

# A Theory of Progressive Lending\*

Dyotona Dasgupta<sup>†</sup>

Dilip Mookherjee<sup>‡</sup>

## Abstract

We characterize Pareto efficient long term ‘relational’ lending contracts with one-sided lender commitment in a context where the borrower can accumulate wealth, the lender has some sanctioning power following default, and the borrower’s instantaneous utility is concave. We show the negative results of [Bulow and Rogoff \(1989\)](#) do not apply irrespective of the extent of sanctions, concavity of the borrower’s utility, initial wealth or relative welfare weight. Borrowing, investment and wealth grow and converge to the first-best. Optimal allocations can be implemented by backloaded ‘progressive’ lending: a sequence of one period loans of growing size.

Keywords: Dynamic Contracts, Borrowing Constraints, Moral Hazard, Progressive Lending, Microfinance.

JEL Classification Number: O16, G21, D86.

---

\*We acknowledge useful comments from Mausumi Das, Parikshit Ghosh, Hugo Hopenhayn, Debraj Ray, Prabal Roy Chowdhury, Rohini Somanathan and participants of Delhi Theory Workshop at Indian Statistical Institute and seminar participants at Delhi School of Economics. Dyotona Dasgupta acknowledges funding from the Robert S. McNamara Fellowship provided by the World Bank, and a postdoctoral fellowship provided jointly by Centre for Development Economics, Delhi School of Economics and Institute of Economic Growth. She also thanks the Institute for Economic Development, Boston University for hosting her visit during 2016-17.

<sup>†</sup>Jindal Global Business School, O.P. Jindal Global University. Email: dasgupta.dyotona@gmail.com

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Economics, Boston University. Email: dilipm@bu.edu

# 1 Introduction

This paper studies Pareto efficient lending contracts between a lender that can commit, and a borrower who cannot commit to a long term relationship and is thereby subject to an *ex post* moral hazard problem. The borrower can accumulate wealth via saving and investing in a concave productive technology, discounts the future at the rate of interest, and has a strictly concave utility function over current consumption that create a preference for intertemporal consumption smoothing. Our framework differs from existing literature in two aspects – by allowing the lender to impose *some* sanctions (which lower the borrower’s productivity) but not restricting their magnitude, and by imposing no additional restrictions on borrower utility. We show that lending is feasible without inducing any default, and optimal contract outcomes converge to the first-best levels. The optimum can be implemented via a sequence of one period loans that grow in size, conditional on no past default. The model is applicable to the contexts of microcredit or sovereign debt subject to problems of endogenous default risk.

[Bulow and Rogoff \(1989\)](#) showed that if the borrower does not face any sanction following default (except for the suspension of future access to borrowing), there does not exist any incentive compatible loan contract that enables the lender to break-even. [Rosenthal \(1991\)](#) extended this result when the default sanction included suspension of future access to saving as well,<sup>1</sup> while continuing to assume the lender lacked any capacity to lower the borrower’s productivity. In the subsequent literature, many papers ([Thomas and Worrall \(1994\)](#), [Aguiar et al. \(2009\)](#) for example) analyse optimal debt contracts under the assumption of strong sanctions imposed by the lender following defaults, which remove the borrower’s access to the production technology altogether (while the borrower is still able to spread resources into the future via saving).

Such an assumption of strong sanctions may perhaps be appropriate for small sovereign countries that rely entirely on a multinational firm for access to technology as well as credit. However it does not seem realistic for most sovereign debt settings. For example, [Kuvshinov and Zimmermann \(2019\)](#) estimate the cost of sovereign default to be 2.9% of GDP on impact, 4.3% at peak (five years later), which dissipates after ten years.<sup>2</sup> In the microcredit context relevant to most developing countries, borrowers are typically poor individuals who own some productive assets (such as land, equipment or earning capacity) that cannot be seized by formal lending institutions owing to lack of secure titles and/or weak

---

<sup>1</sup>For a borrower whose future discount factor is no greater than the interest rate on savings.

<sup>2</sup>Their paper summarizes the findings of a number of other studies that have estimated the cost of default using different data and methodologies, with broadly consistent results.

legal institutions. Indeed, these weak legal institutions are the very reason that these borrowers cannot meet collateral requirements for access to formal credit channels.<sup>3</sup> Hence defaulting borrowers are able to engage in subsistence production even if they are denied access to microcredit loans (besides other benefits bundled with these loans such as training, access to peer groups and marketing channels). This motivates the need to consider contexts where default sanctions include both denial of future access to borrowing and of complementary inputs and knowhow that lower the borrower's productivity, but do not eliminate their productive capacity entirely. Indeed, an important question is how loans, investment and welfare of the borrower vary with the extent of sanctions available to the lender.

[Albuquerque and Hopenhayn \(2004\)](#) allow sanctions to be less extreme, but assume a linear utility function for the borrower. This simplifies the analysis considerably, as optimal contracts are then fully backloaded – the borrower is not permitted to consume until investment distortions disappear. However, when the borrower's utility is strictly concave, such maximal backloading is no longer optimal. Optimal contracts then require spreading of consumption across time owing to a higher marginal value of current over future consumption, thereby aggravating default incentives. The limited scope for backloading then reduces the scope of loans to generate asset growth, raising the possibility that debt traps could emerge with a sufficiently high degree of curvature of the borrowers utility when default sanctions are weak. Specifically, one needs to analyze the nature of credit frictions that result and how these vary with parameters such as maximal sanctions, curvature of the borrower's utility and initial wealth.

Models of dynamic lending with two-sided commitment problems have shown how debt traps can emerge under suitable parameter ranges (e.g., [Mookherjee and Ray \(2002\)](#), [Liu and Roth \(2020\)](#)). However, many financial institutions (such as the IMF or large microfinance institutions) are long-lived, lend to large numbers of borrowers and have established reputations. A model of one-sided commitment therefore seems more relevant for such contexts, which motivates the model studied in this paper.

Allowing an arbitrary concave borrower utility function raises a number of technical problems, e.g., the borrower's value function need not be concave. These motivated [Thomas and Worrall \(1994\)](#) and [Aguiar et al. \(2009\)](#) to impose restrictions on the extent of concavity of the borrower's utility. Our paper develops a different method of analysis which does not rely on concavity of the borrowers value

---

<sup>3</sup>[Djankov et al. \(2008\)](#), in a study of 88 countries, find a strong correlation between the efficiency of debt enforcement and per capita income of a country.

function, and is thus able to investigate the consequences of high degrees of concavity of the utility function in conjunction with arbitrary default sanctions.

We start by showing that borrowers with initial wealth above some threshold  $w^*$  can achieve first-best investment via borrowing, in a steady state with stationary consumption and wealth. The borrower borrows and repays a stationary loan at the threshold, so  $w^*$  is lower than first-best steady state wealth in the absence of any borrowing or lending. Default is costly to the borrower owing to the sanctions subsequently imposed which lower productivity. As *some* sanctions are possible, this permits *some* lending to be sustainable and help borrowers with wealth at least  $w^*$  attain first-best investment.

The future prospect of attaining the  $w^*$ -steady state can then be used to sustain lending for borrowers with initial wealth below  $w^*$ . We show that net wealth, investment, consumption and borrowing grow over time. Though allocations are distorted at every date, these distortions eventually vanish: the allocation converges to the first-best  $w^*$  steady state, irrespective of initial wealth, borrowers utility function or ex ante welfare weight. The dynamic is qualitatively similar to that in a Ramsey model of autarkic self-financing, except that the steady state involves higher welfare, consumption and output at every date. Comparative dynamics with respect to decrease in the lender's bargaining power or profit target yield short-run increases in investment and consumption, leaving the long-run allocation unaffected. Hence the benefits accruing to the borrower are entirely front-loaded, with no long-term consequences.

Our approach bypasses the need to establish concavity of the borrower's value function. The underlying arguments are simple and can be explained intuitively as follows. A recursive representation of the optimal contracting problem is used to show that the loan contracts and the optimal investment are conditional on a single state variable – a measure of the (net) wealth of the borrower equal to value of current output, less debt repayments due. Next, we show that the sequence of wealths is monotonically increasing or decreasing over time, and thus must converge. This argument relies only on a single-crossing property that follows from the concavity of the utility function, implying that wealthier borrowers face a lower marginal cost of investing, and thus cannot invest less than poorer borrowers. Further, the recursive representation implies that as net wealth converges, so must consumption — for large enough  $t$ , the borrower's consumption must be smoothed nearly perfectly. The investment distortion must also vanish, since the borrower can always self-finance some extra investment. Hence a first-best allocation must be attained in the limit.

However a first-best allocation cannot be achieved in finite time, because this would result in a

consumption distortion without a co-existing investment distortion. Hence the borrower's wealth must be strictly less than  $w^*$  at all dates. This is only possible if wealth is rising and converging to  $w^*$ . Finally, the argument for optimality of progressive lending (i.e., loan sizes are increasing in net wealth) is based on showing that consumption grows faster on the equilibrium path than in the counter-factual event of default. While the detailed argument is somewhat complicated, it is essentially driven by the observation that the technology available to the borrower on the equilibrium path has a higher rate of return than the autarkic technology.

The last section extends the model to incorporate productivity shocks. The recursive representation continues to apply, and investments increase in net wealth. Moreover, conditional on stationary (or nondecreasing) productivity shocks, the borrower's net wealth, investment and output increase over time, with underinvestment disappearing once net wealth crosses some threshold. Of course in this setting wealth could also contract, owing to the possibility of declining productivity shocks. If wealth falls from one period to the next owing to an adverse shock, it continues to fall thereafter if the shock persists or becomes worse over time. Hence the wealth dynamic continues to be qualitatively similar to the stochastic version of the neoclassical growth model.<sup>4</sup>

In summary, we show the possibility of lending that leads asymptotically to first-best outcomes, irrespective of the level of default sanctions or borrower smoothing preferences, in contrast to previous literature which either assumes extreme sanctions or near-linear utility. Moreover, this model provides a rationale for progressive lending both in a positive and normative sense. Loan sizes increase, conditional on past repayment, and loans are repaid on the equilibrium path, broadly consistent with observed practice of MFIs.<sup>5</sup> These strategies provide repayment incentives efficiently, ensure that the lender's profit targets are met, and enable poor borrowers to escape poverty and accumulate wealth (conditional on absence of adverse shocks).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>We conjecture that results concerning ergodicity of wealth dynamics also continue to hold, but do not pursue this further.

<sup>5</sup>Table 1 shows that MFIs experience remarkably low default rates, while Table 2 provides evidence of use of progressive lending strategies by many large MFIs in Bangladesh, India and Vietnam.

<sup>6</sup>This is in an 'ideal' setting where borrowers have dynamically consistent preferences, convex technologies, and lenders commit to exclusive long-term credit contracts. Exclusivity clauses prevent borrowers from switching to a new lender after defaulting. These can arise owing to lender's coordinating on strategies, or borrowers being institutionally prevented from borrowing simultaneously from multiple lenders (see Pauly (1974), Arnott and Stiglitz (1986), Bizer and DeMarzo (1992) or Kahn and Mookherjee (1998)). To the extent that the observed anti-poverty impact of microcredit so far have been less successful than the model predicts (e.g., see Banerjee et al. (2015)), our results suggest that the problem does not stem from any inherent defect in progressive lending policies *per se*. Instead they must lie in violation of one or more of the other ideal assumptions.

Section 2 discusses relation to existing literature in more detail. Sections 3 and 4 provide analyses for the deterministic and uncertainty contexts respectively. Proofs are collected in the [Appendix](#).

## 2 Related Literature

As explained in the Introduction, this paper differs from the literature on dynamic lending by exploring a larger range of ex post default productivity-lowering sanctions and borrower utility functions. [Thomas and Worrall \(1994\)](#) and [Aguiar et al. \(2009\)](#) assume sanctions include denial of access to any production, and confine attention to linear or nearly-linear utility functions. [Albuquerque and Hopenhayn \(2004\)](#) allow weaker sanctions but limit the analysis to linear utility for the borrower which removes any preference for current consumption relative to future consumption. Our analysis applies to contexts with arbitrarily low sanctions and arbitrary preferences for intertemporal consumption smoothing.

[Acemoglu et al. \(2008\)](#) study a dynamic political economy agency setting and show that distortions disappear asymptotically without imposing any restrictions on the degree of concavity of agent utility. However they assume the agent does not have the capacity to spread resources into the future following a default via savings or storage. Translating this into a borrowing-lending setting, this amounts to lenders having an even stronger capacity to sanction borrowers than allowed by [Thomas and Worrall \(1994\)](#) and [Aguiar et al. \(2009\)](#). We show that distortions disappear asymptotically even when the lender has arbitrarily small sanctioning capacity and the borrower has an arbitrary concave utility function.

[Ray \(2002\)](#) considers a general model of constrained Pareto efficient self-enforcing contracts in the context of a repeated game between a principal and agent with limited transferability of utility, where the agent can neither save nor commit. He shows that all such contracts back-load in the sense the allocation of surplus tends progressively to the agent's favor at later dates, converging to the one that maximizes the agent's continuation payoff, which may or may not involve a distortion. Our model imposes more structure on preferences and technology, but incorporates investment and wealth accumulation, and shows that distortions disappear eventually.

[Thomas and Worrall \(2017\)](#) study optimal relational contracts between two agents neither of whom can commit, both contribute effort to a common joint output, and cannot save or invest. They consider both the case where the agents have strictly concave utility, and where they have linear utility and subject to limited liability. In the former case, their results turn out similar to ours: over-investment

never occurs; and convergence to the first-best is monotone if the first-best is sustainable.

[Dasgupta and Roy Chowdhury \(2018\)](#) provide an alternative explanation of progressive lending in a framework with a nonconvexity, where the borrower (with linear utility) has an opportunity to graduate to a higher occupation or productive activity which requires a minimum investment. The lender provides a savings as well as borrowing opportunity which enables the borrower to accumulate wealth and graduate at an endogenous finite date. Over time, savings banked with the lender increase, which the borrower forfeits in case of default. The endogenous growth of collateral permits the lender to extend larger loans which are repaid. In a context with a similar nonconvexity, [Liu and Roth \(2020\)](#) present a model of a debt poverty trap that arises when the lender is profit-maximizing and cannot commit to long term contracts. [Mookherjee and Ray \(2002\)](#) present a model where poverty traps can arise without any technological nonconvexity, with a profit-maximizing lender with limited commitment, and a borrower with concave utility subject to ex ante moral hazard. Comparing our results with these papers, we highlight the role of lender commitment in preventing debt traps.

A number of papers on dynamic lending in microfinance focus on unobserved borrower heterogeneity, and the possible role of progressive lending in screening borrowers. In all of these models, defaults necessarily occur on the equilibrium path. This limits their relevance to the microfinance setting where repayment rates are near 100%. For instance, [Ghosh and Ray \(2016\)](#) show how progressive lending can help screen out bad borrowers who always default from good borrowers, by providing small initial loans followed by larger ones after the bad borrowers have been eliminated. [Egli \(2004\)](#) shows that progressive lending may fail to identify a “bad” type, since a bad borrower may camouflage herself as a “good” borrower (who always repays) in order to get a higher amount of loan later on which she defaults with certainty. [Shapiro \(2015\)](#) examines a framework with uncertainty over borrowers’ discount rates. He shows that even in the efficient equilibrium almost all the borrowers default. An earlier paper with the same feature is [Aghion and Morduch \(2000\)](#), where in a two period context the borrower repays the first period loan to get a higher amount of loan in the second period on which she subsequently defaults. In contrast to these papers, we provide a theory of progressive lending without any equilibrium default and without any unobserved heterogeneity.

### 3 Model with Deterministic Technology

Consider a borrower with initial endowment  $e$ , in an infinite horizon discrete time framework. Her current payoff is given by  $u(c)$  where  $c$  denotes consumption.  $u(\cdot)$  is time-stationary, twice differentiable, strictly increasing, strictly concave and satisfying Inada conditions. The borrower's objective is to maximize the present discounted value of her lifetime utility:  $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t u(c_t)$ ; where  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  is the discount factor.

#### 3.1 Autarky

The borrower always has access to (i) a neoclassical production technology  $g(\cdot)$  which is strictly increasing, strictly concave and satisfies the Inada conditions:  $g'(0) = \infty$  and  $g'(\infty) = 0$  and (ii) a linear savings opportunity at a constant rate of return  $r = \frac{1}{\delta} - 1$ . Together, these imply that the borrower has access to a transformation possibility of resources from any date  $t$  to  $t + 1$  at a rate of return bounded below by  $r = \frac{1}{\delta} - 1$ . This possibility is represented by the function  $\phi(k)$  which provides total resources available at the next date if the borrower invests a total of  $k$ , shown in Figure 1 (where  $k_{\delta}^A$  denote the solution to  $\delta g'(k) = 1$ ). The budget constraint at  $t$  is then  $c_t + k_t \leq \phi(k_{t-1})$ , where  $c_t, k_t$  respectively denote consumption and capital stock at period  $t$ .




Figure 1: Autarky Technology

This formulation assumes that capital depreciates entirely after one period. As is well known, it is easy to extend the model to incorporate less than 100% depreciation, by redefining the production function. Suppose  $k_t = (1-d)k_{t-1} + i_t$ , where  $d$  is the proportion of capital stock that depreciates in one period,  $i_t$  denotes investment,  $k_{t-1}$  denotes capital stock, and output  $y_t = y(k_{t-1})$  at date  $t$ , where  $y(\cdot)$  is a

strictly increasing, concave function satisfying  $y(0) = 0$  and  $y'(0) = \infty$ . The agent's budget constraint at  $t$  is then  $c_t + i_t \leq y(k_{t-1})$ , which can be rewritten as  $c_t + k_t \leq \phi(k_{t-1}) \equiv y(k_{t-1}) + (1-d)k_{t-1}$ , with  $\phi(0) = 0$ ,  $\phi'(0) = \infty$ . In the remainder of the paper, we will therefore simplify notation by assuming full depreciation.

In autarky the problem of the borrower with endowment  $e > 0$  is to

$$\text{Maximize}_{\{k_\tau\}_{\tau=0}^\infty} u(e - k_0) + \sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \delta^{\tau-t} u(\phi(k_{\tau-1}) - k_\tau)$$

Subject to:

$$k_0 \leq e \text{ and } k_\tau \leq \phi(k_{\tau-1}), \forall \tau \geq 1.$$

We denote the solution to this standard Ramsey optimal growth problem by  $V^A(e)$ . It is well known that  $V^A$  is differentiable, with  $V^{A'}(e) = u'(e - k_A(e))$ , where  $k_A(e)$  is the optimal investment rule which is nondecreasing in  $e$ .

### 3.2 The Lender

The lender provides the borrower with access to a more productive technology  $z(k)$ , as well as to loans. The cost of capital of the lender is  $r$ , equal to the borrower's rate of return on savings. The lender has some sanctioning ability following a default: the production function  $z(\cdot)$  dominates  $g(\cdot)$  in terms of both absolute and marginal returns to investment:  $z(k) > g(k)$  and  $z'(k) > g'(k)$  for all  $k$ . This can represent higher productivity or price at which the output can be sold. Alternatively, it could represent a different production opportunity, which enables the borrower to raise returns by allocating investment between the two projects.<sup>7</sup> We impose no restriction on the extent of sanctions, i.e., the difference between the two production functions.

Let  $y(k)$  denote the return on investment  $k$  which is optimally allocated between production and savings:

$$y(k) = \begin{cases} z(k) & \text{if } k \leq k_\delta \\ z(k_\delta) + (1+r)(k - k_\delta) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where  $k_\delta$  denotes the first-best investment which solves  $\delta z'(k) = 1$ .

---

<sup>7</sup>If the production function in the new opportunity is represented by a strictly concave twice-differentiable function  $f(k)$  satisfying Inada conditions, the borrower will optimally allocate a total investment of  $k$  into  $x(k)$  in the new technology and  $k - x(k)$  in the old, such that  $f'(x(k)) = g'(k - x(k))$ . This results in total production  $z(k) = f(x(k)) + g(k - x(k))$  which dominates the old one in the sense described.

### 3.2.1 Credit Contracts

The borrower is subject to *ex post* moral hazard and cannot commit to repaying loans. The lender on the other hand can commit to a long-term contract providing access to the improved technology, stipulated investments and financial transfers to the borrower, as a function of past history which includes past investments, loans and repayments (all of which are verifiable).

Standard arguments imply that attention can be restricted without loss of generality to contracts where all loans are repaid on the equilibrium path, and any default is followed by suspension of technology and loan access at all future dates. Hence we can focus attention on incentive compatible contracts. A contract is a sequence  $p \equiv \{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$  and  $k \equiv \{k_0, k_1, \dots\}$  of stipulated net transfers and investments at each date  $t = 0, 1, \dots$ , conditional on absence of any past defaults. When  $p_t > 0$ , the borrower effectively obtains a loan, while  $p_t < 0$  denotes payments made by the borrower.

Let  $e$  denote the initial endowment of the borrower, and  $\pi$  an arbitrary profit target for the lender. A Pareto optimal contract then solves the following problem.

$$\max_{\langle \{p_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}, \{k_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \rangle} V_0 \equiv [u(e + p_0 - k_0) + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^t u(y(k_{t-1}) + p_t - k_t)] \quad (1)$$

subject to:

Lender's Profit Constraint

$$\text{LPC: } p_0 + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^t p_t \leq -\pi$$

Incentive Compatibility Constraints

$$\text{IC}_t: \quad V_t \equiv \sum_{\tau=t}^{\infty} \delta^{\tau-t} u(y(k_{\tau-1}) + p_{\tau} - k_{\tau}) \geq V^A(y(k_{t-1})), \quad \forall t \geq 1.$$

Borrower Participation Constraint

$$\text{BPC: } V_0 \geq V^A(e).$$

We do not include non-negativity constraints on the borrower's consumption owing to Inada conditions. The borrower has the option to default at any date  $t \geq 1$ ; hence the incentive compatibility constraint requires that continuation payoff does not fall below the autarkic payoff corresponding to an endowment equal to the current output  $y(k_{t-1})$ . The participation constraint requires an analogous condition at  $t = 0$ , where the borrower's outside option corresponds to the autarkic payoff starting with an endowment  $e$ .

We start with a preliminary observation which enables the problem to be simplified.

**Lemma 1.** (a) *There exists an upper bound  $\bar{\pi}(e) \in (0, \infty)$  to the profit that can be earned by the lender in any feasible contract.*

(b) *Given any feasible profit target  $\pi \leq \bar{\pi}(e)$ , the optimal contract solves the following competitive equilibrium (CE) problem with initial endowment  $w \equiv e - \pi \geq -\bar{\pi}(0)$ :*

$$V(w) \equiv \max_{\langle \{p_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}, \{k_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \rangle} [u(w + p_0 - k_0) + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^t u(y(k_{t-1}) + p_t - k_t)] \quad (2)$$

subject to:

*Lender's Breakeven Constraint*

$$LBC: \quad p_0 + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^t p_t \leq 0$$

*Incentive Compatibility Constraints*

$$IC_t: \quad V_t \equiv \sum_{\tau=t}^{\infty} \delta^{\tau-t} u(y(k_{\tau-1}) + p_{\tau} - k_{\tau}) \geq V^A(y(k_{t-1})), \quad \forall t \geq 1.$$

(3)

(a) states there is a positive upper bound  $\bar{\pi}(e)$  to the profit that the lender can earn by contracting with a borrower with initial endowment  $e > 0$ : any higher profit would violate the borrower's participation constraint. Any lower profit than  $\bar{\pi}(e)$  allows the existence of a feasible contract. The upper bound is positive since there is always a feasible contract if  $\pi = 0$ : access to the more profitable technology allows the borrower to attain a higher payoff compared to autarky in the absence of any transfers (i.e., if  $p_t = 0$  for all  $t$ ). Hence the borrower would be willing to pay a positive fee for such access, even if it is not bundled with any loans. Bundling access with loans will further increase the scope for the lender to earn profits.

Part (a) therefore implies we can focus attention on the case where  $\pi \leq \bar{\pi}(e)$ . The borrower participation constraint can then be dropped. Part (b) says moreover that the optimal contracting problem can be simplified as follows. First modify the borrowers initial endowment from  $e$  to  $w = e - \pi$ , i.e., via a lump-sum transfer of  $\pi$  from the borrower to lender.<sup>8</sup> Then the lender provides transfers  $p_t$  at successive dates to the borrower, subject to a break-even constraint, besides the repayment incentive

---

<sup>8</sup>Observe that  $\bar{\pi}(e) = \bar{\pi}(0) + e$ , so there is a feasible contract and  $V(w)$  is defined for all  $w \geq -\bar{\pi}(0)$ , i.e., including some negative values of borrower net wealth.

constraints. It therefore suffices to focus on the problem in (b), which corresponds to the CE contract maximizing payoff of a borrower with initial endowment  $w = e - \pi$ .

In the remainder of the paper, we therefore study the CE problem (b). We shall refer to  $w = e - \pi$  as the borrower's initial wealth and treat this as a parameter.

It is evident that the borrower's CE payoff  $V(w)$  is strictly increasing in her initial wealth, since this permits the borrower to consume more at  $t = 0$  without disturbing any of the incentive constraints (which pertain to  $t \geq 1$ ). Moreover, this payoff must strictly exceed her outside option  $V^A(w)$  corresponding to an initial endowment of  $w$ , because it is always feasible for a lender to break even by providing the borrower with access to the technology  $y(\cdot)$  unaccompanied by any financial transfers. Moreover, the optimal contract can be implemented by a sequence of one period loans at the competitive interest rate  $r$ , which satisfy a 'no Ponzi' scheme condition:

**Lemma 2.** (a)  $V(\cdot)$  is strictly increasing, and  $V(w) > V^A(w)$  for all  $w$ .

(b) The optimal contract can be implemented by a sequence of one period loan contracts  $l_t, t = 1, 2, \dots$  charging the interest rate  $r$ , which are always repaid on the equilibrium path, where

$$l_0 = p_0, l_t = p_t + (1 + r)l_{t-1}, \forall t \quad (4)$$

and

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \delta^T l_T \leq 0. \quad (5)$$

(b) follows from observing that the payment sequence  $p_t$  is equivalently represented by the one-period loan sequence  $l_t$  defined by (4), so  $p_t = l_t - \frac{l_{t-1}}{\delta}$ . We can interpret the transfer  $p_t$  at any date as the composition of a fresh loan  $l_t$  that is offered, after the borrower has repaid the previous loan. Observe that  $\sum_{t=0}^T \delta^t p_t = \delta^T l_T$ . Hence the break-even constraint (LBC) reduces to (5).

### 3.3 First-best Contracts

Consider the optimal contract when all the incentive constraints are dropped. It involves full consumption smoothing (via choice of transfers  $p_t$ ) and efficient investment  $k_t = k_\delta$ . The constant consumption  $c^*(w)$  is obtained by the requirement that the resulting present value of consumption  $\frac{c^*(w)}{1-\delta}$  equals the present value of endowment/output minus investment:  $w - k_\delta + \frac{\delta}{1-\delta}[y(k_\delta) - k_\delta]$ , so

$$c^*(w) = (1 - \delta)w + \delta y(k_\delta) - k_\delta. \quad (6)$$

The borrower then attains welfare  $V^*(w) = \frac{u(c^*(w))}{1 - \delta}$ .

As the first best contract is stationary, all the incentive constraints collapse to a single constraint  $c^*(w) \geq (1 - \delta)y(k_\delta) + \delta g(k_\delta^A) - k_\delta^A$ .<sup>9</sup> The first-best is incentive compatible if and only if the borrower's wealth exceeds the following threshold:

$$w^* \equiv y(k_\delta) - \frac{(\delta y(k_\delta) - k_\delta) - (\delta g(k_\delta^A) - k_\delta^A)}{1 - \delta} \quad (7)$$

Since the  $y(\cdot)$  technology dominates  $g(\cdot)$ , it follows that the threshold  $w^*$  is smaller than the first-best output  $y(k_\delta)$ . A borrower with wealth in the interval  $[w^*, y(k_\delta))$  obtains a loan at the first date of  $\delta[y(k_\delta) - w]$  and then repays  $(1 - \delta)[y(k_\delta) - w]$  at every subsequent date. These repayments are motivated by the lender threatening a defaulter with loss of access to the more productive technology, which allows the borrower to earn additional surplus  $(\delta y(k_\delta) - k_\delta) - (\delta g(k_\delta^A) - k_\delta^A)$  at every date in the future. Observe that  $\delta^T l_T = \delta^{T+1}[y(k_\delta) - w]$  which converges to 0 as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , so the 'no Ponzi scheme' condition (5) is satisfied. This is sustained by a stationary sequence of one-period loans of size  $\delta[y(k_\delta) - w]$  at every date. If  $w$  falls below  $w^*$  the loan is too large, resulting in a repayment obligation that would motivate the borrower to default.

For borrowers starting with wealth above  $y(k_\delta)$ , there is no need to borrow to achieve the first-best allocation: they invest  $k_\delta$  in production, and supplement this by saving  $\delta[w - y(k_\delta)]$  at every date.

Note that the incentive problem arises only for intermediate ranges of the discount factor. If  $\delta$  approaches 1, the first best can be sustained for any initial  $w$ , as the threshold  $w^*$  goes to minus infinity. While if  $\delta$  approaches zero, the threshold approaches zero (as in this case, the efficient investment approaches zero), and the demand for loans vanishes.

It follows the first-best contract is incentive compatible if and only if the borrower is wealthy enough to start with:  $w \geq w^*$ .

### 3.4 Second-best Contracts for Poor Borrowers

Now we focus on poor borrowers with  $w < w^*$  and characterize the features of the optimal contract.

Let  $c_t = y(k_t) + p_t - k_t$  denote the borrower's consumption at date  $t \geq 0$ .

**Lemma 3.**  $c_t \geq c_{t-1}$  for all  $t$ .

---

<sup>9</sup>If the borrower were to default, she would enter autarky with an initial wealth of  $y(k_\delta)$ . Since this exceeds  $g(k_\delta^A)$  the autarkic steady state output, the borrower would smooth consumption perfectly, and attain a per period consumption of  $c^A = (1 - \delta)y(k_\delta) + \delta g(k_\delta^A) - k_\delta^A$ .

**Proof.** Suppose otherwise, and  $c_t < c_{t-1}$  for some  $t$ . Lower  $p_{t-1}$  slightly, and raise  $p_t$  correspondingly to keep  $p_{t-1} + \delta p_t$  unchanged. This smooths consumption, raising  $V_l$  for every  $l \leq t$ , while leaving it unchanged for every  $l > t$ . Hence LBC and all incentive constraints are preserved, while raising borrower welfare. ■

To make further progress we use Lemma 1 to obtain a recursive formulation of the problem in terms of one-period loans. We study the ‘relaxed’ problem where the asymptotic breakeven constraint (5) is ignored. This relaxed problem can be stated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\langle \{l_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}, \{k_{t+1}\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \rangle}{\text{Maximize}} \left[ u(w + l_0 - k_0) + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^t u\left(y(k_{t-1}) - \frac{l_{t-1}}{\delta} + l_t - k_t\right) \right] \\ & \text{subject to} \\ & \text{IC: } V_t \equiv \sum_{\tau=t}^{\infty} \delta^{\tau-t} u\left(y(k_{\tau-1}) - \frac{l_{\tau-1}}{\delta} + l_{\tau} - k_{\tau}\right) \geq V^A(y(k_t)) \quad \forall t \geq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We will show later that the solution to this relaxed problem will end up automatically satisfying the breakeven constraint (5). Hence the optimal contract can be characterized by the solution to the relaxed problem. What makes this problem tractable is that the relaxed problem admits the following convenient recursive representation.

Observe that starting from any date  $t$ , the effect of past history is summarized in the single state variable  $w_t \equiv y(k_{t-1}) - \frac{l_{t-1}}{\delta}$ , the borrower’s net wealth which is the value of current output less inherited debt. So the contracting problem can be restated as follows.

**Lemma 4.** *The maximum attainable welfare  $V(w)$  for a borrower with initial wealth  $w$  must satisfy*

$$V(w) = \max_{l,k} \left[ u(w + l - k) + \delta V\left(y(k) - \frac{l}{\delta}\right) \right] \quad \text{subject to: } V\left(y(k) - \frac{l}{\delta}\right) \geq V^A(y(k)) \quad (9)$$

Denote target wealth by  $\Omega(l, k) \equiv y(k) - \frac{l}{\delta}$ . Then (9) can be restated as:

$$V(w) = \max_{l,k} \left[ u(w + l - k) + \delta V(\Omega(l, k)) \right] \quad \text{subject to: } V(\Omega(l, k)) \geq V^A(y(k)) \quad (10)$$

This problem can be broken into two stages. At the first stage, given any ‘target’ wealth  $\Omega$  for the next date, select  $(l, k)$  to minimize the net investment cost, i.e, the sacrifice of current consumption  $k - l$ , subject to the incentive constraint  $V(\Omega) \geq V^A(y(k))$ . Let the resulting minimized cost be denoted by  $C(\Omega)$ . Formally,

$$C(\Omega) = \min_{l,k} (k - l) \quad \text{subject to: } y(k) - \frac{l}{\delta} = \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad V(\Omega) \geq V^A(y(k)). \quad (11)$$

Then at the second stage, select the optimal target wealth  $\Omega(w)$  for the next date, given current wealth  $w$ . We summarize this as follows.

**Lemma 5.** *The maximum attainable welfare  $V(w)$  for a borrower with initial wealth  $w$  must satisfy*

$$V(w) = \max_{\Omega} [u(w - C(\Omega)) + \delta V(\Omega)] \quad (12)$$

Let us start with the first stage cost minimization problem. Given target wealth  $\Omega$  and capital choice  $k$ , the associated current loan must be  $l(\Omega, k) = \delta y(k) - \delta \Omega$ . Hence we can simplify (11) and reduce it to choice of investment alone as follows:

$$C(\Omega) = \delta \Omega + \min_k (k - \delta y(k)) \quad \text{subject to: } V(\Omega) \geq V^A(y(k)) \quad (13)$$

So when  $\Omega \geq w^*$ , the borrower invests  $k_{\delta}$  from the very first period and hence  $C(\Omega)$  in that case becomes  $\delta \Omega - [\delta y(k_{\delta}) - k_{\delta}]$ . While if  $\Omega < w^*$ , the incentive constraint binds and in particular

$$V(\Omega) = V^A(y(k)) \quad (14)$$

so the resulting investment size is  $k(\Omega) = y^{-1}(V^{A^{-1}}(V(\Omega)))$ . Since  $V(\Omega) < V(w^*) = V^A(y(k_{\delta}))$ , and  $V^A$ ,  $V$  and  $y$  are increasing, hence when  $\Omega < w^*$  there will be underinvestment:  $k(\Omega) < k_{\delta}$ . We summarize this in the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.** *For target wealths  $\Omega$  smaller than  $w^*$ , investment  $k(\Omega)$  is smaller than the efficient level  $k_{\delta}$ , and equal to the efficient level otherwise.*

So given target wealth  $\Omega$ , optimal investment is uniquely determined:

$$k(\Omega) \equiv \begin{cases} k_{\delta} & \text{if } \Omega \geq w^* \\ y^{-1}(V^{A^{-1}}(V(\Omega))) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and the cost function is

$$C(\Omega) = \delta \Omega + k(\Omega) - \delta y(k(\Omega)) \quad (15)$$

which is continuous and strictly increasing. Clearly the marginal cost of target wealth is  $\delta$  for wealthy borrowers ( $w > w^*$ ) and larger than  $\delta$  for poor borrowers.

The second-stage problem involves choosing the target wealth  $\Omega$ . Observe first that the set of attainable target wealths is bounded above by  $\frac{w}{\delta}$ , since the marginal cost of target wealth is bounded below by  $\delta$ , and current consumption must be non-negative owing to the Inada conditions. It is also bounded below, e.g., by the incentive constraint which requires  $V(\Omega) \geq V^A(y(0))$ . Hence there always exists an optimal target wealth.<sup>10</sup> The optimal target wealth however may be non-unique. In what

<sup>10</sup>This relies on the upper semi-continuity of the value function, which follows from a standard recursive argument.

follows we consider any policy function which is a measurable selection from the optimal target wealth correspondence.

Since  $V$  is strictly increasing, a higher target wealth is always valuable. The borrower must trade off a higher target wealth against the current cost. The concavity of  $u$  implies wealthier borrowers incur a lower marginal cost (in terms of sacrifice of utility from current consumption) of achieving higher future wealth. Hence those currently wealthier will remain wealthier in future.

**Lemma 7.**  $\Omega(w)$  is nondecreasing in  $w$ .

One useful consequence of this result is the following.

**Lemma 8.** *The value function  $V(w)$  is differentiable almost everywhere, with derivative equal to  $u'(c(w))$ , where  $c(w) \equiv w - k(w) + l(w)$  denotes the borrower's consumption policy. More generally, at every  $w$ , the right hand derivative of  $V$  is bounded below by  $u'(c(w))$ .*

We continue to focus on the case where initial wealth is below the threshold  $w^*$ . We are now ready to present our first main result, showing the absence of any poverty trap: the wealth of every poor borrower will converge to the first-best threshold  $w^*$ .

**Proposition 1.** *If  $w < w^*$ , the sequence of net wealths  $w_t$  is strictly increasing, strictly smaller than  $w^*$  at every  $t$ , and converges to the first best threshold  $w^*$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . The corresponding investment sequence  $k_t$  is nondecreasing and converges to  $k_\delta$ , and consumption  $c_t$  is nondecreasing and converging to  $c^*(w^*)$ .*

The underlying intuition is the following. The sequence of net wealths is monotone, hence must converge. This implies that near the limit, consumption is almost perfectly stationary, i.e., the consumption distortion vanishes asymptotically. Then there cannot be any underinvestment in the limit. Otherwise it is feasible for the borrower to increase welfare by raising investment slightly and finance it with a combination of altered borrowing and self-financing which preserves the incentive constraint. A similar logic (but reversed) ensures that convergence cannot be achieved in finite time (because that would imply absence of a production distortion and presence of a consumption distortion at the previous date).

Observe also that the no Ponzi scheme condition (5) holds for the optimal contract for any poor borrower starting below  $w^*$ , because the wealth and behavior of such borrowers eventually are arbitrarily

close to those of someone who starts with  $w^*$ . Hence as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\delta^T l_T$  converges to  $l(w^*) \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \delta^T = 0$ , and LBC is automatically satisfied at the solution to the relaxed problem in which it was dropped.

Our next main result is that the optimal strategy involves progressive lending: when  $w < w^*$  optimum loan size increases over time.

**Proposition 2.** *Starting with any  $w < w^*$ , the borrower obtains a loan  $l(w)$  which is strictly positive and strictly increasing in  $w$ .*

The reasoning is based on observing that the optimal loan size is characterized by the binding incentive constraint:  $V(y(k(w)) - \frac{l(w)}{\delta}) = V_A(y(k(w)))$  for all  $w < w^*$ . The loan size  $l(w)$  is rising in  $w$  if  $V'(\Omega(w)) = u'(c(\Omega(w)))$  exceeds  $V'_A(y(k(w))) = u'(c_A(y(k(w))))$ , where  $c_A(w')$  denotes the optimal consumption of a borrower in autarky when starting with wealth  $w'$ . In other words, consumption on the equilibrium path lies below consumption on the corresponding autarkic outside option which generates equal welfare. This in turn holds because the borrower has access to a more productive technology on the equilibrium path, implying a faster rate of consumption growth. Since the present value of consumption is the same on and off the equilibrium path, current consumption on the equilibrium path must be lower.

We conclude this section by considering the effect of lowering  $\pi$ , the profit target of the lender. This corresponds either to a higher bargaining power of the borrower, or an increase in ‘aid’ disbursed by a non-profit lender. The latter interpretation corresponds to an external aid donor providing aid to facilitate lending by a non-profit MFI that seeks to design contracts to maximize the present value utility of the representative borrower, subject to a break-even constraint. If the external aid donor provides aid  $a > 0$  per borrower, the MFI’s profit target is lowered from 0 to  $-a$ .

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose the borrower has initial endowment  $e < w^* + \pi$ , and the profit target of the lender is lowered from  $\pi$  to  $\pi - a$  with  $a > 0$ . This raises (weakly) the net wealth, borrowing and investment at every date, while long run wealth, borrowing, investment and consumption are unaffected.*

Hence the effects of aid are entirely ‘front-loaded’, just as in a neoclassical growth model. Proposition 3 follows straightforwardly from our preceding results. Given the initial endowment  $e$  of the borrower, this raises her initial net wealth from  $e - \pi$  to  $e - \pi + a$ . Owing to the monotonicity of the  $\Omega(w), k(w), l(w)$  functions, this results in a (weak) increase in the net wealth, borrowing and investment of the borrower at the next date, and thereafter at every subsequent date. However in the long run the borrower’s wealth must converge to the same limit  $w^*$ , and so must all the other outcomes.

## 4 Extension to Uncertain Productivity Shocks

In autarky, the output of the borrower is now  $g(k; s)$ , where  $s$  is an i.i.d. shock with a CDF  $J(\cdot)$  over a finite support  $[\underline{s}, \bar{s}]$ , and  $g$  is twice differentiable, satisfying  $g_k > 0 > g_{kk}, g_s > 0, g_{ks} \geq 0$  besides Inada conditions. This includes both the case of additive ( $g(k; s) = \tilde{g}(k) + s$ ) and multiplicative shocks ( $g(k; s) = s\tilde{g}(k)$ ). In the presence of the lender, the borrower has a production function  $y(k; s)$  with higher output and marginal product of capital than the autarkic technology at any  $(k; s)$  and satisfying all other analogous properties of  $g(\cdot)$  mentioned above.

We assume that at any date  $t$ , the shock is observed *before* investment decisions are made. This is analogous to the model of [Albuquerque and Hopenhayn \(2004\)](#). If the shock is observed after investments are made, it can be verified that all the results continue to apply if the shocks are additive.<sup>11</sup>

### 4.1 Autarky

The autarkic value function is for a state with current wealth  $e$  which is the value of output realized from investment at the previous date, and shock  $s$  applying to production at the current date:

$$V_A(e, s) = \max_{0 \leq k \leq w} [u(e - k) + \delta E_{s'} \{V_A(g(k; s), s')\}] \quad (16)$$

Standard arguments imply that optimal investment  $k_A(e, s)$  is non-decreasing in both arguments. This implies that wealth follows a monotone Markov process ([Hopenhayn and Prescott \(1992\)](#)): the distribution of wealth at the next date conditional on current wealth  $w$  first order stochastically dominates that conditional on a lower current wealth  $w' < w$ . Note that unlike [Hopenhayn and Prescott \(1992\)](#) we have not imposed any exogenous upper bound on capital stocks, so the state space is not compact and their results concerning invariant or limiting distributions do not necessarily apply.

---

<sup>11</sup>The main complication arises from the need to keep track of a single dimensional measure of wealth the value of which can be targeted while making current investment decisions. If the current shock is known, the borrower and lender can predict the former's output that will result next period. If the shock is unknown, the borrower's output cannot be predicted with certainty. However, in this case if the shock is additive, the mean output can be predicted which serves to pin down the distribution of output as well as wealth next period by their corresponding certainty equivalents (CE). That is, with production function  $\tilde{y}(k) + s$ , the wealth next period from choice of  $(k, l)$  today will be  $\tilde{w} + s$  where  $\tilde{w} = \tilde{y}(k) - \frac{l}{\delta}$ . Hence future CE wealth ( $\tilde{w} + Es$ ) is determined by current decisions, and a higher CE wealth results in a wealth distribution that is 'larger' in the sense of first order stochastic dominance. Hence we can extend the theory to this case where we replace target wealths by target CE wealths.

## 4.2 Access to Lender

A lender provides access to the superior technology  $y(k; s)$ , and a lending contract featuring a sequence of a state-contingent investments  $k_t(h_t)$  and transfers  $p_t(h_t)$  where  $h_t \equiv (s_0, \dots, s_t)$ , provided the borrower has not defaulted at any previous date. As in the deterministic case, the analysis of Pareto efficient contracts with a minimum profit constraint  $\pi$  for the lender, reduces to the analysis of CE contracts with a lender breakeven constraint and a borrower initial wealth of  $w = e - \pi$ .

Such a contract generates welfare for a borrower starting with wealth  $w$  and initial shock  $s_0$ :

$$u(w - k_0 + p_0) + E_{s_1, s_2, \dots} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^t u(y(k_{t-1}, s_{t-1}) - k_t + p_t) \right] \quad (17)$$

The lender's breakeven constraint is

$$E \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t p_t \right] \leq 0 \quad (18)$$

while the incentive constraint requires at any date  $t$  and following any history  $h_t$ :

$$E \left[ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^j u(y(k_{t-1+j}, s_{t+j}) - k_{t+j} + p_{t+j}) | h_t \right] \geq E_{s'} [V_A(y(k_{t-1}, s_t), s')] \quad (19)$$

A contract is feasible if it satisfies (18) and (19). Let welfare  $V(w, s_0)$  denote the maximum value of (17) subject to the two feasibility constraints.

Analogous to the deterministic case, we obtain:

**Lemma 9.** *Any feasible contract can be implemented by a sequence of one period state-contingent loans satisfying  $l_0 = p_0$ ,  $l_t(h_t) = p_t(h_t) - \frac{l_{t-1}(h_{t-1})}{\delta}$ , which (i) are always repaid on the equilibrium path, and (ii) satisfy the break-even condition:*

$$E \left[ \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \delta^T l_T \right] \leq 0 \quad (20)$$

In other words, the lender provides a fresh one period loan at each date-history pair, which provides the required net transfer after allowing for repayment of the previous loan. The break-even condition (20) reduces to a 'no-Ponzi' scheme requirement which holds in expectation. To ensure this, we shall assume there is a finite lower bound  $\underline{w}$  on the borrower's net wealth imposed by law or MFI policy. This amounts to a limit on loan size that depends on anticipated current output:

$$l_t \leq \delta [y(k_t, s_t) - \underline{w}] \quad (21)$$

As in the deterministic case, we shall ignore constraint (20) and then show that the solution to the ‘relaxed’ problem (which incorporates constraint (21) instead) satisfies it automatically

We then obtain a recursive representation of the optimal contracting problem:

$$V(w, s) = \max_{k, l} [u(w - k + l) + \delta E_{s'} [V(y(k, s) - \frac{l}{\delta}, s')]] \quad (22)$$

subject to the incentive constraint

$$V(y(k, s) - \frac{l}{\delta}, s') \geq V_A(y(k, s), s'), \forall s' \in [\underline{s}, \bar{s}] \quad (23)$$

and borrowing constraint

$$l \leq \delta [y(k, s) - \underline{w}] \quad (24)$$

This is similar to the case of certainty, except that there is a separate incentive constraint for each possible realization of the shock at the next date, while the objective function involves only the corresponding expected value of the continuation utility.

The measure of net wealth is now  $w \equiv y(k, s) - \frac{l}{\delta}$ , which is bounded below by  $\underline{w}$  and unbounded above. And we can continue to break down the recursive contracting problem into two steps. First, given current shock  $s$  and a target net wealth  $\Omega \geq \underline{w}$  in the next period, minimize the cost in terms of foregone current consumption:

$$C(\Omega, s) \equiv \min(k - l) \quad \text{subject to: (23) and } y(k, s) - \frac{l}{\delta} = \Omega \quad (25)$$

Then at the second step, select the target wealth  $\Omega(w, s)$  for next period:

$$V(w, s) = \max_{\Omega \geq \underline{w}} [u(w - C(\Omega, s)) + \delta E_{s'} V(\Omega, s')] \quad (26)$$

As in the deterministic case, optimal target wealths are well-defined, and we consider any policy function which is a measurable selection from the optimal policy correspondence. Let an optimal investment and financing policy be denoted by  $k(w, s), l(w, s)$  respectively.

Our main result for the case of uncertainty is the following.

**Proposition 4.** (a) *Wealth next period  $w' = \Omega(w; s)$  is non-decreasing in current wealth  $w$  and productivity shock  $s$ .*

(b)  *$k(w, s) \leq k_\delta(s)$  for all  $w$ , where  $\delta y'(k_\delta(s); s) = 1$ .*

(c) Along any history, the no-Ponzi scheme condition  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \delta^T l_T \leq 0$  holds, and the lender breaks even.

(d)  $k(w; s)$  is non-decreasing in  $w$ .

(e) Conditional on  $w_t \geq w_{t-1}$  and a sequence of nondecreasing productivity shocks:

$$s_{t+j} \geq s_{t+j-1}, \forall j = 0, 1, 2.. \quad (27)$$

net wealth  $w_{t+j}$  and investment  $k_{t+j}$  are nondecreasing in  $j$ .

(f) For any  $s$ , there exists wealth threshold  $w^*(s)$  such that  $k(w, s) = k_\delta(s)$  and  $l(w, s) \leq 0$  for all  $w \geq w^*(s)$ .

Part (a) implies the evolution of wealth follows a monotone Markov process. (b) ensures there is never any under-investment, while (c) implies the break-even condition for the lender along every history. Part (d) says that investment is non-decreasing in wealth. These results imply part (e): conditional on a nondecreasing sequence of productivity shocks (combined with wealth rising initially), the wealth and investment of the borrower rises monotonically over time. This shows that the main result of [Albuquerque and Hopenhayn \(2004\)](#) regarding the effect of rising ‘age’ of the relationship (conditional on productivity shock) continues to hold in this setting. Once wealth rises sufficiently, (f) states that investment levels become first-best. As wealth rises further, the borrower becomes a lender rather than borrower and attains first-best investment. Of course, welfare is not first-best, owing to lack of insurance and resulting consumption distortions. Wealthy borrowers may suffer a string of negative productivity shocks and subsequent declines in wealth and forced to borrow again.

We have not provided any results concerning invariant or limiting wealth distributions. Such results could be obtained upon imposing exogenous upper bounds on lending and capital investment, as in ([Hopenhayn and Prescott \(1992\)](#)), which ensure a compact state space. Such bounds would be arbitrary and ad hoc, so we avoid imposing them. Whether such results can be obtained despite the absence of such bounds, remains an interesting open question.

## References

- Acemoglu, Daron, Michael Golosov, and Aleh Tsyvinski**, “Political economy of mechanisms,” *Econometrica*, 2008, 76 (3), 619–641.
- Aghion, B. and J. Morduch**, “Microfinance Beyond Group Lending,” *The Economics of Transition*, 2000, 8 (2), 401–420.
- Aguiar, Mark, Manuel Amador, and Gita Gopinath**, “Investment cycles and sovereign debt overhang,” *The Review of economic studies*, 2009, 76 (1), 1–31.
- Albuquerque, R. and H. A. Hopenhayn**, “Optimal Lending Contracts and Firm Dynamics,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 2004, 71, 285–315.
- Arnott, R. and J. E. Stiglitz**, “Moral hazard and optimal commodity taxation,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 1986, 29 (1), 1–24.
- Banerjee, A., D. Karlan, J. Zinman, E. Duflo, R. Glennerster, C. Kinnan, A. Tarozzi, J. Desai, K. Johnson, O. Attanasio et al.**, “American Economic Journal,” *Applied Economics*, 2015, 7 (1), 2015.
- Bizer, D. S. and P. M. DeMarzo**, “Sequential banking,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 1992, 100 (1), 41–61.
- Bulow, J. and K.S. Rogoff**, “Sovereign Debt: Is to Forgive to Forget?,” *American Economic Review*, 1989, 79 (1), 43–50.
- Dasgupta, D. and P. Roy Chowdhury**, “Dynamic Incentives in Microfinance – Progressive Lending, Microsavings, and Borrower Welfare,” *Working Paper*, 2018.
- Djankov, Simeon, Oliver Hart, Caralee McLiesh, and Andrei Shleifer**, “Debt enforcement around the world,” *Journal of political economy*, 2008, 116 (6), 1105–1149.
- Egli, D.**, “Progressive Lending as an Enforcement Mechanism in Microfinance Programs,” *Review of Development Economics*, 2004, 8 (4), 505–520.

- Ghosh, P. and D Ray**, “Information and Enforcement in Informal Credit Markets,” *Economica*, 2016, 83 (329), 59–90.
- Hopenhayn, H. and E. Prescott**, *Econometrica*, 1992, 60 (6), 1387–1406.
- Kahn, C. M and D. Mookherjee**, “Competition and incentives with nonexclusive contracts,” *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 1998, pp. 443–465.
- Kuvshinov, Dmitry and Kaspar Zimmermann**, “Sovereigns going bust: estimating the cost of default,” *European Economic Review*, 2019, 119, 1–21.
- Liu, E. and B. Roth**, “Contractual Restrictions and Debt Traps,” *Working Paper, Harvard Business School*, 2020.
- MIX**, “Global Outreach and Financial Performance Benchmark Report 2015,” Technical Report 2017.
- Mookherjee, D. and D. Ray**, “Contractual Structure and Wealth Accumulation,” *American Economic Review*, 2002, 92 (4), 818–849.
- Pauly, M. V.**, “Overinsurance and Public Provision of Insurance: The Roles of Moral Hazard and Adverse Selection,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1974, 88 (1), 44–62.
- Ray, D.**, “The Time Structure of Self-Enforcing Agreements,” *Econometrica*, 2002, 70 (2), 547–582.
- Rosenthal, R. W.**, “On the incentives associated with sovereign debt,” *Journal of International Economics*, 1991, 30, 167–176.
- Shapiro, D. A.**, “Microfinance and Dynamic Incentives,” *Journal of Development Economics*, 2015, 115, 73–84.
- Thomas, J. and T. Worrall**, “Foreign Direct Investment and Risk of Expropriation,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 1994, 61 (1), 81–108.
- and — , “Dynamic Relational Contracts Under Complete Information,” *Working Paper*, 2017.

Table 1: MFI Portfolio at Risk Average, By Region

Regions <sup>12</sup>	Percentage of Total Borrowers	Percentage of Gross Loan Portfolio (GLP)	Portfolio at Risk > 30 Days (PAR)
Africa	5%	9%	10.60%
East Asia and the Pacific (EAP)	1%	16%	3.40%
Eastern Europe and Central Asia (ECA)	3%	11%	10.00%
Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)	19%	42%	5.40%
Middle East and North Africa (MENA)	2%	1%	3.60%
South Asia	57%	20%	2.60%

“Portfolio at Risk (PAR)”: is one of the indicators of repayment rate. Portfolio at Risk [xx] days is defined as the value of all loans outstanding that have one or more installments of principal past due more than [xx] days. This includes the entire unpaid principal balance, including both the past due and future installments, but not accrued interest. It also includes loans that have been restructured or rescheduled.

“Gross Loan Portfolio (GLP)”: All outstanding principals due for all outstanding client loans. This includes current, delinquent, and renegotiated loans, but not loans that have been written off.

Source MIX (2017): Global Outreach and Financial Performance Benchmark Report 2015.

Table 2: MFI Clienteles, Loan Portfolio and Progressive Lending Practices in Three Countries

Country	Number of Active Borrowers '000	Gross Loan Portfolio (GLP)(USD)m	Financial Service Provider (FSP)	Number of Active Borrowers '000	Gross Loan Portfolio (GLP)(USD)m	Progressive Lending?
India	38,097.6	11,640.8	Bandhan	-	2,352.66	Yes
			Janalakshmi	5,888.75	1,973.48	Yes
			Bharat Financial (SKS)	5,323.06	1,413.30	Yes
			Share	3,740.00	251.68	Yes
			SKDRDP	3,612.43	754.60	
Bangladesh	23,977.7	5,753.7	Grameen Bank	7,180.00	1,294.65	Yes
			ASA	6,207.69	1,533.97	Yes
			BRAC	5,356.52	1,768.61	
			BURO Bangladesh	917.46	311.61	Yes
			TMSS	736.98	188.95	Yes
Vietnam	7,533.9	7,351.9	VBSP	6,863.04	6,434.69	Yes
			CEP	288.49	108.28	Yes
			Coopbank	111.93	726.19	
			TYM	97.42	45.45	Yes
			MOM	40.17	7.26	

Top three countries by active borrowers and top five MFIs from each of them.

Source MIX (2017): Global Outreach and Financial Performance Benchmark Report 2015 and respective websites.

## Appendix

**Proof of Lemma 1:** Denote the original problem (1) by  $\mathcal{P}(e, \pi)$  and note that it can be rewritten as follows with a change of variable from transfers  $p_t$  to consumption  $c_t \equiv y(k_{t-1}) + p_t - k_t, t \geq 1$  and  $c_0 \equiv e + p_0 - k_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\langle \{c_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}, \{k_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \rangle} V_0 &\equiv \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t u(c_t) & (28) \\ \text{subject to:} & \\ \text{LPC: } \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t c_t &\leq e - \pi - \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t k_t + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^t y(k_{t-1}) \\ \text{IC}_t: V_t &\equiv \sum_{\tau=t}^{\infty} \delta^{\tau-t} u(c_{\tau}) \geq V^A(y(k_{t-1})), \quad \forall t \geq 1. \\ \text{BPC: } V_0 &\geq V^A(e). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly refer to the CE problem (2) by  $\mathcal{P}^C(w)$ , and using the same change of variables this can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} V(w) &\equiv \max_{\langle \{c_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}, \{k_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \rangle} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t u(c_t) & (29) \\ \text{subject to:} & \\ \text{LBC: } \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t c_t &\leq w - \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t k_t + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^t y(k_{t-1}) \\ \text{IC}_t: V_t &\equiv \sum_{\tau=t}^{\infty} \delta^{\tau-t} u(c_{\tau}) \geq V^A(y(k_{t-1})), \quad \forall t \geq 1. & (30) \end{aligned}$$

We claim that the feasible set in  $\mathcal{P}(e, \pi)$  is non-empty if and only if the feasible set in  $\mathcal{P}^C(e - \pi)$  is non-empty and  $V(e - \pi) \geq V^A(e)$ . To show the ‘if’ part, observe that the solution to  $\mathcal{P}^C(e - \pi)$  is feasible in  $\mathcal{P}(e, \pi)$ . For the converse, take any feasible contract  $\{\hat{c}_t, \hat{k}_t\}$  in  $\mathcal{P}(e, \pi)$ . This is feasible in  $\mathcal{P}^C(e - \pi)$ . Hence the solution to the latter problem yields a payoff  $V(e - \pi)$  of at least  $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t u(c_t)$ , which in turn is at least  $V^A(e)$  owing to (BPC).

Next observe that  $V(\cdot)$  is strictly increasing, since any increase in  $w$  can be accompanied by an equivalent increase in  $c_0$  without violating either LBC or any  $\text{IC}_t$ .

Define  $\bar{\pi}(e) \equiv \sup\{\pi | V(e - \pi) \geq V^A(e)\}$ . It is evident that  $\bar{\pi}(e) < \infty$ , since  $V^A(e) > 0$  for any  $e > 0$ . Also  $\bar{\pi}(e) > 0$ , since  $V(e) > V^A(e)$ , as the access to superior technology combined with financial autarky ensures a higher payoff to the borrower. Since  $V(\cdot)$  is strictly increasing, it follows that a feasible contract in  $\mathcal{P}(e, \pi)$  exists if and only if  $\pi \leq \bar{\pi}(e)$ . Finally, observe that given any  $\pi \leq \bar{\pi}(e)$ , BPC is redundant in  $\mathcal{P}(e, \pi)$ , and the two problems  $\mathcal{P}(e, \pi)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}^C(e - \pi)$  are the same as they involve the same objective function and constraint set. ■

**Proof of Lemma 2:** Already provided in the text.

**Proof of Lemma 7:** If this is false, there exist  $w_1 < w_2$  with  $\Omega_1 \equiv \Omega(w_1) > \Omega(w_2) \equiv \Omega_2$ . Then  $V(\Omega_1) > V(\Omega_2)$  and

$$u(w_2 - C(\Omega_2)) - u(w_2 - C(\Omega_1)) \geq \delta[V(\Omega_1) - V(\Omega_2)] > 0 \quad (31)$$

which implies  $C(\Omega_1) > C(\Omega_2)$ . On the other hand,

$$\delta[V(\Omega_1) - V(\Omega_2)] \geq u(w_1 - C(\Omega_2)) - u(w_1 - C(\Omega_1)) \quad (32)$$

which implies

$$u(w_2 - C(\Omega_2)) - u(w_2 - C(\Omega_1)) \geq u(w_1 - C(\Omega_2)) - u(w_1 - C(\Omega_1)) \quad (33)$$

This contradicts the concavity of  $u$ . ■

**Proof of Lemma 8:** Consider any  $w$  and a slightly higher wealth  $w + \epsilon > w$ . Since the incentive constraint in (9) does not depend on  $w$ , the policies  $(k(w), l(w))$  and  $(k(w + \epsilon), l(w + \epsilon))$  are feasible for both borrowers with starting wealth  $w$  and  $w + \epsilon$ . Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} V(w + \epsilon) &\equiv u(w + \epsilon - C(\Omega(w + \epsilon))) + \delta V(\Omega(w + \epsilon)) \geq u(w + \epsilon - C(\Omega(w))) + \delta V(\Omega(w)) \\ V(w) &\equiv u(w - C(\Omega(w))) + \delta V(\Omega(w)) \geq u(w - C(\Omega(w + \epsilon))) + \delta V(\Omega(w + \epsilon)) \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{u(w + \epsilon - C(\Omega(w + \epsilon))) - u(w - C(\Omega(w + \epsilon)))}{\epsilon} &\geq \frac{V(w + \epsilon) - V(w)}{\epsilon} \\ &\geq \frac{u(w + \epsilon - C(\Omega(w))) - u(w - C(\Omega(w)))}{\epsilon} \end{aligned}$$

Take limits as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0+$ . Since Lemma 7 implies  $C(\Omega(w))$  is nondecreasing in  $w$ , it is continuous almost everywhere. At any continuity point of  $C(\Omega(w))$ , it follows that the right-hand derivative of  $V$  exists and equals  $u'(w - C(\Omega(w)))$ . A parallel argument for the case of  $\epsilon < 0$  with direction of inequalities reversed in (34) holds, implying the left-hand derivative of  $V$  also exists and equals  $u'(w - C(\Omega(w)))$ . Finally observe that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , it is always feasible to let the borrower consume the incremental wealth immediately, so right hand derivative of  $V$  is everywhere bounded below by  $u'(c(w))$ . ■

**Proof of Proposition 1:** Consider any  $w < w^*$ . If  $\Omega(w) \leq w$ , Lemma 7 implies that starting from  $w$  the sequence of net wealth is monotonically nonincreasing. Conversely, if  $\Omega(w) > w$ , the sequence is monotonically nondecreasing. Hence either way, the sequence of net wealths must converge. This implies that the sequence of consumption and investments must also converge.

Next we show that the limiting wealth  $w_\infty$  cannot be smaller than  $w^*$ . Suppose otherwise. Then we claim there is a variation on the contract which is feasible and raises the borrowers welfare. Since  $w_\infty < w^*$ , for all large  $t$  we have  $w_t < w^*$ , and there is underinvestment in the limit ( $k_\delta > k_\infty$ ). So  $[\delta y'(k_t) - 1]$  is positive and bounded away from zero for all large  $t$ .

For all large  $t$ , the incentive constraint binds, hence  $V(y(k_t) - \frac{l_t}{\delta}) = V^A(y(k_t))$ . Consider an increase in  $k_t$  by  $\epsilon > 0$ , and let  $l_t$  change by  $\Delta_t \epsilon$  where

$$\Delta_t = \delta y'(k_t) \left[ 1 - \frac{V^{A'}(y(k_t))}{u'(c_{t+1})} \right] \quad (34)$$

For  $\epsilon$  sufficiently small, the IC is preserved because:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial V(y(k_t + \epsilon) - \frac{l_t}{\delta} - \frac{\Delta_t \epsilon}{\delta})}{\partial \epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon=0+} \\ & \geq u'(c_{t+1}) \left[ y'(k_t) - \frac{\Delta_t}{\delta} \right] \\ & = V^{A'}(y(k_t)) y'(k_t) \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where the last equality follows from construction of  $\Delta_t$  (equation (34)), and the preceding inequality follows from Lemma 8.

The resulting borrower's welfare at  $t$  is

$$V_t(\epsilon) \equiv u(w_t + l_t + \Delta_t \epsilon - k_t - \epsilon) + \delta V(y(k_t + \epsilon) - \frac{l_t + \Delta_t \epsilon}{\delta}) \quad (36)$$

implying that at  $\epsilon = 0$ , the rate of rise of  $V_t$  is at least:

$$\begin{aligned} & -u'(c_t)[1 - \Delta_t] + u'(c_{t+1})[\delta y'(k_t) - \Delta_t] \\ = & u'(c_t)[\delta y'(k_t) - 1] + [u'(c_{t+1}) - u'(c_t)][\delta y'(k_t) - \Delta_t] \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

For  $t$  sufficiently large (37) is positive, because  $[\delta y'(k_t) - 1]$  is positive and bounded away from zero,  $[u'(c_{t+1}) - u'(c_t)]$  converges to zero, and  $[\delta y'(k_t) - \Delta_t] = \delta y'(k_t) \frac{V^A'(y(k_t))}{u'(c_{t+1})}$  is positive and converges to a finite number as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

Hence  $w_\infty \geq w^*$ . Since  $\Omega(w^*) = w^*$ , Lemma 7 implies that  $\Omega(w) \leq w^*$  for any  $w < w^*$ . Hence  $w_\infty \leq w^*$ , and it follows that  $w_\infty = w^*$ .

Next, we show that first-best wealth  $w^*$  cannot be achieved at any finite date. Otherwise, there exists some date  $t$  with  $w_t < w^*$  and  $\Omega(w_t) = w_{t+1} = w^*$ . From Lemma 6 it follows that  $k(w_t) = k_\delta$ , and hence  $\delta y'(k_t) = 1$ , while  $c_{t+1} = c(w_{t+1}) = c^*(w^*)$ . And  $c_t$  must be strictly lower than  $c^*(w^*)$ , otherwise the borrower achieves welfare at least  $V(w^*)$  at a wealth  $w_t < w^*$ . So there is a consumption distortion resulting in  $u'(c_{t+1}) - u'(c_t) < 0$ . Now we can consider a sequence of reverse perturbations analogous to that constructed above, with  $\epsilon < 0$  and converging to 0 from below. From (37) it is evident that this will raise welfare for  $\epsilon$  close enough to zero.

Finally, the sequence of wealths must be strictly increasing at every date (otherwise  $w_{t+1} = \Omega(w_t) = w_t$ , and wealth will remain at  $w_t < w^*$  for ever). ■

**Proof of Proposition 2:** Whenever  $w < w^*$  the IC binds, hence  $V(\Omega(w)) \equiv V(y(w) - \frac{l(w)}{\delta}) = V^A(y(w))$  implies  $\Omega(w) < y(w)$  since  $V(w') > V^A(w')$  for all  $w'$ . Hence  $l(w) \equiv \delta[y(w) - \Omega(w)] > 0$ .

Next, we show that  $l(w)$  must be strictly increasing for all  $w < w^*$ .

**Claim 1:** To establish this, it suffices to show that  $c(\Omega(w)) < c^A(y(w))$  for all  $w < w^*$ , i.e., optimal consumption on the equilibrium path is smaller than the optimal consumption off the equilibrium path in the first period of any deviation. This is because the right hand derivative of  $V$  at  $\Omega(w)$  is bounded below by  $u'(c(\Omega(w)))$ , while the slope of  $V^A(y(w))$  equals  $u'(c^A(y))$  (where  $c(y), c^A(y)$  respectively denote the optimal consumptions at the first date along the equilibrium path and in autarky respectively, starting with wealth  $y$ ). Hence  $c(\Omega(w)) < c^A(y(w))$  implies the slope of  $V$  at  $\Omega(w)$  is larger than  $V^A'(y(w))$ . So  $\Omega(w)$  must rise more slowly in  $w$  than  $y(w)$ .

Next, observe that if  $k(w) \geq k_\delta^A$ , off-equilibrium-path consumption is stationary. Then Claim 1 follows from the IC:  $V(\Omega(w)) = V^A(y(w))$ , since consumption is growing on the equilibrium path (an

argument similar to that used in Proposition 1 rules out the possibility that consumption is stationary on the equilibrium path).

Let  $c_{t'}^{A,t}$  denote optimal consumption at date  $t'$  in autarky, resulting from a deviation at  $t < t'$ .

**Claim 2:** If at any date  $t$ :  $c_t^{A,t} \leq c_t$ , then the same must be true at  $t + 1$ :  $c_{t+1}^{A,t+1} \leq c_{t+1}$ .

To establish Claim 2, suppose otherwise that at some date  $t$ :  $c_t^{A,t} \leq c_t$  and  $c_{t+1}^{A,t+1} > c_{t+1}$ . Then

$$\Delta_t \equiv \delta y'(k_t) \left[ 1 - \frac{u'(c_{t+1}^{A,t+1})}{u'(c_{t+1})} \right] > 0$$

and so

$$u'(c_t)[1 - \Delta_t] < u'(c_t) \leq u'(c_t^{A,t}) = \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial k} [V^A(g(k_t^{A,t}))] \quad (38)$$

Since the IC at  $t$  binds, we have

$$u(c_t) + \delta V(y_{t+1} - \frac{l_t}{\delta}) = u(c_t^{A,t}) + \delta V^A(g(k_t^{A,t}))$$

so  $c_t^{A,t} \leq c_t$  implies

$$V^A(g(k_t^{A,t})) \geq V(y_{t+1} - \frac{l_t}{\delta}) \geq V^A(y_{t+1})$$

where the last inequality again uses the IC at  $t$ . Hence  $g(k_t^{A,t}) \geq y_{t+1}$ . Since  $V^A$  is concave, this implies  $\delta \frac{\partial}{\partial k} [V^A(g(k_t^{A,t}))] \leq \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial k} [V^A(y_{t+1})]$ . Hence (38) implies

$$u'(c_t)[1 - \Delta_t] < \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial k} [V^A(y_{t+1})]$$

Using an argument similar to that used in Proposition 1, it is feasible to increase investment slightly on the equilibrium path and raise the borrower's welfare, contradicting optimality of the original contract. Hence Claim 2 holds.

Finally, Claim 2 implies by induction that  $c_{t'}^{A,t'} \leq c_{t'}$  for all  $t' > t$ . Since  $k_t$  converges to the first-best capital stock  $k_\delta$  which strictly exceeds  $k_\delta^A$ , there exists some date  $t' > t$  when  $k_{t'} = k(w_{t'}) > k_\delta^A$  and we would obtain a contradiction to the argument in the previous paragraph. This completes the proof. ■

#### Proof of Proposition 4:

(a) The same argument as in the deterministic case ensures  $\Omega(w; s)$  is non-decreasing in  $w$ . To show that it is non-decreasing in  $s$ , it suffices to show that  $C$  and marginal cost of wealth  $C_w(\Omega, s)$  are both non-increasing in  $s$ .

Observe that

$$C(\Omega, s) = \delta \Omega - \delta Z(\Omega, s) \quad (39)$$

where

$$Z(\Omega, s) \equiv \max_{y \geq 0} \left[ y - \frac{k(y, s)}{\delta} \right] \quad \text{subject to:} \quad V_A(y, s') \leq V(\Omega, s') \forall s' \quad (40)$$

and  $k(Y, s)$  denotes the solution for  $k$  in  $y(k, s) = Y$ .

Since (using standard arguments)  $V_A(y, s')$  is strictly increasing and continuous in  $y$ , we can define  $Y(\Omega)$  as the largest (or supremum)  $y$  satisfying the incentive constraint (IC) in (40). The IC can then be replaced by  $y \leq Y(\Omega)$ . Standard arguments also imply  $V(w, s)$  is increasing in  $w$ , hence  $Y(\Omega)$  is increasing. Therefore

$$Z(\Omega, s) \equiv \max_{y \geq 0} \left[ y - \frac{k(y, s)}{\delta} \right] \quad \text{subject to:} \quad y \leq Y(\Omega) \quad (41)$$

As  $k(y, s)$  is non-increasing in  $s$ , it follows that  $Z$  is non-decreasing in  $s$ , and  $C$  is non-increasing in  $s$ .

The unconstrained solution to (41) involves setting  $y(\Omega, s) = y_\delta(s) \equiv y(k_\delta(s), s)$ , and the IC binds iff  $y_\delta(s) > Y(\Omega)$ . Hence  $y(\Omega, s) = Y(\Omega)$  if  $y_\delta(s) > Y(\Omega)$  and  $y_\delta(s)$  otherwise. It follows that  $C(\Omega, s) = \delta\Omega - y(k_\delta(s), s) + \frac{1}{\delta}y(k_\delta(s), s)$  in the former case, and  $\delta\Omega - Y(\Omega, s) + \frac{1}{\delta}k(Y(\Omega, s), s)$  otherwise.

Hence the marginal cost of a higher wealth target  $C_w(\Omega, s)$  equals  $\delta$  if  $\Omega$  is large enough that IC does not bind, so does not depend on  $s$ . When the IC does bind, the marginal cost is defined a.e. (whenever  $Y'(\Omega)$  exists), in which case it equals  $\delta - Y'(\Omega)[1 - \frac{1}{\delta}y_k(k(Y(\Omega), s), s)]$ . This is non-increasing in  $s$  because  $y_k(k, s)$  is decreasing in  $k$  and increasing in  $s$ ,  $k(Y, s)$  is decreasing in  $s$ , and  $Y'(\Omega) > 0$ .

**(b)** Suppose  $\delta y'(k(w, s)) < 1$ . Consider a small reduction in both capital and borrowing:  $k = k(w, s) - \epsilon$  and  $l = l(w, s) - \epsilon$ , which then results in an increase in  $y(k, s) - \frac{l}{\delta}$ . The IC constraint (23) and borrowing constraint (24) continue to hold, continuation utility  $E_{s'}[V(y(k, s) - \frac{l}{\delta}, s')]$  rises and current consumption is unchanged. So the original contract could not have been optimal.

**(c)** From (b) and (24) we have  $l_t(w, s) \leq \delta[y_\delta(s) - \underline{w}] \leq \delta \max_s [y_\delta(s) - \underline{w}]$ , so the size of loans is uniformly bounded above, implying  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \delta^T l_T \leq 0$  along any history.

**(d)** If this is false, there exists  $s$  and wealths  $w > w'$  with  $k(w, s) < k(w', s) \leq k_\delta(s)$ . From (a),  $y(k(w, s), s) - \frac{l(w, s)}{\delta} \geq y(k(w', s), s) - \frac{l(w', s)}{\delta}$ , which implies

$$l(w', s) - l(w, s) \geq \delta[y(k(w', s), s) - y(k(w, s), s)] \quad (42)$$

Define  $l'' \equiv [k(w', s) - k(w, s)] + l(w, s)$ . Since  $k(w, s) < k(w', s) \leq k_\delta(s)$ , the Intermediate Value Theorem implies

$$\delta[y(k(w', s), s) - y(k(w, s), s)] > k(w', s) - k(w, s) = l'' - l(w, s). \quad (43)$$

(42) then implies that  $l(w', s) > l''$ . Therefore:

$$y(k(w', s), s) - \frac{l''}{\delta} > y(k(w', s), s) - \frac{l(w', s)}{\delta} \quad (44)$$

implying that the borrower with wealth  $w$  could feasibly borrow  $l''$  and invest  $k(w', s)$  while preserving the incentive and borrowing constraints. This would entail the same current consumption:  $k(w, s) - l(w, s) = k(w', s) - l''$ , and generate higher continuation utility because of (43), so we obtain a contradiction.

**(e)** Note to start with that  $w_{t+1} = \Omega(w_t, s_t) \geq w_t = \Omega(w_{t-1}, s_{t-1})$  upon using (a), combined with  $w_t \geq w_{t-1}$  and  $s_t \geq s_{t-1}$ . Now use the same argument inductively at all subsequent dates.

**(f)** If this is false, there is some  $s$  for which  $k(w, s) < k_\delta(s)$  for all  $w$ . Observe first that this implies  $l(w, s) \geq 0$  for all  $w$ , since otherwise  $l(w, s) < 0$  for some  $w$  and the IC (23) does not bind for a borrower with wealth  $w$ . This borrower can increase  $k$  and  $l$  by the same small amount and raise continuation utility strictly, while keeping current consumption unchanged. Since  $y'(k(w, s), s) > \frac{1}{\delta} > 1$ , the borrowing constraint is also preserved. So the contract could not have been optimal.

Since  $l(w, s) \geq 0$  for all  $w$ , (b) implies that net wealth next period  $\Omega(w, s) \equiv y(k(w, s), s) - \frac{l(w, s)}{\delta} \leq y_\delta(s)$  for all  $w$ , i.e., is bounded above. Consumption in the next period is therefore bounded above because investment is nonnegative and borrowing is bounded above by  $\max_{s'} y_\delta(s') - \underline{w}$ .

On the other hand, current consumption for the borrower is bounded below by  $w - k_\delta(s)$  since borrowing is non-negative for all  $w$ . Hence as  $w \rightarrow \infty$ , current consumption goes to  $\infty$ , while consumption in the next period is bounded above. Since the utility function satisfies Inada conditions, the marginal utility of current consumption must be lower than discounted marginal utility of consumption in the following period, for sufficiently large  $w$ . Such a borrower can reduce  $l$  slightly below  $l(w, s)$  which preserves borrowing and incentive constraints, and raises welfare. So the contract cannot be optimal for large enough  $w$ . ■