51.92	10.24	39.46	71.07
Domestic debt/GDP	72	30.29	3.46	25.59	37.75
Foreign debt/GDP	72	21.63	6.99	13.42	34.68

Obs. = observation; std. dev. = standard deviation; GDP = gross domestic product;  
CPI = consumer price index; PH = Philippines; PHP = Philippine peso; US = United States;  
USD = United States dollar; NG = national government  
Note: Level variables are log-transformed. GDP omits statistical discrepancy.  
Source: Authors' calculation

Notably, government consumption is no longer considered exogenous in the current model. Instead, it is cast as a function of primary spending (government spending net of interest payments) in the short and long horizons, with a trend variable added in the short-run specification.

As in the original small macro model, private investment and exports drive imports both in the long and short run in the levels and first-differences equations.<sup>9</sup> Exports, in contrast, are now formulated as simply a function of the real peso-dollar exchange rate and world income in all horizons, with world income proxied by a trade-weighted aggregate of the GDP of the country's major export partners.<sup>10</sup> Although imports are no longer included as determinants of exports in the expanded model, the overall structure of the trade block remains reflective of the country's role in the global supply chain.

The labor block consists solely of domestic employment. Employment is still cast as a variant of Okun's law, with the employment rate formulated as a function of GDP in the long run. In the short run, changes in the employment rate depend on its own lag.

Though the authors focus on developing the fiscal block, they also expand the financial/monetary block by adding equations for the 10-year Philippine treasury rate and effective interest rates on domestic

---

<sup>9</sup> In Debuque-Gonzales and Corpus (2023), the real effective exchange rate (REER) was omitted as an explanatory variable in the levels equation of imports because of the incorrect sign on the estimated coefficient (positive instead of negative). Similarly, the authors omitted the REER in the current model and replaced it with the real exchange rate (RER), which can be more conveniently computed within the model.

<sup>10</sup> These are (1) Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand from Southeast Asia; (2) Japan, Hong Kong, and South Korea from East Asia; (3) the US and Mexico from North America; and (4) the Netherlands, Germany, France, and the UK from Europe. These economies comprised 75 percent of the market for Philippine exports from 2002 to 2019, on average. For each country, the real GDP series in 2014 prices converted into US dollars obtained from CEIC was used. Several export partners had to be omitted from the set: China (accounting for an average of 10.4% of exports during the period), Taiwan (4.22%) due to the absence of comparable quarterly GDP data, and Viet Nam (1.05%) and Indonesia (1.10%) due to their GDP series being short (starting only in 2010).



as well as foreign debt.<sup>11</sup> The 10-year Philippine treasury rate is modeled as a function of the 91-day Philippine T-bill rate in the long run. In contrast, corresponding changes in the yield of the domestic 10-year note are modeled as a function of inflation in the short run.

In this study, the researchers formulate the effective interest rate on domestic debt as a function of the 10-year Philippine treasury rate in the long run but cast corresponding yield changes as simple autoregressions in the short run. Correspondingly, they formulate the effective interest rate on foreign debt as a function of the yield of the 10-year US treasury note and the Philippine debt-to-GDP ratio in both short and long horizons.

Unlike before, they detect a cointegrating relationship between the policy rate and relevant variables.<sup>12</sup> Thus, they model the policy rate (the BSP's overnight reverse repurchase rate) as dependent on deviations of the inflation rate from the official target in the long run, with policy rate changes cast as an autoregressive function in the short run.<sup>13</sup>

The 91-day T-bill rate is formulated as a long-run function of the policy rate and the primary balance (as a percentage of GDP), while corresponding rate changes are determined as a function of inflation in the short horizon. Previously modeled as solely a function of the 91-day T-bill rate in the absence of a long-maturity rate in the system, the real bank lending rate is now modeled as a long-term function of the policy rate and the 10-year Philippine treasury rate. Bank lending rate changes are formulated as a short-term function of its own lagged change and inflation. The policy rate transmits to the real economy in this way—in summary, by driving the key short-term and long-term rates, the latter in turn influencing consumption and investment, and ultimately aggregate demand.

---

<sup>11</sup> Given absent data on government debt interest rates, the authors construct the effective interest rates on domestic and foreign debt as follows. The domestic effective interest rate is defined as  $100 \left( \frac{XP_t^{INTD}}{D_{t-1}^d} \right)$ , where  $XP_t^{INTD}$  is domestic interest payments in the current quarter, and  $D_{t-1}^d$  is domestic debt in the previous quarter. The foreign effective interest rate is defined as  $100 \left( \frac{XP_t^{INTF}}{D_{t-1}^f} \right) \left( \frac{X_t}{X_{t-1}} \right)^{-1}$ , where  $XP_t^{INTF}$  is foreign interest payments in the current quarter,  $D_{t-1}^f$  is foreign debt in the previous quarter, and  $X_t$  is the nominal PHP-USD exchange rate.

<sup>12</sup> Note though that the estimation sample was delimited to 2007 Q1–2019 Q4.

<sup>13</sup> As in the original model, a standard Taylor rule was not estimated, as incorporating an output variable (whether as output gap or growth) yielded incorrect coefficient signs.

In the price block, the evolution of the CPI is specified purely as a short-run equation depending on changes in world oil and retail rice prices, domestic demand, and the nominal peso-dollar exchange rate.<sup>14</sup> This equation is similar to those of the central bank's workhorse models for inflation targeting—namely, the BSP's Single-Equation Model and Multi-Equation Model.

Lastly, the GDP deflator is added to the price block to enable the computation of nominal GDP within the system. The CPI and CPI inflation drive this variable in the long- and short-run specifications, respectively.

### **The fiscal block**

The fiscal block in this expanded macroeconometric model comprises equations for government revenues, expenditures, and debt. Figure 2 illustrates the newly added sector's interrelationships in greater detail.

Total revenues are defined as the sum of tax revenues and nontax revenues. Nontax revenues, in turn, are modeled as a function of GDP in the long run, while tax revenues are computed as the sum of internal tax revenues and customs revenues.

Internal tax revenues are modeled as a long-run function of GDP, while internal tax revenue growth is formulated as a function of its own lag in the short horizon. Customs revenues, meanwhile, are cast as a function of imports, the peso-dollar exchange rate, and the world price of oil in the long horizon, though only import growth drives customs revenue growth in the short run.


On the expenditure side, total expenditures are defined as the sum of primary expenditures and interest payments on debt. Primary expenditures respond negatively to the previous year's debt-to-GDP ratio in the long- and short-run specifications, ensuring that any escalation of debt does not continue indefinitely.

Interest payments are the sum of domestic and foreign interest payments. Domestic interest payments are computed as the product of

---

<sup>14</sup> Modeling the CPI equation as an ECM was initially attempted, with money supply (M3-to-GDP ratio) as the long-run determinant (following the quantity theory of money) and changes in the price of rice, world price of oil, nominal peso-dollar exchange rate, and domestic demand as short-run determinants. Contrary to expectation, the money supply variable yielded the wrong sign (negative) in the long-run equation. This led to omission of the money supply from the specification and model CPI as a purely short-run equation.

**Figure 2. The fiscal block in detail**



GDP = gross domestic product; BIR = Bureau of Internal Revenue; BOC = Bureau of Customs; PH = Philippines; US = United States  
 Note: Orange boxes denote the exogenous variables in the model. Solid lines represent behavioral relationships, and broken lines represent identities.  
 Source: Authors' illustration

the effective interest rate on domestic debt and domestic debt from the previous period. Similarly, foreign interest payments are the product of the effective interest rate on foreign debt and foreign debt from the last period, adjusted for exchange rate depreciation. Taking the difference between government revenues and primary expenditure yields the primary balance.

The level of government debt evolves in line with a simplified equation for debt dynamics. Specifically, current-period debt derives from the sum of domestic and foreign debt from the previous period (the latter adjusted for exchange rate depreciation), interest on the debt

of the prior period, the current period primary deficit, and a residual term that accounts for all other unexplained sources of debt.

Total government debt is defined as the sum of domestic and foreign debt. Domestic and foreign debt levels are restricted to reflect the actual distribution of government debt by source.

## Model Evaluation

To evaluate the model's predictive performance, in-sample static and dynamic forecasts are generated in a deterministic setting for the period 2012 Q1–2019 Q4, representing a forecast horizon of 32 quarters or 8 years.<sup>15</sup> The static simulation generates a series of one-period ahead forecasts using actual (historical) values for lagged endogenous variables. Meanwhile, dynamic simulation uses values for lagged endogenous variables that are predicted by the model based on previous periods. However, an out-of-sample evaluation was not performed due to the inclusion of the highly unusual and uncertain pandemic years of 2020 and 2021.

Conventional forecast accuracy metrics, namely, the mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) for level variables and mean absolute error (MAE) for rate or percentage variables, are employed to gauge forecast performance. In-sample forecasts are depicted alongside historical data in Figure 3, while forecast accuracy statistics are presented in Table 3. As static forecasts are expected to perform better than dynamic forecasts, the discussion pays greater attention to the latter as an indication of the model's predictive capabilities.

Quarter-ahead predictions of GDP and its components have good accuracy, with MAPEs of under 5 percent for both static and dynamic forecasts. Net exports are the exception with relatively large MAPEs, particularly from the dynamic simulation (14.65%). This stems from sizeable dynamic prediction errors for exports and imports in the last two forecast years.


---

<sup>15</sup> In a deterministic simulation, model inputs are held fixed at their known values, and endogenous variables follow a single path over the forecast period.

<sup>16</sup> The formulas for the MAPE and MAE are, respectively,  $MAPE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left| \frac{A_t - F_t}{A_t} \right|$  and  $MAE = \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{|A_t - F_t|}{n}$ , where  $n$  is the number of observations,  $A_t$  are the actual values, and  $F_t$  are the forecast values.


**Figure 3. In-sample simulations**

**A. Core small model variable**



**Figure 3. In-sample simulations (continued)**

**B. Fiscal block and related variables**



CPI = consumer price index; PHP = Philippine peso; USD = United States dollar;  
 GDP = gross domestic product; NG = national government  
 Source: Authors' calculation

**Table 3. In-sample forecast accuracy, 2012 Q1–2019 Q4**

	Static forecast	Dynamic forecast
I. Mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) of level variables, percent		
GDP	0.97	2.45
Household consumption	0.60	2.39
Investment	3.20	6.06
Government consumption	2.40	3.31
Exports	2.03	2.54
Imports	2.49	4.38
Net exports	9.94	14.65
Real PHP/USD exchange rate	0.29	2.25
Nominal revenues	3.04	3.73
Nominal tax revenues	2.34	3.01
Nominal internal tax revenues	2.56	2.87
Nominal customs revenues	4.10	6.13
Nominal nontax revenues	15.07	15.10
Nominal NG expenditure	4.97	6.32
Nominal interest payments	4.19	13.46
Nominal domestic interest payments	5.35	13.63
Nominal foreign interest payments	4.13	14.02
Nominal primary expenditure	5.72	7.34
NG debt	0.58	7.23
Domestic NG debt	0.58	7.23
Foreign NG debt	0.63	7.23
GDP deflator	0.43	1.79
II. Mean absolute error (MAE) of rate and percentage variables, percentage points		
GDP growth	1.03	1.34
Employment rate	0.31	0.35
CPI inflation	0.30	0.72
Central bank policy rate	0.20	0.38
91-day Treasury rate	0.30	0.95
10-year Treasury rate	0.40	1.00
Bank lending rate	0.10	0.55
Real 91-day Treasury rate	0.38	0.71
Real 10-year Treasury rate	0.49	0.89
Real bank lending rate	0.34	0.52
Effective domestic interest rate	0.08	0.10
Effective foreign interest rate	0.05	0.08
Primary balance/GDP	0.97	1.08
Fiscal balance/GDP	0.96	1.14
Debt/GDP	0.25	3.32
Foreign debt/GDP	0.09	1.16
Domestic debt/GDP	0.16	2.17

Q= quarter; GDP = gross domestic product; PHP = Philippine peso;  
 USD = United States dollar; NG = national government

Source: Authors' calculation

The model's dynamic GDP growth predictions have a MAE of 1.34 percentage points. Predictions for inflation show better performance, with the dynamic forecast tracking the data rather well, in addition to having relatively small errors (MAE of 0.72 percentage points). Forecasts for the employment rate also do well, with a MAE of 0.35 percentage points from the dynamic simulation.

The model's dynamic central bank policy rate forecast departs from the actual series' stepwise movement. However, it captures the data's historical turning points (Figure 3A) and has relatively small absolute errors (0.38 percentage points on average). Dynamic predictions of market interest rates do somewhat worse, with MAEs of between 0.5 and 1 percentage point, as well as trajectories that are not quite successful at mimicking the data's actual movements. Their real counterparts perform better in this regard largely due to the more accurate dynamic inflation forecast.

Forecasts for revenue variables perform well, with most having MAPEs below 5 percent or slightly higher (in the case of the dynamic forecast for customs revenues). Nontax revenues are the exception, with forecast MAPEs of slightly over 15 percentage points.<sup>17</sup>

On the expenditure side, the dynamic prediction for primary expenditures (the largest expenditure component) outperforms those for the interest payment variables (MAPE of 7.34% versus 13–14%). Despite relatively good dynamic predictions for the effective debt interest rates (with MAEs of 0.8–1 percentage point), the model's dynamic forecast for interest payments drifted away from the historical data from around 2014 to 2015, reflecting the divergence observed with dynamic debt forecasts (Figure 3B).

MAPEs of the model's debt level predictions notably rise from below 0.58 percent for the static simulation to 7.23 percent for the dynamic simulation. The gap between the actual and dynamic simulations of debt levels appears to have been due to the large downward errors in the dynamic primary balance forecast for 2014 and 2015. The consecutive

---

<sup>17</sup> Nontax revenues consist of income of the Bureau of the Treasury (BTr) from various sources (e.g., interest income on government deposits with the BSP, income from BTr-managed funds, dividends from government corporations), fees and charges, privatization proceeds, income from Malampaya, and other nontax revenue streams. Nontax revenues are relatively small, comprising an average of 11.86 percent of total revenues from 2002Q1 to 2019Q4.



larger-than-actual predicted primary deficits in this period were absorbed into the debt forecasts and, in turn, filtered through to the dynamic forecast paths of effective debt interest rates and interest payments.

## Impact Analysis (Analytic Shocks)

To further test the model's validity, shocks are introduced to the system, and the response of the simulated dynamic paths of the model's endogenous variables are considered: (1) a world oil price shock, (2) an exchange rate shock, and (3) a primary spending shock. Figures 4–6 illustrate the simulation results, with the blue lines representing the deviation of the simulated dynamic paths from the (no-shock) baseline. The deviations are in percent terms for level variables<sup>18</sup> and in percentage points for rate and percentage variables. Appendices C, D, and E show the simulated paths of the variables in their original units of measurement for each respective shock experiment.

### *World oil price shock*

In this scenario, the world oil price is raised by 20 percent relative to its baseline path in 2013. Figure 4 illustrates the simulation results.


The higher price of oil triggers faster inflation, which rises above the baseline during the first year (2013) (Figure 4A). This leads to a small upward adjustment in the central bank policy rate and, consequently, in nominal market interest rates. Although inflation causes real interest rates to fall below the baseline, leading to a faint expansionary effect, price hikes eventually weigh down private investment and consumption, pulling GDP below the baseline path. Meanwhile, exports declined due to eventual real exchange rate (RER) appreciation, which added to the downward pressure on total spending.

Inflation begins to decelerate by the second year (2014), causing real interest rates to rise. This leads to a deeper decline in investment, consumption, and GDP. GDP begins to climb back to the baseline path by mid-2014 to 2015, as both investment and consumption rebound owing to softer inflation and subsequently to a decline in real interest rates. Exports also recover as the RER weakens. Government consumption, additionally rose in 2014 with an increase in primary spending.

<sup>18</sup> Except for net exports, for which deviations are expressed in level terms.


# Figure 4. World oil price shock

## A. Core small model variables



**Figure 4. World oil price shock (continued)**

**B. Fiscal block and related variables**



PHP = Philippine peso; USD = United States dollar GDP = gross domestic product;  
 NG = national government  
 Source: Authors' calculation

The oil price shock generates a windfall in customs revenues and causes total revenues to increase in 2013 (Figure 4B). Consequently, the primary balance improves during the period, leading to a decline in the debt ratio. Wider fiscal space allows primary expenditure to rise a year later, which worsens the primary balance, causing the debt ratio to increase again by the end of 2014.

### *Exchange rate shock*

This experiment involves a weakening of the peso against the US dollar by 10 percent relative to the actual exchange rate in 2013. Simulation results are depicted in Figure 5.

The exchange rate shock leads to an increase in exports of about 3.4 percent in the first year in 2013 (Figure 5A). Inflation also accelerates, causing the policy rate to tighten and nominal market interest rates to rise. However, real interest rates decline due to the larger increase in inflation, thus promoting higher consumption and investment spending and higher GDP growth overall.

By the second year, however, the inflation shock reverses, causing real interest rates to rise. Consequently, consumption and investment weaken. These events, combined with the normalization of exports and a decline in government consumption due to developments in the fiscal sector, ultimately depress GDP growth. Eventually, real interest rates fall as inflation normalizes, leading to higher investment and consumption spending and ultimately faster GDP growth by the third year (2015).


On the fiscal side, the exchange rate shock generates a windfall gain in customs revenues, causing overall revenues to improve in 2013 (Figure 5B). Despite the consequent improvement in the primary balance, total debt increases due to the upward revaluation of foreign debt. Higher debt causes a reduction in primary expenditure in the following year, pulling down government consumption. Subsequently, primary spending recovers as total debt falls back to baseline due to the normalization of the exchange rate.

### *Primary spending shock*

In this final exercise, primary spending is exogenously increased by 10 percent from its baseline path in 2013. As part of the experiment, the


# Figure 5. Exchange rate shock

## A. Core small model variables



# Figure 5. Exchange rate shock (continued)

## B. Fiscal block and related variables



GDP = gross domestic product; NG = national government; PHP = Philippine peso;  
 USD = United States dollar  
 Source: Authors' calculation

mechanism for primary spending to react to worsening debt conditions is removed. Thus, after the shock, primary spending follows its actual historical path. Figure 6 summarizes the simulation results.

The primary spending shock leads to an increase in government consumption, raising domestic demand (Figure 6A). Higher domestic demand causes inflation to pick up, triggering monetary tightening by the central bank, which in turn leads to a rise in nominal market interest rates. A fall in real interest rates alongside an increase in total government spending, however, promotes greater investment and consumption spending, although GDP growth is partly dampened by a decline in exports due to real peso appreciation tracing to higher domestic inflation. The increase in GDP begins to fade away by 2014 as government consumption normalizes, and both investment and consumption spending falls with the subsequent recovery of real interest rates.

The expansion of the real economy leads to an increase in both internal tax and customs revenues, the latter due to higher import demand (Figure 6B). However, the revenue improvements are outstripped by the primary spending shock, causing a sharp deterioration in the primary balance in 2013. While the primary balance eventually returns to baseline, the borrowing incurred during the shock period leads to a permanent increase in the debt stock.


## **Conclusion**

This paper aims to expand the small macroeconomic model of the Philippine economy to include a relatively detailed fiscal block that seeks to capture the government sector and related mechanisms. Developing the model in this direction has become essential, with fiscal issues rising in importance and policy tradeoffs becoming even sharper under the current, less benign macroeconomic environment (Debuque-Gonzales et al. 2022).

The addition of a more detailed fiscal block brings the research a step closer to building a reliable macroeconomic model that can be used for policy simulation and analysis, as well as quick forecasting. Model simulations, particularly in-sample simulations, continue to demonstrate acceptable levels of predictive accuracy for most macroeconomic variables, even when producing dynamic forecasts. The expanded model

# Figure 6. Primary spending shock


## A. Core small model variables





**Figure 6. Primary spending shock (continued)**

**B. Fiscal block and related variables**



GDP = gross domestic product; NG = national government; PHP = Philippine peso;  
 USD = United States dollar  
 Source: Authors' calculation

has been able to predict key macroeconomic variables reasonably well, though much can still be improved on the fiscal side.

Simulation exercises also demonstrate the expanded model's usefulness for macroeconomic analysis relevant to policymaking. Apart from the expected negative impact of an oil price shock on macroeconomic conditions (higher inflation and slower growth), the simulations reveal more details on the likely outcomes on the fiscal side. These include a tax windfall from customs revenues, which improves the primary balance and lowers debt indicators, although this trend eventually reverses as primary spending rises.

Similarly, exchange rate simulations show that a positive exchange rate shock (peso depreciation) generates an increase in customs revenues and the primary balance. However, the gains are offset by a rise in foreign debt in domestic currency terms. This, again, is in addition to other important findings, such as the positive response of exports to surprise depreciation and the positive net effect on growth, at least initially.

Policy simulation capacity, meanwhile, is also displayed through the primary balance simulations, where a primary spending shock and removal of a significant fiscal response triggers an increase in inflation relative to the baseline, higher growth, and eventual monetary tightening. While there are revenue improvements because of greater economic activity, these are offset by a sharp decline in the primary balance, bringing about an increase in the public debt stock.

As a continuous work in progress, further improvements in the model should be in terms of adding a more detailed financial block, modeling the aggregate supply side (especially to capture productivity effects), strengthening the linkages across blocks, and incorporating the role of expectations. The model may also be adjusted in response to important economic developments or structural changes, such as what could have possibly occurred because of the COVID-19 pandemic, and to include key features of the Philippine economy (e.g., key sectors like the business-process-related industry and key inflows such as overseas Filipinos' remittances).

## References

- Akbar, M. and E. Ahmad. 2021. Repercussions of exchange rate depreciation on the economy of Pakistan: Simulation analysis using macroeconomic model. *Journal of Policy Modeling* 43(5):574–600.
- Bagnai, A., B. Granville, and C. Mongeau Ospina. 2017. Withdrawal of Italy from the Euro area: Stochastic simulations of a structural macroeconomic model. *Economic Modelling* 64(2017):524–538.
- Bautista, C.C., R.S. Mariano, and B.V. Bawagan. 2009. The NEDA quarterly macroeconomic model: Theoretical structure and some empirical results. *The Philippine Review of Economics* 46(2):243–260.
- Blanchard, O. 2018. On the future of macroeconomic models. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 34(1–2):43–54.
- Cagas, M.A., G. Ducanes, N. Magtibay-Ramos, D. Qin, and P. Quising. 2006. A small macroeconomic model of the Philippine economy. *Economic Modelling* 23:45–55.
- Constantino, W. and J. Yap. 1988. The impact of trade, trade policy and external shocks on the Philippine economy based on the PIDS-NEDA macroeconomic model. PIDS Working Paper 1988-29. Makati City, Philippines: Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Constantino, W., J. Yap, R. Butiong, and A. dela Paz. 1990. The PIDS-NEDA annual macroeconomic model version 1989: A summary. PIDS Working Paper 1990-13. Makati City, Philippines: Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Debuque-Gonzales, M. and J.P. Corpus. 2023. Starting small: Building a macroeconomic model of the Philippine economy. PIDS Research Paper Series 2023-05. Quezon City, Philippines: Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://www.pids.gov.ph/publication/research-paper-series/starting-small-building-a-macroeconomic-model-of-the-philippine-economy> (accessed on December 3, 2023).
- Debuque-Gonzales, M., J.P. Corpus, and R.M. Miral. 2022. Macroeconomic prospects of the Philippines in 2022–2023: Steering through global headwinds. PIDS Discussion Paper Series 2022-31. Quezon City, Philippines: Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/document/pidsdps2231.pdf> (accessed on December 1, 2022).
- Ducanes, G., M.A. Cagas, D. Qin, P. Quising, and N. Magtibay-Ramos. 2005. A small macroeconomic model of the Philippine economy. ERD Working Paper Series 62. Manila, Philippines: Asian Development Bank.

- Hammersland, R. and C.B. Tr ae. 2014. The financial accelerator and the real economy: A small macroeconometric model for Norway with financial frictions. *Economic Modelling* 36(2014):517–537.
- Kasimati, E. and P. Dawson. 2009. Assessing the impact of the 2004 Olympic Games on the Greek economy: A small macroeconometric model. *Economic Modelling* 26(2009):139–146.
- Pesaran, M.H., Y. Shin, and R.J. Smith. 2001. Bounds testing approaches to the analysis of level relationships. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 16:289–326.
- Reyes, C., C. Bayudan-Dacuycuy, R.M. Abrigo, F.M. Quimba, N. Borromeo, D. Bautista, J. Ocampo, L.K. Baje, S. Calizo Jr., Z. Tam, and G. Hernandez. 2020. PIDS-BSP annual macroeconometric model for the Philippines: Preliminary estimates and ways forward. PIDS Discussion Paper Series 2020-16. Quezon City, Philippines: Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps2016.pdf> (accessed on November 1, 2022).
- Reyes, C. and J. Yap. 1993. Re-estimation of the PIDS-NEDA annual macroeconometric model. Unpublished manuscript.
- Rodriguez, U.E. and R.M. Briones. 2002. The Ateneo macroeconomic and forecasting model. *The Philippine Review of Economics* 39(1):142–178.
- Yap, J.T. 2000. PIDS annual macroeconometric model 2000. PIDS Discussion Paper Series 2000-13. Makati City, Philippines: Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps0013.pdf> (accessed on November 1, 2022).

## Appendices

### Appendix A. Results of unit root tests

#### 1. Results of Augmented Dickey-Fuller tests on model variables

	diff=0	diff=1	diff=2
GDP	0.98	0	0
GDP growth	0.01	0	0
Consumption	1	0.04	0
Investment	0.97	0	0
Government consumption	1	0	0
Imports	1	0	0
Exports	0.94	0	0
Disposable income	1	0	0
Domestic demand	1	0	0
Employment rate	0.71	0	0
CPI	0.47	0	0
GDP deflator	0.03	0	0
US CPI	0.36	0	0
Inflation rate	0	0	0
Inflation - inflation target	0.01	0	0
World oil price	0.15	0	0
Retail price of rice	0.08	0	0
Nominal exchange rate	0.49	0	0
Real exchange rate	0.63	0	0
Central bank policy rate	0.47	0	0
91-day Treasury rate	0.07	0	0
10-year Treasury rate	0.07	0	0

## 1. Results of Augmented Dickey-Fuller tests on model variables (*continued*)

	diff=0	diff=1	diff=2
Bank lending rate	0.04	0	0
Real 91-day Treasury rate	0.08	0	0
Real 10-year Treasury rate	0.02	0	0
Real bank lending rate	0	0	0
US 10-year Treasury rate	0.59	0	0
Nominal revenues	0.89	0	0
Nominal tax revenues	0.92	0	0
Nominal internal tax revenues	0.91	0	0
Nominal customs revenues	0.79	0	0
Nominal nontax revenues	0.54	0	0
Nominal expenditure	1	0	0
Nominal primary expenditure	1	0	0
Nominal interest payments	0.01	0	0
Nominal domestic interest payments	0.13	0	0
Nominal foreign interest payments	0	0	0
Effective interest rate on domestic debt	0.67	0	0
Effective interest rate on foreign debt	0.94	0	0
Primary balance/GDP	0.02	0	0
NG debt	0.72	0	0
Domestic NG debt	0.73	0	0
Foreign NG debt	0.44	0	0
Debt/GDP	0.86	0	0
Domestic debt/GDP	0.91	0	0
Foreign debt/GDP	0.95	0	0

GDP = gross domestic product; CPI = consumer price index; US = United States; NG = national government

Note: Figures are p-values from the Augmented Dickey-Fuller tests, with the null hypothesis being the presence of a unit root. The first, second, and third columns show the results of the test in terms of levels, first difference, and second difference, respectively. Level variables are log-transformed.

Source: Authors' calculation

## 2. Results of Elliott, Rothenberg, and Stock point optimal unit root test

	Diff=0	Diff=1	Diff=2
GDP	1485.5723	0.8826***	1.534***
GDP growth	2.1068**	0.7899***	4529.3576
Consumption	6785.9773	22.383	34.8902
Investment	77.6845	1.8987***	1.5435***
Government consumption	257.5739	0.8664***	0.5334***
Imports	237.4713	0.8728***	0.8728***
Exports	238.4139	0.922***	0.5396***
Disposable income	6167.278	0.0013***	2.6879**
Domestic demand	1642.0213	0.8676***	0.145***
Employment rate	23.3827	1.9979**	172.0068
CPI	734.7171	1.1837***	0.74***
GDP deflator	1284.8461	1.3206***	0.0175***
US CPI	1116.4898	0.7201***	2.2379**
Inflation rate	0.7523***	0.2689***	1836.95
Inflation - inflation target	0.2545***	0.1765***	2.6584**
World oil price	19.4667	0.9784***	0.4635***
Retail price of rice	83.269	0.8438***	0.4158***
Nominal exchange rate	5.7979	0.8798***	0.7781***
Real exchange rate	38.8243	0.7912***	1.079***
Central bank policy rate	14.5337	0.7899***	2.7527**
91-day Treasury rate	9.8806	0.862***	0.6832***
10-year Treasury rate	78.4053	1.1608***	0.4637***
Bank lending rate	35.8473	1.7777***	2.1148**
Real 91-day Treasury rate	5.1851	0.1199***	6.4527
Real 10-year Treasury rate	57.2514	0.0546***	8.5053
Real bank lending rate	2.8127**	1.4785***	4.4307
US 10-year Treasury rate	28.6412	0.7875***	0.314***

## 2. Results of Elliott, Rothenberg, and Stock point optimal unit root test (*continued*)

	Diff=0	Diff=1	Diff=2
Nominal revenues	863.5698	0.9515***	59.4279
Nominal tax revenues	325.8007	2.499**	1.3041***
Nominal internal tax revenues	791.5401	10.5147	1.5604***
Nominal customs revenues	240.1693	0.5345***	0.3221***
Nominal nontax revenues	32.1605	0.3985***	400.0325
Nominal expenditure	776.4533	0.0052***	791.1307
Nominal primary expenditure	379.4627	0.3642***	702.2408
Nominal interest payments	109.9192	2.7703**	3.7257*
Nominal domestic interest payments	54.7798	1.0585***	0.8459***
Nominal foreign interest payments	65.0057	0.6405***	427.3829
Effective interest rate on domestic debt	23.7831	1.7167***	658.4168
Effective interest rate on foreign debt	35.1067	1.6162***	6477.1921
Primary balance/GDP	2.4226**	1.3051***	23.331
NG debt	416.3514	4.4044	0.7704***
Domestic NG debt	619.0079	3.5252*	1.1334***
Foreign NG debt	105.1203	2.3595**	0.5267***
Debt/GDP	31.8015	2.7291**	0.4572***
Domestic debt/GDP	27.9514	1.7351***	0.6092***
Foreign debt/GDP	137.8358	1.7203***	0.3422***

GDP = gross domestic product; CPI = consumer price index; US = United States;

NG = national government

Note: Test statistics are reported. \*\*\* denote significant at 1%; \*\* significant at 5%; \* significant at 10%. See Elliott, Rothenberg, and Stock (1996) for critical values. The first, second, and third columns show the results of the test in terms of levels, first difference, and second difference, respectively. Level variables are log-transformed.

Source: Authors' calculation



## Appendix B. Behavioral equations

Refer to Table 1 for variable names. In estimated equations, subscripted figures enclosed in square brackets are t-statistics. Figures enclosed in parentheses in residual diagnostic tests are p-values. Asterisks after the F-Bounds test statistic are significance levels (\*\* 5 percent, \* 10 percent).

### 1. Consumption

a. Long-run equation


$$\log C_t = 0.96 \log YD_{t[6.90]} + 0.00 emp_{t[0.05]} - 0.01 rrr_{t[-0.43]}^{bl} - 0.00 \pi_{t[-0.41]} + 0.42_{[0.60]} + ec_t$$

b. ECM form


$$\Delta \log C_t = 0.26 \Delta \log YD_{t[4.22]} + 0.00 \Delta emp_{t[1.93]} + 0.01 \Delta emp_{t-1[2.84]} - 0.13 ec_{t-1[-7.37]} + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.998
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.31
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	0.15 (0.93)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (8)	21.36 (0.01)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	6.44 (0.17)
F-Bounds test	8.19***

**CUSUM test**



**CUSUM of squares test**



## 2. Investment

### a. Long-run equation


$$\log I_t = 1.57 \log Y_{t[11.59]} - 10.17_{[-4.93]} + ec_t$$

### b. ECM form


$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \log I_t = & -0.28 \Delta \log I_{t-1[-2.58]} \\ & + 2.04 \Delta \log Y_{t[3.53]} \\ & + 1.82 \Delta \log Y_{t-1[2.90]} - 0.01 \Delta r r^{BL}_{t[-1.81]} - 0.01 \pi_{t[-2.70]} - 0.19 ec_{t-1[-2.76]} \\ & + \epsilon_t \end{aligned}$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.98
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.31
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	0.56 (0.75)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (7)	22.81 (0.00)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	4.34 (0.36)
F-Bounds test	2.46

#### CUSUM test



#### CUSUM of squares test



## 3. Government consumption

### a. Long-run equation


$$\log G_t = 0.36 \log X_{t[5.43]}^{PPR} + ec_t$$

### b. ECM form


$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \log G_t = & 0.01 Trend_{t[4.43]} \\ & + 0.03 \Delta \log G_{t-1[0.25]} \\ & + 0.19 \Delta \log X_{t[3.31]}^{PPR} - 0.02 \Delta \log X_{t-1[-0.26]}^{PPR} - 0.65 ec_{t-1[-4.33]} + 4.97_{[4.34]} \\ & + \epsilon_t \end{aligned}$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.99
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.29
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	1.77 (0.41)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (6)	11.52 (0.07)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	4.11 (0.39)
F-Bounds test	9.24***

#### CUSUM test



#### CUSUM of squares test



#### 4. Imports

a. Long-run equation


$$\log M_t = 0.67 \log I_{t[7.11]} + 0.31 \log X_{t[2.53]} + 0.58_{[0.91]} + e_{ct}$$

b. ECM form


$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \log M_t = & -0.37 \Delta \log M_{t-1[-5.24]} \\ & + 0.33 \Delta \log I_{t[9.23]} \\ & + 0.68 \Delta \log X_{t[11.03]} + 0.30 \Delta \log X_{t-1[3.97]} - 0.18 e_{ct-1[-4.29]} + \epsilon_t \end{aligned}$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.997
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.75
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	1.35 (0.51)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (7)	8.44 (0.30)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	6.99 (0.14)
F-Bounds test	4.39***

##### CUSUM test



##### CUSUM of squares test



#### 5. Exports

a. Long-run equation


$$\log X_t = 4.16 \log Y_{t[18.65]}^{WORLD} + 0.37 \log xrrr_{t[2.85]} - 46.75_{[-13.05]} + e_{ct}$$

b. ECM form


$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \log X_t = & -0.20 \Delta \log X_{t-1[-1.86]} \\ & + 2.53 \Delta \log Y_{t[4.11]}^{WORLD} + 0.47 \Delta \log xrrr_{t[2.31]} - 0.32 e_{ct-1[-3.98]} + \epsilon_t \end{aligned}$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.99
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.29
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	43.16 (0.00)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (6)	6.25 (0.40)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	3.10 (0.54)
F-Bounds test	3.77**2.5%

##### CUSUM test



##### CUSUM of squares test



## 6. Employment rate

### a. Long-run equation


$$emp_t = 3.35 \log Y_{t[9.29]} + 43.07_{[8.02]} + ec_t$$

### b. ECM form


$$\Delta emp_t = -0.30 \Delta emp_{t-1[-2.42]} - 0.58 ec_{t-1[-3.77]} + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.82
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.45
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	0.04 (0.98)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (3)	3.61 (0.31)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	2.88 (0.58)
F-Bounds test	4.57**2.5%

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test



## 7. Internal tax revenues

### a. Long-run equation


$$\log RV_t^{TXBIR} = 1.12 \log Y_{t[30.68]}^N - 3.96_{[-6.99]} + ec_t$$

### b. ECM form


$$\Delta \log RV_t^{TXBIR} = -0.27 \Delta \log RV_{t-1[-3.03]}^{TXBIR} - 0.21 ec_{t-1[-7.60]} + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.995
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.21
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	2.18 (0.34)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (3)	0.36 (0.95)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	2.41 (0.66)
F-Bounds test	18.67***

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test



## 8. Customs revenues

### a. Long-run equation


$$\log RV_t^{TXBOC} = 0.83 \log(M_t * PY_t)_{[20.23]} + 0.35 \log oil_{t[4.18]} + 0.52 \log xr_{t[1.41]} - 7.44_{[-5.16]} + \epsilon_t$$

### b. ECM form


$$\Delta \log RV_t^{TXBOC} = -0.21 \Delta \log RV_{t-1}^{TXBOC}_{[-2.45]} + 0.91 \Delta \log(PY_t * M_t)_{[4.82]} - 0.44 \epsilon_{t-1}[-5.46] + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.97
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.49
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	26.11 (0.00)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (6)	13.42 (0.04)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	4.90 (0.30)
F-Bounds test	5.60***

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test



## 9. Nontax revenues

### a. Long-run equation


$$\log RV_t^{NTX} = 0.80 \log Y_t^N_{[13.01]} - 1.07_{[-1.17]} + \epsilon_t$$

### b. ECM form


$$\Delta \log RV_t^{NTX} = -2.57 \Delta \log Y_{t-1}^N_{[-2.38]} - 0.83 \epsilon_{t-1}[-7.19] + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.74
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.42
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	13.16 (0.00)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (2)	1.43 (0.70)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	4.43 (0.35)
F-Bounds test	16.72***

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test



## 10. Primary expenditure

### a. Long-run equation


$$\log X P_t^{PR} = -0.01 \Delta D Y_{t-4[-1.50]} + e c_t$$

### b. ECM form


$$\Delta \log X P_t^{PR} = 0.13 T r e n d_{t[4.85]} + 6.76_{[4.78]} - 0.55 e c_{t-1[-4.77]} + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.97
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.28
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	3.04 (0.22)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (6)	3.79 (0.28)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	4.74 (0.32)
F-Bounds test	11.20***

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test



## 11. Effective interest rate on domestic debt

### a. Long-run equation


$$r_t^{dd} = 0.73_{[5.10]} + 0.13 r_t^{t10y}_{[7.21]} + e c_t$$

### b. ECM form


$$\Delta r_t^{dd} = -0.46 \Delta r_{t-1}^{dd}[-4.78] - 0.28 e c_{t-1}[-3.49] + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.87
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.42
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	9.75 (0.01)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	9.06 (0.03)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	3.99 (0.41)
F-Bounds test	3.94*

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test



## 12. Effective interest rate in foreign debt

a. Long-run equation


$$r_t^{df} = 0.03r_{t[0.59]}^{10yUS} + 0.01DY_{t[2.76]} + 0.60_{[4.98]} + e_t$$

b. ECM form


$$\Delta r_t^{df} = -0.36\Delta r_{t-1[-3.74]}^{df} - 0.02\Delta DY_{t[-0.97]} - 0.02\Delta DY_{t-1[-1.43]} - 0.46e_{t-1[-4.07]} + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.64
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.46
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	8.32 (0.02)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (7)	7.49 (0.28)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	15.71 (0.00)
F-Bounds test	3.95**2.5%

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test



## 13. Central bank policy rate

a. Long-run equation


$$r_t^{cb} = 0.34(\pi_t - \pi_t^T)_{[2.76]} + 3.95_{[24.32]} + e_t$$

b. ECM form


$$\Delta r_t^{cb} = 0.15\Delta r_{t-1[1.55]}^{cb} - 0.26e_{t-1[-5.01]} + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.86
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.45
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	7.81 (0.02)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (3)	4.57 (0.21)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	6.37 (0.17)
F-Bounds test	8.01***

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test



## 14. 91-day Treasury bill rate

a. Long-run equation

$$r_t^{t91d} = 1.29 r_t^{cb} \underset{[3.08]}{\quad} - 0.59 \operatorname{movav} \left( \frac{pb_t}{y_t}, 4 \right) \underset{[-2.27]}{\quad} - 3.08 \underset{[-3.69]}{\quad} + e_{c_t}$$


where the  $\operatorname{movav}(pb_t/y_t, 4)$  is the simple moving average of the primary balance-to-GDP ratio for four quarters.

b. ECM form


$$\Delta r_t^{t91d} = 0.35 \Delta r_{t-1}^{t91d} \underset{[3.33]}{\quad} + 0.08 \pi_t \underset{[3.52]}{\quad} - 0.25 e_{c_{t-4.36}} + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.95
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.31
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	0.95 (0.62)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (5)	5.03 (0.41)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	5.23 (0.26)
F-Bounds test	4.54**

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test



## 15. 10-year Treasury bond rate

a. Long-run equation


$$r_t^{t10y} = 1.07 r_t^{t91d} \underset{[2.84]}{\quad} + 1.85 \underset{[1.85]}{\quad} + e_{c_t}$$

b. ECM form


$$r_t^{t10y} = 0.02 \pi_t \underset{[1.00]}{\quad} - 0.15 e_{c_{t-1[-3.52]}} + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.96
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.12
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	4.48 (0.09)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (3)	4.46 (0.22)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	2.98 (0.56)
F-Bounds test	4.00**

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test





## 16. Bank lending rate

a. Long-run equation


$$r_t^{bl} = 0.53r_{t-10y}^{t10y} + 2.91_{[7.35]} + e_{ct}$$

b. ECM form


$$\Delta r_t^{bl} = 0.19\Delta r_{t-1}^{bl} + 0.03\pi_{t[3.11]} - 0.20ec_{t-1[-4.91]} + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.97
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.27
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	21.20 (0.00)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	9.27 (0.05)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	8.52 (0.07)
F-Bounds test	7.80***

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test



## 17. Consumer price index


$$\Delta \log CPI_t = 0.06\Delta \log p^{oil}_{t[2.94]} + 0.15\Delta \log p^{rice}_{t[3.27]} + 0.44\Delta \log DD_t^{\square}_{t[4.61]} + 0.18\Delta \log xr_{t[2.05]} + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL) 0.68


Residual diagnostics

Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	1.45 (0.48)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (9)	14.33 (0.11)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	5.25 (0.26)

### CUSUM test



### CUSUM of squares test



# Extending the Small Macroeconometric Model of the Philippine Economy

## 18. GDP deflator

a. Long-run equation


$$\log P_t^Y = 0.78 \log CPI_{t[12.67]} + 1.00e_{t[3.61]} + e_{c_t}$$

b. ECM form


$$\Delta \log P_t^Y = 0.88 \Delta \log CPI_{t[16.37]} - 0.10 e_{c_{t-1[-3.54]}} + \epsilon_t$$

Adjusted R-squared (ARDL)	0.999
Adjusted R-squared (ECM)	0.60
Residual diagnostics	
Residual normality (Jarque-Bera)	0.11 (0.95)
Homoskedasticity (Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (3)	2.47 (0.48)
No serial correlation (Breusch-Godfrey) $\chi^2$ (4)	7.50 (0.11)
F-Bounds test	4.05**

### CUSUM test




### CUSUM of squares test




## Appendix C. Oil price shock simulation results

Note: Green lines represent baseline paths, while red broken lines represent scenario paths.

### A. Core model variables



**B. Fiscal block and related variables**




GDP = gross domestic product; CPI = consumer price index; PHP = Philippine peso; USD = United States dollar; NG = national government  
 Source: Authors' calculation


## Appendix D. Exchange rate shock simulation results

Note: Green lines represent baseline paths, while red broken lines represent scenario paths.

### A. Core model variables



**B. Fiscal block and related variables**




GDP = gross domestic product; CPI = consumer price index; PHP = Philippine peso;  
 USD = United States dollar; NG = national government  
 Source: Authors' calculation


## Appendix E. Primary spending shock

Note: Green lines represent baseline paths, while red broken lines represent scenario paths.

### A. Core model variables



**B. Fiscal block and related variables**



GDP = gross domestic product; CPI = consumer price index; PHP = Philippine peso; USD = United States dollar; NG = national government  
 Source: Authors' calculation




## **The Authors**

***Margarita Debuque-Gonzales*** is a former senior research fellow at PIDS. She obtained her PhD from the UP School of Economics, where she was also an associate professor. Her research interests are in the areas of monetary economics, financial economics, macroeconomics, and development.

***John Paul P. Corpus*** is a former supervising research specialist at PIDS. He holds a master's in Economics from the UP School of Economics. His fields of interest are in the areas of macroeconomics and development.







This study presents a small macroeconometric model with a fiscal sector, extending the model in Debuque-Gonzales and Corpus (2023). The model retains the original core blocks of domestic demand, international trade, employment, prices, and monetary sectors and adds a fiscal sector consisting of equations for government revenues, expenditures, and debt. Behavioral equations are estimated in error-correction form (using an autoregressive distributed lag or ARDL model) on quarterly data from 2002 to 2019. In-sample simulations demonstrate acceptable levels of predictive accuracy for most macroeconomic variables, even when producing dynamic forecasts. The model also projects plausible outcomes on the fiscal side in response to shocks in world oil prices, the exchange rate, and primary expenditure, showing the expanded model's policy simulation capabilities. The next steps for developing the model include adding a detailed financial block, modeling the aggregate supply side, and incorporating expectations.



18th Floor, Three Cyberpod Centris - North Tower  
EDSA corner Quezon Avenue, Quezon City, Philippines  
Tel.: (+632) 8877-4000  
Email: [publications@pids.gov.ph](mailto:publications@pids.gov.ph)  
Website: <https://www.pids.gov.ph>

 [facebook.com/PIDS.PH](https://facebook.com/PIDS.PH)  [x.com/PIDS\\_PH](https://x.com/PIDS_PH)  [youtube.com/PIDSPHL](https://youtube.com/PIDSPHL)